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Parents in today's society are confronted with a variety of demands. Moreover, the nature of these demands has shifted somewhat from providing children with necessities for basic survival to a more heavy emphasis on ensuring optimal mental and physical well being. Faced with such expectations, parents have increasingly turned to the experts for advice about childrearing. One outgrowth of this movement has been the upsurge of organized parent education programs.

The research reported in the literature indicates that parents generally demonstrate positive change after participation in parent education programs. The purpose in this study was to quantitatively describe the components of parent education programs and to determine the relationship between those components and parental outcomes.

The sample for the study was 12 parent education programs. A total of 60 mothers from these programs participated in the research project. Program leaders completed a questionnaire which measured 24 variables. Parents completed three questionnaires which measured 16 parent variables as well as pretest and posttest ratings on a behavioral assessment instrument. The relationship between the various parent and program variables and mothers' change scores was analyzed on both total change scores and change scores on an item by item basis.
Four research questions were posed. The first question asked, "How do parent education programs differ?" Six parent variables and 12 program variables were found to have sufficient variability to warrant further analysis.

The second question asked, "Do parent education programs significantly affect changes in parents' reported behaviors?" Overall effects as well as individual program effects were tested by a t-test. When all mothers in the 12 programs were analyzed, significant differences between pretest and posttest scores were found. Subsequent analyses of the individual programs found significant differences in only one program. Moreover, a two-way analysis of variance on mothers' change scores did not find significant differences between programs.

The third and fourth questions were, "What influence does the background of the participating parents have upon changes in their reported behaviors?" and "What are the important variables of parent education programs which affect changes in parents' reported behaviors?" Although none of the variables tested showed a significant relationship to changes in reported behaviors, other differences were identified. Repeated measures on the 60 items on the outcome measure indicated significant differences between mothers' responses to various items. That is, large changes were consistently noted on some items, whereas small or negative changes were noted on others. In addition, significant interactions also
were detected in some of the analyses. The presence of interaction may indicate differential effects on changes in mothers in various groups to the various items. These two findings suggest that the relationship between parent/program variables and parental changes may be more complex than originally hypothesized.
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Parent education, in the sense of providing information and assistance to parents in rearing their children, has existed for centuries. Relatives, physicians, the clergy and others have served as resources for parents facing the new, and often difficult, challenges of parenthood. In the late 1800's, however, the nature of this assistance changed, and parent education as a structured, organized movement began.

Two major societal developments are believed to have influenced this change (Hendrickson, 1963b). First, thousands of small women's groups across the country actively sought information about the expanding field of child development. Through their membership, these organizations sponsored educational groups designed to increase the knowledge, and by inference, the effectiveness, of parents. A second development, probably even more far-reaching than the first, was the decline of the absolute power of the father and/or the church. As these strong authoritarian patterns broke down, parents began to question their roles more and were motivated to seek help and guidance from experts in childrearing. As Callahan (1974) notes, "With the authority of God and the Church gone from the scene, the only legitimation for a parent is the pragmatic success of his child." (p. 28).
Parents now are beset with the problem of choosing the appropriate mechanism for obtaining this parent education information. Program developers, on the other hand, also need empirical evidence to aid them in designing meaningful parent education programs. The need, therefore, is for data which identifies the important elements of parent education. This study was designed to investigate some of these potentially important variables. In short, the purpose in the study was to quantitatively describe the components of parent education programs and to determine the relationship between those components and parental outcomes. This type of detailed information thus can be used by program developers in determining the most appropriate approach to parent education and by parents in selecting a parent education program.

**Definition of Parent Education Programs**

The media, family and friends, as well as the experts, provide information and/or advice to parents about childrearing. However, the term "parent education program", or simply "parent education", is generally restricted to a more narrow type of encounter.

According to Auerbach (1968), parent education is a "term used to cover a wide range of educational programs to help parents increase their competence as parents and develop effective methods of child care" (p.3). Included in this definition are several key elements of parent education programs which need further explanation.

First, parent education is an educational program. Sanders (1975) states that "an education program [is] a social system (a set of
structured interpersonal statuses and processes) deliberately established and operated over time to facilitate learning by more than one learner" (p. 4). Five components, thus, form the necessary conditions for an educational program: (1) It is a social system in which roles are well defined; (2) it is deliberately established, not merely a spontaneous gathering, and has delimited boundaries; (3) it has duration over time, i.e., it is not a one-time occurrence; (4) its over-riding goal is to facilitate learning; and finally, (5) it involves more than one learner, i.e., two or more parents are enrolled in the program. On this basis, interactions such as the neighbor giving advice, the physician talking to a concerned parent, and the caseworker occasionally explaining the "proper" way to rear children can be excluded from the category of parent education programs.

Auerbach's definition also identifies the goal of parent education. Specifically, she states that the purpose is to increase the parents' competence in role performance. Parental competence, moreover, can be defined as a "measure of the parent's conscious awareness and acceptance of the teaching role he plays in the life of his children, and the desire to increase his skill in guiding his children's growth" (Pickarts and Fargo, 1971, p. 25). Thus, conscious intent of actions, awareness of parenting roles, and internal commitment to change are all essential for parents to achieve competence.

The concept of competence is crucial to the entire process and outcome of parent education. Argyris (1970) argues that:
The core activities of any system are (1) to achieve its objectives, (2) to maintain its internal environment, and (3) to adapt to, and maintain control over, the relevant external environment. How well the system accomplishes these core activities over time and under different conditions is an indication of its competence. How well the system accomplishes these core activities in any given situation indicates its effectiveness (p. 36).

These two terms—effectiveness and competence—generally are used synonymously. Unfortunately, confusion can result when the differences between them become apparent. Clearly, both are goals toward which parent education programs are striving. However, research (Clarke-Stewart, 1977) indicates that it is the totality of the experience, i.e., competence, rather than any single event (effectiveness) which most significantly affects a child's development. (For a further discussion on these terms, see "Parent Behavior Assessment", Chapter IV)

A third component of parent education suggested by the Auerbach definition is that it involves more than information transferral and acquisition. In addition, the program seeks to help parents develop their own parenting skills. This implies an active decision making role on the part of parents involved in the program. "Education presents a range of evidence, values and attitudes from which the parent may select those meaningful to him and thus, increase his skill in rational autonomous problem-solving" (Pickarts and Fargo, 1971, p. 75). Even those programs that adhere fairly rigidly to a specific approach, e.g., behavior modification, offer parents choices for dealing with situations. Thus, parents are integrally involved in the process of the educational experience, since ultimately parents can and must function independently.
Finally, for purposes in this study, the term parent education will be restricted to group programs, i.e., programs in which groups of parents meet for the purpose of increasing their competence and effectiveness as parents. Thus, home-based programs, although they are a social system deliberately established to facilitate learning by more than one learner and thereby meet the definition of a program, are not considered in this study. They represent a somewhat different approach to parent education and should be investigated in a separate study.

In summary, a parent education program is any group-based educational program or activity designed to help parents increase their competence and effectiveness in childrearing. This definition, taken in conjunction with the above definitions of educational program, competence, and effectiveness, incorporates the crucial elements of parent education used in this study.

Need for the Research

Even when parent education is limited to programs which meet the definition stated above, many different programs across the country still remain. In addition to the obvious differences in terms of geographical location, socioeconomic variables of the participants, and the qualifications of the various leaders, substantial theoretical differences make comparison across programs difficult at best. Yet, at least on a very global level, all programs strive for the same goal of increasing parents' competence and effectiveness in childrearing. As Brim (1965) notes, "The primary objective of those parent education
programs generally acknowledged as successful and outstanding in quality is to make him (the parent) more autonomous and creative, to improve his independent judgement, to increase the rationality of the parent's role performance" (p. 10). How then, can such diverse programs strive toward a common goal? Or, perhaps an even more basic question, what methods can be employed to analyze and synthesize the similarities and differences between programs in order to achieve some understanding of the underlying processes involved in parent education?

One way to begin to answer these questions is to develop a conceptual framework of parent education. A conceptual framework is "the essential or important concepts employed and the basic assumptions which underlie the concepts and to a degree integrate them into a meaningful configuration" (Nye and Berardo, 1966, p. 3). Certainly the specification of a conceptual framework of parent education, that is, an outline of the important concepts and assumptions made by parent education programs, would provide a foundation on which to begin such an analysis.

The critical elements of a conceptual framework are the concepts. Concepts, in this context, represent a schema, or system, for classifying and evaluating objects and events in the environment (Harvey, Hunt and Schroder, 1961). They symbolize some aspect of reality which can be communicated (Durr, 1973). Thus, concepts provide definitiveness and dimension to the world, e.g., hot-cold, clear-unclear, and so forth. Concepts are the indicators for evaluating a program. The conceptual framework, which organizes these concepts into a meaningful configuration,
adds meaning to the discrete concepts and enables generalizations and conclusions to be drawn.

Aside from a purely philosophical perspective, however, of what practical benefit is such a conceptual framework of parent education? Nye and Berardo (1966) suggest four ways in which a conceptual framework can aid research. Conceptual frameworks can (1) help develop adequate measures of the properties being considered by focusing the study on particular topics of interest; (2) identify and/or suggest possible variables by specifying the dimensions to be measured; (3) list and define the central concepts so that different frameworks can be compared, and finally, (4) make explicit the underlying assumptions which would enable replication and/or generalization of the results. The need for a conceptual framework is particularly evident in a field such as parent education in which many diverse approaches often are integrated into a single program. By outlining the conceptual framework, the inter-relationships between these elements can begin to be specified. Ultimately, then, the conceptual framework itself can be tested to determine if the variables are in fact related in the way that was predicted from the framework and to determine how much of the total variance in the outcomes is accounted for by the model (Broderick, 1971).

What constitutes a statement of a conceptual framework? Such a framework should: (1) consist of a set of postulates and definition of terms involved in these postulates, i.e., concepts; (2) specify the boundaries of its concerns and constraints, i.e., the limitations; (3)
be internally consistent; (4) be capable of generating hypotheses which go beyond existing data; (5) be verifiable; (6) represent a qualitative synthesis; and (7) be congruent with empirical data. (Ashby, 1970; Gordon, 1970; Hall & Lindgry, 1957)

In order to form the meaningful configuration, a conceptual framework must specify: (1) the program variables in a manner which permits comparison across programs; (2) the outcomes of the program in common terms; and (3) the relationship between (1) and (2). This process is described by LeBaron (1969) as system analysis: "Systems analysis is, in short, an orderly approach for first, defining and describing a universe of interest (and the significant factors and their inter-relationships within that universe); and second, determining what changes in that universe will cause a desired effect" (p. 3). That is, it is not sufficient to simply describe the relevant input and output variables. The connections between these variables must also be made in order to both describe the present system better and to make predictions about how modifications in that system would affect the outcomes.

Returning to the original question - what methods can be employed to analyze and synthesize the similarities and differences between programs in order to achieve some understanding of the underlying processes - one answer appears to lie in the systems approach. The systems approach is "a process by which needs are identified, problems selected, requirements for problem solution are identified, solutions are chosen from alternatives, methods and means are obtained and
implemented, results are evaluated, and required revisions to all or part of the system are made so that the needs are eliminated" (Kaufman, 1972, p. 2). Graphically, this process is illustrated in Figure 1.

The identification of a need is clearly the first step in this process. A need is simply a discrepancy between what is and what should be. The need identified in this study is for data which relates specific characteristics of programs to their outcomes. The next step then becomes one of generating appropriate techniques for identifying these characteristics and testing the corresponding assumptions made about them. Larson (1972) has summarized these issues as follows:

Individual components of each program need to be identified, factor analyzed, and evaluated as to their effectiveness apart from the total program. Interactive patterns between components should be isolated, and promising individual components and interaction clusters need to be experimented with and reassembled into new programs, to be administered and tested as to their effectiveness in improving family communications (p. 270).

Problem to be Investigated

The problem thus becomes one of evaluating existing programs and then aggregating this information across programs in order to generalize about the results. Bryk and Weisburg (1977) propose a three step process: (1) identify through an exploratory analysis potentially controllable factors, (2) systematically introduce these factors into successive programming, and (3) accumulate evidence about what appears to be the critical ingredients of a successful program. Only the first step can be taken in the present study. The second step is determined
Figure 1. The systems approach as a process for designing and conducting research (adapted from Kaufman, 1972, p. 2).
by the program sponsors who will use the results to modify existing programs. The final step is to reevaluate the programs after modifications have been implemented in order to assess the effects. Subsequent studies would be needed to undertake these efforts.

What are the potentially controllable factors influencing outcomes of parent education programs? In order to answer this question, the study was designed to analyze components of parent education programs to determine which of these variables showed a significant relationship to changes in parents' reported behavior. Specifically, four major research questions were investigated. The specific variables included in each question were identified by a review of related research (Chapter III). The hypotheses developed from each question and the methods used to test these hypotheses are described in Chapter IV.

1. How do parent education programs differ?

In the previous discussion, it was noted that parent education programs generally strive toward a common goal of increasing parental competence and effectiveness. However, programs often appear to be quite different. What are some of the specific ways in which programs differ? Variations could occur in terms of the content included, techniques employed, staff training, duration and frequency of the meetings, types of parents enrolled, ancillary services available, and a host of other dimensions. Describing as concretely as possible the similarities and differences between programs is the first step in determining potentially controllable and significant factors.
2. Do parent education programs significantly affect changes in parents' reported behaviors?

The goal of parent education programs is to increase parents' competence and effectiveness. Clearly one of the first determinations must be whether or not the programs accomplished their goal by demonstrating significant changes in parents. Two levels of analyses are possible. First, the overall effects of all programs in the study can be examined. Following that analysis, the effects of each individual program can also be analyzed.

3. What influence does the background of the participating parents have upon changes in their reported behaviors?

In addition to changes in reported behavior, the background of the parents also can directly affect their perceptions of and reactions to the programs. That is, all parents with similar backgrounds may react in one way to parent education programs, whereas parents with other backgrounds could react in a different manner. The effect of these background variables could operate either independently or in interaction with the program variables.

4. What are the important variables of parent education programs which affect changes in parents' reported behaviors?

Finally, the critical question the study was designed to answer concerned the nature of the relationship between specific program variables and the concomittant changes in parents' reported behaviors. As the research reviewed in Chapter III indicates, most parent education programs do succeed in significantly affecting parents. Thus, a statement such as, "This program succeeded in making changes", does not really provide much significant and useful
information to program planners. It is important to ask not only, "Did the program succeed or fail?", but also "What were the specific elements that caused the observed effects?" By analyzing a series of program variables, some potentially controllable factors can be identified.

Plan of the Study

The outline for the remainder of the study follows the system approach diagrammed in Figure 1. Therefore, since the need has been identified (need for research which relates program characteristics to parental outcomes) and problems have been selected (questions of determining how programs and parents differ and what effects these differences have upon observed changes), the next step was to generate possible solutions. The strategy employed for generating these solutions was to examine current literature and related research to specify a conceptual basis within which to view the parent education process and to determine appropriate variables to investigate and designs to employ (Chapters II and III). Chapter IV contains the overall strategy selected and the specific hypotheses to be tested. In Chapter V, the instruments used, the sample in the study, the procedures for implementation, and finally, the limitations of the particular strategies chosen are described. The analysis techniques and the findings of the study are described in Chapter VI. The results are organized around the original problems selected and the hypotheses derived from those questions. The final chapter discusses the implications of the findings and suggests revisions
to the process. Thus, the needs, problems, solutions implementation and results are examined and possible modifications are outlined.

In summary, the purpose in this study was to quantitatively describe the components of parent education programs and to determine the relationship between these components and parental outcomes. In order to accomplish this, four steps were taken: (1) the potentially important components of parent education were identified through a review of the literature, (2) programs were compared along these dimensions, (3) the statistical relationship between the variables and the outcome measures was tested in order to assess the impact of the various components, and finally, (4) the original set of potentially important components was modified in light of the accumulated evidence.
The concepts forming the basis of a conceptual framework of parent education can be placed into two broad categories: those concerning the parent-child relationship and those concerning the educational process. If these dimensions can be specified, and the interaction between them determined, then a conceptual framework can begin to be developed.

The Parent-Child Relationship

Consider first the basic assumption that American society makes about the role performance of parents. A parent must perform many roles in society: for example, nurturer, provider, teacher, guardian and spiritual/moral guide. In assessing the adequacy of a parent, society makes certain assumptions about the expected nature of the parent-child relationship. These assumptions, or a subset of them, form the content of a parent education program.

One dimension which immediately arises is the legal rights of parents and their children. Society can, and must, define certain rules of conduct for its members in order to maintain a well-functioning community. These rules are often in a state of transition. Currently, standards for both children's and parent's rights are being redefined (Gross & Gross, 1977). In so doing, the courts and legislatures are clearly establishing new or different expectations for the parent-child
relationship. This is clearly a dimension requiring intensive investigation and discussion and, hence, is mentioned only to emphasize the critical nature of such issues.

A second dimension concerns the influence, or impact, parents have on their children. In the past, two somewhat competing theories were postulated (Skolnick, 1978). One, exemplified by Freud, suggested that children had basically asocial or undesirable behaviors which parents had to redirect to socially approved outlets. The other theory, suggested first by Rousseau and later advocated by behaviorists such as Watson, is that a child's mind is a tabula rasa, or blank slate, and that everything a child becomes is learned through education. These theories, and the countless other versions and competing theories, emphasize the crucial role that parents play in their child's development. Two important generalizations can be made from these theoretical positions. First, little or no importance is placed on the child's role in this process. Children, it is assumed, are passive receptors of the precepts of their parents and others in the environment. However, recent evidence clearly demonstrates the reciprocal, transactional nature of the parent-child relationship (Ausubel, et al., 1954; Clarke-Stewart, 1977; Cox, 1970; Osofsky, 1970; Saxe & Stollak, 1971). Thus, the behaviors and personalities of both the parent and child must be considered in describing the parent-child relationship.

A second, somewhat related, generalization which can be drawn from Freud's and Rousseau's theories concerns the importance of critical
events or traumas, in a child's development. That is, according to both theories, a single event or a series of events has the potential of having an overridingly negative impact on a child. Research now indicates that although parent-child relations are undeniably important, the crucial factor is probably the set or context in which they occur.

"'Setting' and 'context' mean at least two things. First, no isolated type of behavior on the part of caregivers has any invariant effect on children: The consequences of any single kind of action depend on what else is happening between parents and children and on what they bring to their interaction . . . The second meaning of 'context' . . . is the 'ecological' context within which an entire caregiver-child relationship takes place . . . It includes everything from the quality of family housing to the job (or lack of job) of the parent; from the organization of economic security (insecurity) to their pride (or discomfort) in their heritage.

(Clarke-Stewart, 1977, ix-x)

The ecological context of the family is really a separate dimension of the parent-child relationship. Only recently has it come under close scrutiny by researchers. Although the importance of parents' own self-esteem has long been recognized, the role society plays in developing or degrading parents' self-esteem is just beginning to be investigated. All families receive support from society for childrearing, e.g., education, recreation, vocational training, and perhaps even childcare itself. However, the context in which such services are provided varies tremendously. A middle class parent enrolling a child in a preschool program is certainly viewed differently than a low income parent who is required to place the child in such a program in order to retain custody of the child.
In addition, society is gradually withdrawing duties previously assigned to the family and substituting institutions to fulfill these roles, e.g., educational. However, and this is perhaps the critical point of the entire process, although society removes the authority from parents to perform certain roles, it does not consequently remove the responsibility of parents to ensure that their children meet certain standards of behavior which are required by society. Thus, parents are placed in the unenviable position of being accountable but of having little or no authority. In short, they are often the first to be blamed if a child fails, but in many instances, they have little or no control over whether the child has the opportunities to acquire the necessary skills.

The final dimension regarding the parent-child relationship in today's society concerns the role of experts. Although perhaps a subset of the ecological context, the impact and implications of the increasing visibility of child-rearing experts is so far reaching that it deserves special consideration.

As noted in the introduction, the decline in the absolute authority of the father and/or church was accompanied by a concomitant rise in the reliance upon experts for advice. Experts, it was argued, could show parents how to raise their children, and society would eventually benefit from a healthier, happier population. The implication is that parents could (and should) be given dependable information on child-rearing which would then significantly reduce (or eliminate) problems
with their children (Dodson, 1970; Fisher & Fisher, 1976). Thus, parents are encouraged, or perhaps discouraged, to become self-styled experts or to risk permanently handicapping their children through their own ignorance.

While this inference is probably somewhat overstated, two important points must be considered. First, it is incorrect to assume that the experts know the "proper" way to raise children and need only to convey this knowledge to parents. Quite the contrary, many gaps still remain about the exact nature of the parent-child relationship. Second, "blaming parents and giving them advice both spring from the assumption that the problems of individuals can be solved by changing the individuals who have the problems" (Keniston, 1977, p. 9). The above discussion of the ecological context of the family, as well as evidence from family therapy and interaction, suggest that treatment of single individuals often does not provide optimal results.

In summary, then, some assumptions can be made about the parent-child relationship. The following is proposed as a partial list. The list is intended to be general, since more specific information is provided in subsequent chapters. On the other hand, it is also intended to identify the critical issues concerning the parent-child relationship.

1. Both the parents and children have individual rights which need to be protected and maintained. While the exact nature of these rights is in a state of transition, the
era in which children were viewed as property of their parents with no rights of their own has passed.

2. Children are not passive objects to be shaped by their parents. Not only do parents' behaviors influence their children, but the actions of children also modify and influence their parents.

3. It is the sum total of the experiences between a parent and child, not any single event, which determines the quality of the parent-child relationship. The effects of parental behaviors vary across settings and between children in the same family.

4. The ecological context of the family affects the self-concept of both parents and children. Society differentially values behaviors of parents based upon their ecological context.

5. Institutions are increasingly assuming roles previously assigned to parents. In this process, parents are becoming less of a direct role model and more of an advocate for the needs and rights of themselves and their children.

6. As the body of knowledge concerning childrearing increases, parents need to have available an adequate base of knowledge concerning such practices and techniques without surrendering their unique awareness of the special considerations of their own family.
What, then, are the implications of these dimensions for parent education? First, they suggest variables which need to be investigated in a systematic way. That is, they form the basis for selecting variables to include in a study of parent education. Secondly, these dimensions also impact upon the way the educational process is developed and presented to parents.

The Educational Process

Certain assumptions about human beings are made whenever a group educational program is undertaken. Although rarely specified, these assumptions form the overall framework into which the educational process fits. Auerbach (1968) has suggested the following as the assumptions underlying a group approach to parent education:

1. Parents can learn.
2. Parents want to learn.
3. Parents learn best when they are interested in learning.
4. Learning is most significant when the subject matter is closely related to the parents' own immediate experiences.
5. Parents learn best when they are free to create their own response to a situation.
6. Parent group education is as much an emotional experience as it is an intellectual one.
7. Parents learn from one another.
8. Parent group education provides the basis for a remaking of experience.
9. Each parent learns on his own. (pp. 23-28)
The assumptions point to critical elements of an adult education program. First, participants must be motivated and be involved in the learning process. Indeed, the degree of parents' active involvement and participation has been shown to be directly related to the success of the program (Auerbach, 1968; Bronfenbrenner, 1974; Clarke-Stewart, 1977; Hereford, 1963; Stevens, 1968; and Verner & Davidson, 1971). In short, parents need to be prepared for the experience and have an active intent to learn.

A second element which research seems to indicate as essential for an adult educational program is content matter which is specific to the participants' needs and concerns (Albert, 1962). Clarke-Stewart (1977) indicates that "programs with the greatest success would include goal-specific curricula (to date, curricula aimed specifically at children's cognitive or language skills have been most effectively communicated to parents. Curricula should be extended to include experiences that demonstrate to parents the need for being responsive to children's behavior as well as stimulating their senses)" (p. 106).

A third important element is the group process itself. Verner and Davidson (1971) suggest that the participants' willingness to engage in the learning process depends, in part, upon his/her need for social affiliation with others. Indeed, Albert (1962) goes so far as to suggest that "group learning is unlikely to succeed without appealing to attitudes and viewpoints sufficiently familiar to be accepted by the majority" (p. 252). Auerbach (1968) emphasized this element by noting the importance of the learning parents gain from one another.
Finally, the role of the teacher/leader in the educational process is critical. This concerns not only the content expertise, but also the relationship of the teacher to the other adults in the class (Bradford, 1957). Although often viewed as a difference in content matter or theoretical approach, even advocates of the same philosophy of parent education frequently implement and translate that philosophy in very different ways. Moreover, just as the leader's personality and style can affect the group, so too can the individuals in the group affect the teacher.

Therefore, a set of issues, analogous to the issues derived for the parent-child relationship, can also be specified for the group, adult education process. Here again, these issues identify variables which should be addressed in any study involving group adult education programs. In addition, they also interact with the assumptions about the parent-child relationship to form that unique set of experiences labelled parent education programs. In summary, then, these issues are as follows:

1. Participants must be motivated to learn and must be actively involved in the learning process.

2. Curricula must be specific and relevant to the needs and concerns of the learners.

3. A critical element of the success of the program is the actual functioning of the group process itself. Groups which build cohesiveness and foster mutual support are more likely to be successful.

4. The role and relationship of the teacher/leader is an essential element of any group educational process.
The field of parent education is expanding rapidly and research is being conducted in many different levels. The need for an overall framework within which to view this ever changing area is becoming critical.

The purpose in this study was to quantitatively describe the components of parent education programs and to determine the relationship between those components and parental outcomes. In order to accomplish this goal, the related literature was examined from three perspectives. First, the theoretical foundation of parent education was explored. Programs were divided into three major categories and a program in each category was described in detail.

This discussion of the various theoretical approaches provided the basis upon which to examine the related research. Moreover, it also identified some key dimensions on which to compare and contrast programs. Finally, it offered an organizational framework within which the key concepts of parent education could be explored.

The second perspective from which to examine the literature was in terms of the related research. This review was organized into two subsections: (1) research comparing two or more approaches to parent education and (2) research considering the effects of a single program.
No studies were identified which examined individual elements of parent education programs with respect to their effects on parents. However, studies which compared two or more approaches to parent education are directly related to the present research, whereas studies considering the effects of a single program have only limited applicability to this investigation. Both types of research, however, do identify potentially controllable factors to be investigated.

Finally, the methodological considerations related to research in parent education were reviewed. In particular, some of the measurement and assessment problems were discussed, and the strengths and weaknesses of various strategies were presented. Conceptualization of a study must include not only theoretical issues related to parent education but also methodological issues related to measurement of those constructs.

**Theoretical Foundations**

Although much effort has been devoted to parent education, very little research has gone into the actual process of parent education itself. No comparative reviews of recent research were found in the literature; no general classification systems have been widely accepted; indeed, beyond the study of a particular program model, very little work has been reported in the development of an overall theoretical model of parent education.

In order to organize the discussion of the field of parent education, some idea of what is "out there" must be ascertained. That is, the types of programs that are being conducted and, at least on a very general level, the categories into which these programs can be placed must be specified.
With this purpose in mind, Figure 2 is suggested as a tentative classification system. The general components of this system were proposed by Apps (1973) for adult education programs, although the schema presented in Figure 2 has numerous deletions and additions from Apps' original model.

Two comments concerning the schema are particularly important. First, the distinctions between programs were made on the basis of learning models primarily because the definition of parent education specifies that learning on the part of the parents is an integral part of all programs. Moreover, since a general construct such as a learning model is applicable to any program in which learning is the primary objective, such a schema could be generalizable to other encounters not considered as parent education programs under the definition used in this study.

Secondly, the programs listed as examples are not the only programs which could be classified under that category nor were all program models included in the study. However, these models do represent divergent, and yet fairly well known approaches to parent education. One program under each learning model is described in detail and, in the next section, the research related to that program presented. The purpose of this discussion was to highlight similarities and differences between programs in order to identify variables which needed to be included in the analysis of parent education programs.
In attempting to classify a program into one of three learning models, answers to two questions were considered:

1. What is the role of the parent? That is, what is the set of behaviors and/or attitudes which the parent is expected to demonstrate during the course?
   
a. If the parent is seen primarily as a person trying to find solutions to problems in his/her family which are disturbing, the appropriate learning model is probably problem solving.

b. If the parent's function is seen mainly as learning more about parenting from a professional, acquiring content is likely to be the learning model.

c. Finally, self actualization seems the most appropriate model when describing programs which emphasize more effective parenting through the parent's better understanding of him/herself.

2. To what degree is the program content structured, or pre-established? A related question is to what extent is the content limited to the particular theoretical viewpoint(s) under which it was originally designed?

The three learning models can roughly be classified along a continuum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acquiring Content</th>
<th>Problem Solving</th>
<th>Self Actualization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directly structured, strong influence of theory</td>
<td>Less structured, fairly heavy reliance upon particular theory(ies)</td>
<td>Indirectly structured, fairly heavy reliance upon eclectic theory(ies)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lillie (1975) has suggested three divisions of parent education programs. These divisions are apparently based primarily upon the technique used in the operation of the program, whereas Apps' categories focus more upon the underlying assumptions about the nature of the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>PROBLEM SOLVING</th>
<th>LEARNING MODELS ACQUIRING CONTENT</th>
<th>SELF ACTUALIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role of Learner (Parent)</td>
<td>Problem-Solver</td>
<td>Recipient of Content</td>
<td>Self-Searching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles of Adult Educator</td>
<td>Helper, Knowledge</td>
<td>Translator, Communication</td>
<td>Guide, Counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Source, Facilitator</td>
<td>Link, Advocate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Goal</td>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>Mastery of Information</td>
<td>Finding One's Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and Facts, Self Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Advocates</td>
<td>Thomas Gordon</td>
<td>Wesley Decker</td>
<td>Carl Hereford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dreikurs/Adler</td>
<td>Gerland Patterson</td>
<td>Haim Ginott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Glasser</td>
<td>Marilyn Clark</td>
<td>Virginia Satir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eda LeShan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Program Format</td>
<td>Discussion Group</td>
<td>Lecture Style</td>
<td>Continuous Discussion Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with Formal Presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary Programs</td>
<td>Parent Effectiveness</td>
<td>Responsive Parent Training</td>
<td>Child Study Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Patterson's Groups</td>
<td>Parent-Child Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adlerian Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. A classification schema for parent education programs.
experience. Lillie's categories are: (1) a behavioral insight model, (2) a psychological insight model, and (3) an experience model. The behavioral insight model, a structured program for learning behavioral principles, clearly follows Apps' acquiring content learning model. On the other hand, Lillie claims that "the psychological insight model deals with developing an understanding in parents about why children behave the way they do, based on analysis of interactions between parent and child". (p. 11). This category would include programs which fit both the problem solving and self actualization learning models. Indeed, the psychological insight model would probably encompass the great majority of parent education programs. Finally, the experience model includes programs which "... concentrate on providing systematic experience for parents to use as a mechanism for interacting with their children." (p. 11). This seems to be a specific example of a problem solving model in which the technique employed is direct experience. Home-based programs would be examples of the experiential model.

The distinctions between the learning models may be somewhat blurred. All approaches address, to some extent, both the problems confronting parents and parents' need for self understanding. Nevertheless, clear differences between these two approaches do exist. In actuality, the distinction between programs is primarily one of degree. For example, self actualization programs focus mainly upon parents' better understanding of themselves, problem solving programs emphasize the development of more effective techniques for resolving difficulties and acquiring
content models stress the parents' better management of their child's behavior. These differences in emphasis result in some important differences in the nature and scope of the content included in the programs. If a problem solving model is adopted, the material introduced into the course relates more or less directly to finding resolutions to conflicts. On the other hand, self actualization programs are more likely to have a broader range of content, while acquiring content models probably even narrowly define the topics of inquiry.

The purpose of these distinctions was primarily to emphasize the similarities as well as the differences between programs. The model itself is not as important as the effort to group parent education programs into such categories. Indeed, three categories may not be sufficient but in the process of refining the model a closer examination of all programs involved will be necessary. Such an examination of the models is, after all, the primary aim of the activity.

The following sections describe parent education programs which fall into each of the three learning models. These descriptions were designed to further highlight the differences between the learning models as well as to provide an in-depth examination of the three different approaches. The programs selected were not always included in the study.
Parent Effectiveness Training

Parent Effectiveness Training (P.E.T.) can be described as a national movement. Begun in Pasadena, California in 1962, as a community parent education course, it has spread to every state and several foreign countries. Gordon (1970) claims that over 1500 new instructors are being trained each year.

P.E.T. combines some of the aspects of an acquiring content learning model as well as components of a self actualization model. Indeed, in many respects it represents a midpoint between the two "extremes" in approaches to parent education. At one point, Gordon (1970) remarks that P.E.T. presents a "comprehensive philosophy of what it takes to establish and maintain an effective total relationship with a child, in any and all circumstances" (p. 5). Enthusiasts of P.E.T. claim even more. "The receptive and imaginative parent, they indicate, can use what he learns not only to improve his relations with his children, but to enrich, even revolutionize, all his human relationships; his marriage, his friendships, his interactions at work, even his casual encounters with strangers" (Brown, 1976, p. 49).

On the other hand, this approach also has some elements of an acquiring content model. The format in which the course is presented is fairly structured. The course is designed to meet for a total of 24 hours - 8 three hour sessions. Reading materials and tapes as well as classroom exercises and suggested homework assignments are provided by Effectiveness Training Associates, the corporation established to
train P.E.T. educators and to conduct classes. A significant proportion of class time is spent in presentations by the trained instructor. In fact, Buckland (1971) described the P.E.T. model as a "closed system in terms of community inputs or participant goals other than those of the program. It is highly structured, with intentional flexibility only in two dimensions: latitude for the teacher to rearrange elements of the system in terms of sequence and to improve skills; and opportunity for participants to use and respond to the program in individual terms" (pp. 230-231). Clearly, these elements represent some of the components in an acquiring content learning model.

P.E.T. is, however, more than a compromise between two "extreme" approaches to parent education. Its unique contribution lies in the method it offers to parents to interact with their children. Essentially, the P.E.T. approach represents a system for analyzing interactions; insuring open, effective communication; and resolving conflicts if and when they arise. The parent leaves the course with a new, or at least somewhat different philosophy and the tools with which to implement that philosophy. It is argued that P.E.T. thus serves as a cure if problems already exist and as a prevention to guard against future difficulties.

P.E.T. participants come mainly from middle and upper social classes. The two major reasons for this are: (1) the cost - a parent pays between $50 and $90 for the course, depending upon the area in which it is conducted, and (2) the format - classes rely heavily upon a fast-paced, rational approach. However, efforts have been made to include lower income parents. Buckland (1971) reports success with such programs.
Responsive Parent Training Program

Many behavior modification programs for parents are operated around the country and several books have been published which explain these concepts in greater detail (Becker, 1971; Deibert & Harmon, 1970; Macht, 1975; Madsen & Madsen, 1972; Patterson & Gullion, 1958; and Valett, 1969). Often programs which use this approach are associated with therapeutic institutions, either for emotionally disturbed or handicapped children (Alexander & Parson, 1973; Brubakken, Derovin & Gruetor, 1974; Ferber, Keeley & Shenberg, 1974; Turpin, Townes, Wood & Smith, 1975; and Hiltz & Patterson, 1974). Moreover, many programs deal with the individual parents rather than groups of parents and thus do not meet the definition of a parent education program used in this study.

The Responsive Parent Training Program at the University of Kansas, however, works with groups of parents with normal children. Manuals, lectures and small group discussions are all designed to provide parents with an introduction to behavioral principles of learning. The goal is to help parents identify the reinforcers they use with their children.

Each parent conducts a home project. Most parents pick behaviors for their projects which are easily counted, for example, toys not put away, chores not done, fights between siblings. The value of positive reinforcers, in contrast to the negative ones frequently used by parents, is stressed. Parents are given viable alternatives for dealing with the problems that arise with their children.
The program, as it was originally designed, presented a fairly sophisticated approach to the principles of behavioral analysis. Parents were introduced to such concepts as single subject research designs. While this technique was successful with the upper middle class parents enrolled in the first groups, changes are currently being made for implementation of the program with less sophisticated audiences.

The term "behavior modification" often arouses concern among parents as well as the general public. This is indeed one of the very real difficulties such programs face. The response from the participants, however, has been quite positive. Participants feel they have some control over the events in their family rather than simply letting the emotions of the situation dictate their actions. Since they control the use of the reinforcers, they do not feel abuse of power is likely.

**Parent-Child Relations Project**

In 1955, Carl Hereford began a project which was radically different from the traditional conception of an educational program. Recognizing the need for parent education and the lack of trained professional staff as well as the prohibitive cost of individual attention, the Parent-Child Relations Project attempted to develop a delivery system which would meet the needs of parents and remain cost effective. The approach chosen was a discussion group led by a trained nonprofessional.

In addition to reducing costs of using nonprofessionals, this type of group leader was seen as meeting one of the underlying assumptions of
the program; namely, that the responsibility for the program belonged to parents, not the leader. As Hereford (1963) explained, "Since the twin goals of the educational program of the Project were attitudinal change and personal growth and development, it was necessary not only to maximize the participation of the individual parent, but also to maximize his personal involvement with the educational process" (p. 14).

The educational program itself was a series of six two-hour weekly discussion group meetings. The agenda was usually, but not always, the same: A film on parent-child relations started the meeting in order to stimulate discussion and the remainder of the two hours was spent in the sharing of ideas and concerns of the parents. Refreshments were provided by the sponsoring group, usually the Mental Health Association or the PTA, and on rare occasions, by individual participants.

Although problems that parents were having with their children often were discussed, this style differed from a program such as P.E.T. in two major ways: (1) There was no expert; the leader served merely to organize and moderate the discussion and did not function as an authority; and (2) there was no overriding theory of parent-child relations which dictated the content and/or the style of the course. As Hereford described, "The basic philosophy that underlies the education approach . . . is that of individual growth and self development . . . The educational program presented here is directed at helping the individual parent to grow in his own way, the way that is appropriate for him and for his relations with his child" (p. 5).
Figure 3 presents an overview of the three models of parent education referenced according to the major assumptions of the parent-child relationship and the educational process which were identified in Chapter II. An "x" indicates that the parent learning model emphasizes that specific dimension, whereas a "-" indicates the program de-emphasizes or does not include that dimension.

**Related Research**

The purpose in this study, as stated earlier, was to propose a conceptual framework for parent education and then to test the assumptions of this framework. Therefore, the research which is directly related to this project includes studies that systematically compared programs and then examined outcomes. Unfortunately, such studies were not found in the literature reviewed. However, studies were located which examined the differences in outcomes that resulted from two or more programs. These, of course, bear more or less directly upon this research. Finally, numerous projects describe the effects of a single program, at times compared with a control group and at other times simply presented as a case study. These studies offer some insight into both the problems of research in this area and the possible variables which may be important. However, their relevance to this particular study is indirect. Therefore, they are reviewed only briefly.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concepts of Parent Education</th>
<th>Learning Models</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Both the parents and children have individual rights which need to be protected and maintained</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Children are not passive objects to be shaped by their parents</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It is the sum total of the experiences between a parent and a child, not any single event, which determines the quality of the parent-child relationship</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The ecological context of the family affects the self concept of both parents and children</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Parents need less training in being role model and more training in being an advocate for the needs and rights of themselves and their children</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Parents need to have an adequate base of knowledge concerning such practices and techniques without surrendering their unique awareness of the special considerations of their own family</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Process</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Participants must be motivated to learn and must be actively involved in the learning process</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Curricula must be specific and relevant to the needs and concerns of the learners</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program must emphasize and support the cohesiveness of the group</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The role and relationship of the teacher/leader is an essential element of any group educational process</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Summary of the concepts and models of parent education
Studies Comparing Two or More Programs

Seven studies were located which compared two or more approaches to parent education. Most of these were research projects done by graduate students.

Hereford's study (1963), the Parent-Child Relations Project, was mentioned above. His basic design included four treatment categories: (1) Experimental group which was comprised of parents who attended the discussion group series; (2) Lecture-control group which was composed of parents who attended one or more lectures on parent-child relations; (3) Nonattendant control group composed of parents who registered for either the discussion group or lecture series but did not attend; and (4) Random-control group composed of parents who neither registered nor attended either series. The research design enabled the investigators to examine the effects of attendance, participation in discussion and personal involvement of the parents on three variables: (1) parental attitudes, (2) parental behavior, and (3) child's behavior.

The principal hypothesis tested in Hereford's study was confirmed. That is, parents who attended the discussion group series did indicate significantly greater improvement in their attitude scores and behavior than any of the three control groups. These differences were true for measurements on both the attitude scale and personal interviews with parents.

Larsen (1972) conducted a comparison study of three different programs with parents of junior high school students. Since this study
represents one of the most carefully controlled designs, it will be
described in some detail. The three approaches Larson examined were as
follows:

1. Achievement Motivation Program (A.M.P.) - A.M.P. is "based
on the assumption that there are many things right with
people; therefore, focus is on the individual's strengths -
the things he has going for him . . . Personal goals,
values, and conflicts of values are studied in the context
of the individual's strengths" (p. 262). (Self actualization
learning models)

2. Parent Effectiveness Training - see above for description
(problem solving learning model)

3. Discussion-Encounter Group (D.E.G.) - "Encounters, which
simply means being directly and accurately expressive of
one's emotions, is encouraged through positive exercises
and instructions designed to increase practical learning
about human relationships" (p. 262). (Self actualization
learning model)

The parents selected which group they wished to enter. Each group
met for a total of 24 hours over a period of eight weeks. Groups were
conducted during the Fall, Winter and Spring. The later groups served
as controls for the earlier ones.

Larson used seven instruments to evaluate the outcomes of these
different approaches. They included: (1) Self Concept Inventory, (2)
Parent Concern Survey (Goal Attainment Scales), (3) Checklist of Problems
(reveals parental attitudes about their children and family atmosphere),
(4) Hereford's Parent Attitude Scale, (5) Self Report Logs, (6) A
Modified Parent Concern Survey, and (7) Final Evaluations by Parent
Participants. The results are presented in terms of these measuring
devices:
1. A Self Concept Inventory

Both A.M.P. and P.E.T. group members showed improved self concept, but this was not the case for the D.E.G. group.

2. Parent Concern Survey

Once again, both P.E.T. and A.M.P. groups showed reductions in concerns. P.E.T. groups showed the greatest reduction, and D.E.G. parents showed a small change in the opposite direction.

3. A Checklist of Problems

"overall, all groups showed slight change, possibly indicating that the passage of time alone brings about some subjective improvement for such concerns and that this particular instrument is not sensitive enough to discriminate among groups methods used" (p. 265).

4. Parent Attitude Scale

Hereford's (1963) scale consists of five subscales: Confidence, Causation, Acceptance, Understanding and Trust. The P.E.T. group improved on all subscales, whereas A.M.P. parents showed improvement on all but the Causation scale. D.E.G. group members, however, declined on the first three scales and showed improvement on only the latter two.

5. Self Report Logs

Differences in content and frequency of reports were evidenced.

"P.E.T. participants most frequently cited their improvement in listening skills. Further, they noted their own improvement in problem solving skills, in defining ownership of problems, . . . and in communicating with friends." (p. 268).

6. Revised Parent Concern Survey

Whereas the category "Problems with my children" was most reduced for P.E.T. parents, A.M.P. and D.E.G. parents reported the most reductions in "Problems of my own
regarding myself". All groups, however, reported reductions in "Problems of my own regarding my family".

7. Final Evaluations

All participants felt good about their experience, especially P.E.T. members.

The results, although somewhat qualified, indicate that on most of the criteria used in this study, Parent Effectiveness Training produced results equal or superior to the other methods employed. It is, however, interesting to note that the parents demonstrated changes in accord with the learning model employed. Thus, P.E.T. participants showed changes along problem solving dimensions, whereas A.M.P. and D.E.G. participants showed more self understanding changes.

Buckland (1971) approached the topic of parent education from a somewhat different perspective. Her purpose was to develop a theoretical model for parent education program development. In this process, she examined three program models: Child Observation Model, Parent Effectiveness Training and a Dreikurs Program. Her study, however, was not designed to quantitatively measure the differences between programs nor did she examine outcomes from the various programs.

After investigation of these programs, Buckland was able to identify the critical variables for a parent education program. She describes these variables as follows:

1. The formulation and communication of clear goals and objectives for the adult learner-person as well as parent and family member.
2. Specificity in the teaching-learning of such skills as problem solving and communication; experiential approaches.

3. The involvement of children and both parents.

4. 'Enough time' provided in the program structure for breadth, depth and specificity of learning.

5. Group size commensurate with structure and available staff to permit active individual involvement.

6. An approach to discipline which pays adequate attention to the issues of control, power, conflict, and anger together with specific skills.

7. Attention to self concept and personal growth of the parent as a person.

8. New program structures to provide for attention to the marriage relationship.

9. A team building approach to the family as a system.

10. Attention to the prior and basic question: What behaviors are to be valued? What are to be the goals of socialization in the decades ahead? (pp. 254-255)

Hanley (1973) evaluated three groups: (1) a P.E.T. group, (2) a Family Enrichment Program (F.E.P.) group, and (3) a control group receiving no treatment. The data indicate that P.E.T. increased parental attitudes of acceptance and understanding and showed greater increase than the F.E.P. group in ability to trust their children and allow more autonomy. Neither the P.E.T. nor F.E.P. group, however, significantly affected the confidence parents had in their role.

Haynes (1972) conducted a study which compared a P.E.T. program with a lecture/discussion series in a design very similar to the one used by Hereford (1963). Once again, P.E.T. participants improved their
attitudes toward childrearing whereas those attending the lecture series showed no significant improvement.

Miles (1974) added a somewhat different dimension to the comparison of programs. She included four groups in her study: (1) P.E.T., (2) Verbal Reinforcement Group Counseling (V.R.G.C.), (3) both P.E.T. and V.R.G.C., and (4) a control group. Measurements were made of both parents and their children. The data indicate that both P.E.T. and P.E.T. combined with V.R.G.C. are effective in changing parents' self appraisal, improving student's attitudes toward their parents and reducing children's misbehaviors.

Finally, Williams and Sanders (1973) conducted a study which compared P.E.T. and a behavior modification model. Both programs showed positive changes on 10 of the 13 self concept subscales measured. Indeed, the only subscale which significantly differentiated between the two programs was Acceptance, with the P.E.T. group showing a higher level of Acceptance than the behavior modification group.

In summary, the studies just cited indicate that most approaches to parent education, except perhaps a lecture series, show changes in parental attitudes. Moreover, all such approaches report parental satisfaction upon completion of the course. Conclusions as to the most effective model, however, cannot be reached, although there are strong indications that Parent Effectiveness Training does as well or better than any other model considered. Lastly, no research was identified which quantitatively examined the differences between programs and then
related these differences to parental outcomes. If the dynamics of the parent education process are to be uncovered, this is a necessary step and one which this study proposes to undertake.

Studies of a Single Program

One of the outgrowths of the 1960's was an awareness of the integral part which evaluation can play in program development. Many programs, even those community-based ones not included in a research project, assess the impact of their efforts. As a result, numerous papers have appeared which report the effects of various parent education programs. Although clearly of some significance, these studies relate only indirectly to the stated purpose of this research and therefore are reviewed briefly. The discussion is organized around the three learning models presented above, and in particular is focused upon the three parent education programs discussed in detail.

Problem Solving Model. Of all the parent education programs currently available, Parent Effectiveness Training is probably the most widely available and the most thoroughly researched. Numerous studies are published, many with similar designs and conclusions. Therefore, the findings cited below represent new information in the sense that these results have not been reported elsewhere in this review.

Andelin (1975) attempted to teach the principles of P.E.T. concurrently to both parents and their children. Overall, the data indicate that the parents themselves benefited from the P.E.T. instruction and also benefited from their children's exposure to these principles. The children, however, did not show improvement as a result of their classes.
Knight (1974) used a P.E.T. approach to help parents of enuretic children. The results, however, indicated that P.E.T. was not effective in producing the changes necessary to reduce the incidence of enuresis. This study may indicate that P.E.T. is less effective as a therapeutic technique than as a preventive measure.

In addition to examining parental changes, Lillibridge (1971) looked at the changes in the children of P.E.T. graduates. He found that these children perceived their parents as generally more accepting and less rejecting. The children of parents in the two control groups showed no such change.

Schmitz (1975) attempted to generalize the findings of previous studies, mostly conducted in urban settings, to a rural population. The overall results confirmed those found in other studies, namely a P.E.T. program can significantly change parents' attitudes concerning child-rearing.

The P.E.T. course has not been restricted to use only with parents. Modified versions are available for teachers, business leaders, school administrators, adolescents and even personnel in social service institutions. The research conducted in these settings indicate the same general trends as those noted above. That is, P.E.T. is effective in changing the participants' attitudes in the anticipated direction. (Carducci, 1975; Dillard, 1974; Fine, 1975; and Willingson & Bisgaard, 1970).
In general, the conclusions reached by these studies support the findings noted in the previous section. That is, Parent Effectiveness Training does significantly change parents' attitudes toward childrearing and can improve the quality of the parent-child relationship.

**Acquiring Content Model.** As some of the above studies indicate (Haynes, 1972 and Hereford, 1963), a strict lecture series for parents shows little or no improvement in parental attitudes and/or behavior. In a sense, this is the most "pure" form of the acquiring content learning model, and the results do not support its continuance for use in parent education.

However, many behavior modification programs also fit into this learning model and have reported significant changes in parent-child relationships. The research into these programs has generally centered on two questions: (1) Can parents learn the principles of behavior modification well enough to be able to apply them with their own children? and (2) Are these techniques effective in reducing the incidence of undesirable behaviors in children?

All programs cited above (see "Responsive Parent Training Program") reported success in teaching these techniques to parents. Although the initial presentations may not be particularly exciting, parents seem motivated enough to maintain their interest. Even parents of disturbed children, who at times require somewhat complicated reinforcement schedules, are able to apply them, with assistance when necessary, to their home situations (see Brubakken, Derovin & Gruetor, 1974; Ferber, Keeley & Shemberg, 1974; and Wiltz & Patterson, 1974).
Various behavior modification programs emphasize or include many different elements. Johnson and Katz (1973) have suggested the following as at least a partial list of the different training procedures: "lecture, reading assignments, modelling, money contracts, training in observation, cueing, teaching principles of behavior change versus teaching how to modify a specific behavior" (p. 197). Other procedures may include data collection techniques, home-based projects with feedback from the instructor and role-playing.

The effectiveness of the programs, in terms of reducing target behaviors, also has been well documented. However, a more general question can and should be asked. To what extent does participation in such programs improve the quality of the parent-child relationship? Enger (1975) addressed this question by noting:

Behavioral change alone is not the only criterion of success. The affective climate of the home or the classroom may be a useful guide. If there is an improvement in this area, even though the behavioral change may be minimal, the likelihood of continued positive change is rather high. On the other hand, if the attitudes toward the child and the emotional reactions around him continue to be those of frustration, disappointment, concern and disapproval, in spite of behavioral change, there is a high probability that the changes will not persist. (p. 32)

Behavior modification techniques generally are employed to eliminate or shape a particular behavior. Therefore, a criticism often raised against this approach is that it merely addresses the symptom and not the real problem. Therefore, a legitimate question to raise would be, "To what extent does the child generalize across behaviors when such techniques are employed?"
Wahler (1969) indicates that behavioral improvements do not necessarily generalize across situations. The critical element, he argues, is the existence of environmental support to maintain it. This position is similar to that proposed by Enger (1975) above.

Parents enrolled in the Responsive Parent Training Program claim a considerable amount of generalization. That is, not only does the behavior being worked on improve, but many other behaviors of the targeted child and also behaviors of other children in the family show significant improvement.

**Self Actualization Model.** The final model is the self actualization one, and the program studied was done by Hereford (1963). The results of this study point out many of the difficulties in conducting parent education research as well as providing insight into the effects of this particular model.

After examining the initial findings of a significant difference between the discussion group method and the three control groups (see above for further description of the design), Hereford examined the data in greater detail. He reached the following conclusions about the effects of the program and the influence of other factors:

1. Socioeconomic level was related to change in parental attitudes. Hereford concludes, "No matter what research group they were in, parents from the lower socioeconomic level were more likely to improve their attitude scores than were parents from the other levels." (p. 119)
   This may, however, have been an artifact of the internal validity problem of regression toward the mean.
2. The age of the child whose parents were enrolled in the classes (all within the elementary school age range) was not related to change in parental attitudes.

3. Some evidence was found to indicate that the sex of the child affected changes in attitudes.

4. Participants in the discussion group increased the importance they place to their part in the parent-child relationship.

5. Discussion group parents used less corporal punishment and more withdrawal of privileges as punishment after exposure to the group. They were also more satisfied with these methods.

6. Parents attending both the discussion group and the lecture series increased their feelings of inadequacy.

7. Other variables measured included frequency of attendance, degree of participation, and frequency of personal reference. The results "showed these variables to have little influence on changing parental attitudes and behavior" (p. 131).

8. Using sociometric data from children's classrooms, the results indicated that children of discussion group parents significantly increased in acceptance by other children.

9. Teachers' ratings of children showed no significant differences between groups.

Taken as a whole, these findings indicate that the discussion group method did significantly change parental attitudes. The results concerning the influence of other variables were, however, equivocable or inconclusive in most instances.
Methodological Considerations

In 1956, Shapiro reviewed the findings on group parent education and commented, "The lack of appropriate measuring devices is startling in light of the many years of interest in changing parental attitudes" (p. 155). Although more than twenty years have transpired since that time, the situation unfortunately is not greatly improved. Problems concerning measurement are of paramount concern to those conducting evaluations of parent education programs.

Some of the major methodological issues which must be considered in the research design include:

1. What units of behavior are to be measured?
2. How can these behaviors be measured?
3. In what type of situation is the behavior to be measured?
4. What efforts need to be made to control for psycho-social-biological characteristics?
5. How does the child influence parental behavior?
6. How does the observer influence the behavior?
7. What time schedule will be used to measure the behavior? (adapted from Streissguth and Bee, 1972).

In order to answer the question of what behaviors are to be measured, one of two general strategies can be employed. In the first instance, the behavior of an "ideal" parent, the "ideal" program and the "ideal" child can be specified, i.e., criteria and standards can be established. After these behaviors are outlined, the specific ones to be measured in the particular study can be selected. The second approach is to derive
the appropriate behaviors from the goals of the program. Thus, if the program attempts to teach parents certain skills, then a measure of the program success as well as parental competence can be deduced from the degree to which the parent demonstrates these skills. Unfortunately, neither approach is free from difficulties.

Putting aside, at least for the moment, the difficult question of what behaviors to examine, one must still decide how these behaviors can be measured once they have been selected. Cox (1975) reviewed the major assessment techniques of parental behavior, describing the advantages and limitations of each. The major points which he makes are summarized in the outline in Figure 4. Once again, it is evident that serious questions can be raised with any approach adopted.

Three general strategies seemed to be employed most often: interviews, direct observation, and paper-and-pencil assessments. Interviews are one of the most frequently employed techniques and are used in a variety of settings, e.g., visit to the doctor for a health problem, discussion with a school counselor regarding a child's performances in school, etc. Hence, the interview process probably is not unusual to most parents. It can be used to cover a wide range of topics, but it has several limitations. Some of these limitations include: (1) observer bias (parents respond in socially acceptable ways rather than in the most accurate way), (2) expense of data collection in time and money, (3) potential for violating the confidentiality rights of parents, and (4) difficulty in analyzing and summarizing data collected.
Parental behavior has typically been observed in one of three settings: the classroom, the home or a structured interaction situation. Classroom observations, such as questionnaires, measures of participation and role playing all suffer from the same general criticism of their lack of generalizability to actual parent-child relations. The home-based observations intuitively are much more appealing. Research, however, has shown that problems such as subject reactivity and modification of behavior to socially desirable modes arise here also (Bell, 1964; Johnson, Christensen & Bellamy, 1974; Johnson & Lobitz, 1974; Lobitz & Johnson, 1975). Indeed, Johnson and Lobitz (1974) claim that "it is naive to assume that the same threats to external validity are not present with naturalistic methods simply because the research setting is less obviously artificial than is the case with traditional assessment procedures". (p. 29). The structured interaction observations suffer from many of the same problems home-based observations do. In fact, the risk of the observer and/or the setting influencing the behavior is probably even greater in the more formal settings than at home.

Paper-and-pencil assessment devices have several assets. They are inexpensive, easy to administer and analyze, easy to determine reliability, versatile in the settings in which they can be administered, and can cover a wide variety of topics. Questionnaires also suffer from many weaknesses such as (1) potential bias toward socially acceptable responses by using self reports, (2) limited range of questions prevents explaining any topic in depth, and (3) reliance upon an established minimal level of literacy.
I. Interview with Parents

A. Wide range of behaviors over a relatively extended period of time can be covered.
B. Outcomes can be affected by difficulties in recalling events and emotional bias.
C. Qualitative aspects of the parent-child relationship, e.g., nonverbal behaviors, cannot be examined.

II. Conjoint Family Interviews (Whole Family)

A. Observation of the family interaction as well as information collection is possible.
B. Methodology is not well developed.
C. Distortion by presence of observer is threat.
D. Several perspectives concerning the same issue can be obtained, thereby providing greater validity.

III. Observation of Structured Interactions

A. Both qualitative and sequential aspect of behavior can be observed in detail.
B. Technique is time consuming and expensive.
C. Repeated reliability checks on observers are needed.
D. Infrequently occurring behaviors may not appear and observer may influence those behaviors which are evidenced.

IV. Unstructured Observations in the Home

A. Careful selection of categories is necessary, but it is possible to study the context, sequence, detail and qualitative aspects of parent-child interaction.
B. Voluminous amount of data is collected, even when categories of behaviors and numbers of observations are limited.
C. Historical context is lacking.
D. Presence of observer may bias results.

V. Parental Diary and the Parent as Observer

A. Immediate recording of natural events is possible but results may be biased by parent's involvement.
B. Only moderate agreement with independent observers has been found.
C. Some training of parents as observers probably is necessary.

VI. Questionnaires

A. Technique is inexpensive, easy to control and can cover a wide range of behaviors, although none in depth.
B. "Biases can result from parents attributing different meanings to the same words, and from parents' current attitudes to problem behavior or their desire to be socially acceptable. "Lost parents are not trained to disentangle attitudes and behavior and questionnaires provide few means for helping them do so." (p. 258)

Figure 4. Assessment of parent behavior: the advantages and limitations of various approaches to the measurement of parental behavior (adapted from Cox, 1976, pp. 255-259).
Many studies, although certainly not all, have incorporated psychosocial-biological variables into the designs. Continued efforts along these directions may lead to the identification of variables which influence the effectiveness of various parent education programs. In addition, variables other than those involving the parent can and should be included in examining the effects of a particular program. Aitchison and Liberman (1973) identify some of these variables.

Evaluation of the program structure includes the characteristics of the parent (social class, ethnic group, education, attitude toward training procedures); characteristics of the targeted children (age, sex, birth order, number of sibs, type of behavior problem—typography, frequency-duration and reinforcement history of deviant behavior); training and experience as leader and parent of trainers; and curriculum and procedures of the training effort. (p. 1)

An important and often neglected consideration in assessing parental attitudes and behaviors is the effect the child has on the parent. Ausubel, Balthazar, Rosenthal, Blackman, Schpoont & Melkowitz (1954) claim that "although parent behavior is an objective event in the real world, it affects the child's ego development only to the extent and in the form in which he perceives it. Hence, perceived parent behavior is in reality a more direct, relevant and proximate determinant of personality development than the actual stimulus to which it refers" (p. 173). That is, children are not simply passive organisms, but rather they are active and may influence the behaviors emitted by parents (Osofsky, 1970).

One partial solution to this dilemma, adopted by a few studies, is to actually observe the children's behavior. Cox (1970), in attempting
to do so, found that such independent observations of the child's behavior were indeed more highly correlated with the child's perception of parental behavior, both mother and father, than to the parents' report of that behavior. Although much more research needs to be done in this area, such conclusions could have overwhelming effects upon research in parent education. If one assumes that the ultimate goal of more effective parenting is to improve parent-child relations and to favorably affect the development of children, then perhaps a major focus of assessment also should be on the child. As Saxe and Stollak (1971) point out, "Focusing exclusively on the effect the parent has on the child's behavior is too limited an approach to accommodate the data from human and animal research. One must also be aware of the way a child's behavior influences a parent's reaction." (p. 381).

The effects of the presence of an observer on the exhibited behavior have been alluded to above and is summarized here. Stephen Johnson has conducted several studies in this problem area. In two studies (Johnson & Lobitz, 1974 and Lobitz & Johnson, 1975), parents were asked to make their children appear, on different days, good (normal) and bad (deviant). The findings indicate that although parents can make a child appear more undesirable, they do not have a similar ability to increase the positive behavior of their children.

In a fairly elaborate study in which audiotape recorders were worn by children, Johnson, Christensen and Bellamy (1974) found most families do indeed respond to a social desirability set, even when the observer
is not physically present in the room. In another study (Zegoib, Arnold & Forehand, 1975), mothers were observed in two settings. In one setting, they were informed that they were being observed, whereas in the other situation, they did not know they were being monitored. The results indicated that when mothers were informed that observations would occur, they played more with their children and, in general, reacted in a more positive manner. Moreover, mothers were more structuring, i.e., expressed more commands and questions, during the informed observation.

The only studies which conducted long-term (more than six months) follow-up of the participants that were found in the literature reviewed were those using a behavior modification model. Johnson and Christensen (1974) report three studies which showed the maintenance of behavior changes for periods ranging between six months and one year. However, in a study by Ferber, Keeley and Shemberg (1974) only one family in seven showed long-term positive changes. Finally, Johnson and Christensen conducted a follow-up of the parents in their groups at three and eight months. They found no significant deterioration or improvement at either follow-up period. Moreover, they found that "families who participated in follow-up tended to be more cooperative in treatment and had more therapy sessions attending to a greater number of child behaviors. In every other respect, including all measures of treatment outcomes and demographic characteristics, the two samples did not differ significantly". (p. 14).
In conclusion, the only statement has can be made about the durability of effects from participation in parent education programs is that it is uncertain. As Datta (1973) points out, "While early data are encouraging with respect to parents as learners, it is too soon to tell whether parent behavior will return to its original levels without further support, and if children will continue to show good behavioral development" (p. 36).

Serious methodological problems arise in conducting any research in the social sciences, not the least of which is the cost, both in terms of financial and manpower considerations. No one study can hope to resolve all these dilemmas, but certainly awareness of the difficulties can sensitize the researcher to the possible limitations of the project.

Summary

Most parent education programs can and do demonstrate changes in parental attitudes and behaviors. However, very few studies have systematically compared approaches to parent education programs, and no studies have been identified which systematically examine the effects of the individual components of various models. Sufficient research has not been done to warrant the recommendation of one particular approach. Hopefully, the aim is not to identify the single "best" way to conduct parent education programs but rather to investigate the constellation of factors, both program and parent-related, which cluster together. The ultimate goal is to develop the most appropriate approach for the
specific population. In order to accomplish this goal, program and parent characteristics will need to be carefully investigated in a variety of settings and the interrelationships between these variables will have to be determined.

In the first section, the systems approach was introduced (see Figure 1). In reviewing the steps suggested by Kaufman (1972), it would seem that:

1. A need for research into the relationship between parent education program variables and parental change has been identified.

2. The problem then consists of determining the nature of the relationship between such program variables and outcome variables in terms of parental outcomes.

3. Possible solutions, in view of theoretical considerations, related research and methodological considerations, have been explored.

The next step, following the systems model, is to select the solution which is to be implemented. That is, indeed, the subject of the next section.
CHAPTER IV
DESIGN OF THE STUDY

It is in the processes of choice that men, individually and collectively, bridge the gap between thought and action. It is in choosing and deciding that requirements of sensitive and valid thought must come to terms with the requirements of committed and effective action. Were one to take 'choosing' as the distinctive human function, and excellence in choice as the overall goal of general education effort, perhaps the claims of thinking and action could both be taken into just account within the planning and executive of educational programs.

(Benne, 1957, p. 53)

Not only is "choosing" a distinctively human function, it is also the foundation of the creative process. In terms of this study, four areas require significant choices to be made: (1) organization of the conceptual framework, (2) development of the research design, (3) determination of the appropriate analysis techniques to be employed, and (4) planning and execution of feedback into future programming.

The foundation of the conceptual framework was developed in the previous chapters (Chapters II and III). This discussion outlined the broad parameters into which the study fit. However, identifying the concepts to be measured is only half the problem. The second step is to specify the postulates and to develop a research design which will allow these postulates to be tested validly and reliably and which will answer the important questions asked. That is the topic of this Chapter. The next chapter identifies the specific analysis techniques employed.
and the following chapter evaluates whether the design accomplished its goal, i.e., answered the questions posed. The final chapter summarizes the study and discusses the potential impact of the results on future parent education programs and identifies some potential strategies for maximizing those results.

**Strategy for the Study**

At first glance, the basic research design of the study was a pretest-posttest nonequivalent control group design with extant groups (Campbell & Stanley, 1963; Popham, 1975). Twelve different programs were selected (see "Sample", p. C8) and each program as well as the parents in the program were evaluated. Each parent education program served as a control group for the other approaches. However, this is where the analogy between the design for this study and the nonequivalent control group design ends.

A research design is selected because it is the best available strategy, given all considerations, for answering the major research questions. The nonequivalent control group design was developed to answer two general questions: (1) Are there significant differences between treatment groups? and (2) If differences exist, what are the patterns or possible explanations for these results?

The major questions posed in this study, on the other hand, did not relate exclusively to differences between existing program groups, but rather they also were concerned with differences between the elements
which composed the original programs. That is, the primary aim was a comparative analysis across various programs to determine which of the components of these different approaches significantly affected outcomes. For example, if two programs had the same number of parents in the class, on the program variables of class size, these two programs were collapsed into a single unit of analysis. The key focus of inquiry, therefore, was not on differences between the twelve programs, but rather on the effects of the various subcomponents of these programs which were formed by evaluation of the programs with respect to the key variables.

Two general sets of variables were hypothesized to affect changes in parents' reported behaviors -- those related to the background of the participating parents and those related to the implementation of the parent education program model.

Several variables were used to describe the parent and program characteristics. For a description of the parent variables, see "Parent Profile" below. Likewise, the program variables are described in the "Program Profile" section. Both sets of variables are summarized in Figure 5.

The background characteristics of the parents were investigated to determine their relationship to changes in behaviors and likewise the programs were analyzed to assess their potential impact on these outcomes. Moreover, these individual factors were jointly examined to ascertain if any interactions between factors were present.
Figure 5. Program and parent variables hypothesized to influence changes in reported behaviors.
Research Questions and Hypotheses

In the first chapter, four research questions were posed. Each of these questions in turn led to a series of proposed effects to be investigated and hypotheses to be tested. The four questions are restated below and the areas of inquiry for each are discussed.

1. How do parent education programs differ?

The first step in determining the factors related to changes in parents' reported behaviors is to describe, as fully as possible, the differences between programs. Unless some variability between programs exists, the relationship between parent and program variables and changes in parents' reported behaviors cannot be tested. Statistical tests rely upon variability in the findings to determine the probabilities of a given set of results. Without such variability statistical tests are useless. The first question, therefore, does not formulate hypotheses to be tested, but rather outlines the relationships to be investigated in the remainder of the study.

The two sets of variables hypothesized to affect changes in parents' reported behaviors were program components and parent characteristics. The program variables identified for this study are outlined below. The item(s) on the Program Profile used to measure each variable are enclosed in parentheses. A total of twenty-four program variables were investigated: (1) sponsoring agency (item 2); (2) number of meetings (item 3); (3) frequency of meetings (item 3); (4) duration of each meeting (item 3); (5) class size (item 4); (6) collection of fees (item 6); (7) recruitment procedures (item 7); (8) methods used to encourage both parents to
participate (item 3); (9) percentage of parents attending together (item 9); (10) attendance (item 10); (11) follow-up of nonattenders (item 11); (12) additional organized follow-up after program ended (item 12); (13) follow-up evaluation of parents (item 13); (14) crisis intervention services provided (item 14); (15) reference materials provided (item 15); (16) feedback to parents about their progress during the course (item 16); (17) educational background of leaders (item 17); (18) additional training of leaders (item 18); (19) other experience of leaders (item 19); (20) number of hours per week leader devoted to class (item 20); (21) sources of information for program content (item 22); (22) program content (items 23 and 25); (23) methods employed (item 26); and (24) flexibility of program (item 27).

The second set of variables analyzed in this study related to characteristics of the participating parents. Although parent variables are not under the control of program developers, nevertheless, knowledge of their potential impact upon expected outcomes could help leaders to design their programs to more fully meet the needs of the participating parents. Parent variables (see "Parent Profile") included: (1) age, (2) sex, (3) number of children, (4) age of children, (5) sex of children, (6) number of adults in the household, (7) marital status, (8) ethnic origin, (9) education, (10) income, (11) years lived in Columbus, (12) relatives assisting in child care, (13) working status, (14) child care arrangements, (15) parental satisfaction, and (16) expectations from program.
Analysis of these programs and parent variables led to the identification of a set of variables which possessed enough variability to warrant further investigation of their relationship to changes in parents' reported behaviors.

2. Do parent education programs significantly affect changes in parents' reported behaviors?

Program and parent characteristics can be considered independent variables in this study. The dependent variable is change in parents' reported behaviors. Just as it was necessary to have variability in the independent variables in order to test hypotheses, variability also must exist in the dependent variable if relationships are to be tested. The question, therefore, is asked to determine if parents demonstrated any changes after participation in a parent education group. Two statistical hypotheses were tested.

(1) Parents will show no significant changes between pretest and posttest ratings on the Parent Behavior Assessment.

(2) Programs will not significantly affect changes in parents' reported behaviors.

If significant changes in parents were identified, and if parents and programs differed in the variables investigated, then the relationship between those two sets of variables and changes in parents' reported behaviors could be analyzed. The next two questions identify specific hypotheses concerning these relationships.
3. **What influence does the background of the participating parents have upon changes in their reported behaviors?**

Six parent variables were hypothesized to affect changes in parents' reported behaviors. That is, it was postulated that parents with the same characteristics on, for example working status, would change to the same degree, irrespective of the program in which they were enrolled.

The six statistical hypotheses tested were:

1. The number of children in the family will have no effect on changes in parents' reported behaviors.
2. The education of the parents will have no effect on changes in their reported behaviors.
3. The family income will have no effect on changes in parents' reported behaviors.
4. The age of the parents will have no effect on changes in their reported behaviors.
5. The working status of the parents will have no effect on changes in their reported behaviors.
6. Satisfaction with the parenting role before the program began will have no effect on changes in parents' reported behaviors.

4. **What are the important variables of parent education programs which affect changes in parent behavior?**

The central question, in terms of evaluating parent education programs, concerns the relationship between elements of the programs and outcomes of parents. Statistical hypotheses about this relationship include:

1. The agency sponsoring the program will not affect changes in mothers' reported behaviors.
2. Duration of class will have no effect on changes in mothers' reported behaviors.
(3) Class size will not effect mothers' change scores.

(4) The use of club or group members to recruit participants in parent education programs will not affect changes in mothers' reported behaviors.

(5) Programs which were offered in the evening or on weekends will not differ in their effects on mothers' reported change scores from programs offered during the daytime only.

(6) The percentage of parents attending together will not affect changes in mothers' reported behaviors.

(7) The percentage of parents in a class who attend all or most of the sessions will not affect changes in mothers' reported behaviors.

(8) The use of the telephone to follow-up on nonattenders will not affect changes in mothers' reported behaviors.

(9) Inquiry among friends to follow-up on nonattenders will not affect changes in mothers' reported behaviors.

(10) The potential for participation in advanced courses will not affect changes in mothers' reported behaviors.

(11) The availability of continuing groups will have no effect on changes in mothers' reported behaviors.

(12) The encouragement of individual contact with the leader will not affect changes in mothers' reported behaviors.

(13) The referral of parents to other agencies for additional courses will have no effect on changes in mothers' reported behaviors.

(14) The follow-up of parents through informal contact will not affect changes in mothers' reported behaviors.

(15) The provision of individual counseling during crisis situations will not affect changes in mothers' reported behaviors.

(16) Referral of parents to appropriate agencies during crisis situations will not affect changes in mothers' reported behaviors.
(17) Encouragement from other parents will not affect changes in mothers' reported behaviors.

(18) The provision of reference books will not affect changes in mothers' reported behaviors.

(19) The provision of reference handouts will have no effect on changes in mothers' reported behaviors.

(20) The provision of lists of community resources will not affect changes in mothers' reported behaviors.

(21) The provision of phone numbers of other parents in the program will not affect changes in mothers' reported behaviors.

(22) Giving parents ongoing, verbal feedback will have no effect on changes in mothers' reported behaviors.

(23) The educational background of the leaders will not affect changes in mothers' reported behaviors.

(24) A special course for leaders will not affect changes in mothers' reported behaviors.

(25) Leader participation in a series of parent education workshops will not affect changes in mothers' reported behaviors.

(26) Feedback to the leaders from their supervisors will have no effect on changes in mothers' reported behaviors.

(27) Leader participation in other courses will have no effect on changes in mothers' reported behaviors.

(28) The number of hours the leader devoted to the course will have no effect on changes in mothers' reported behaviors.

(29) Communication with parents and other professionals to formulate course content will not affect changes in mothers' reported behaviors.

(30) The use of parent education reports to formulate course content will not affect changes in mothers' reported behaviors.
(31) The use of counseling and therapy reports to formulate course content will not affect changes in mothers' reported behaviors.

(32) The use of group processes reports to formulate course content will not affect changes in mothers' reported behaviors.

(33) The use of personal experiences to formulate course content will not affect changes in mothers' reported behaviors.

(34) The flexibility in the program will not affect changes in parents' reported behaviors.

(35) The methods most frequently employed during the course will not affect changes in mothers' reported behaviors.

(36) The parent education concept most highly rated by the program leader will have no effect on changes in mothers' reported behaviors.

Each research question placed certain requirements on the methodology employed and the analyses conducted. The fourth question, in particular, called for some unique organization of the data in order to test the hypotheses. The next chapter describes the methodology finally adopted whereas Chapter VI discusses the analysis techniques as well as the findings.
CHAPTER V

METHODOLOGY

The overall design of the study was outlined in the previous chapter. However, in order to implement that design three steps had to be taken: (1) The instruments used to measure the variables had to be identified and/or developed; (2) The sample of programs had to be specified; and (3) The procedures for actually conducting the research had to be determined. Each of these steps is described below. The final section of this chapter discusses the limitations of the study.

Instrumentation

Three instruments were used to assess the variables in this study: (1) a measure of program variables (Program Profile), (2) a measure of background and demographic characteristics of parents (Parent Profile), and (3) an assessment of parental behaviors (Parent Behavior Assessment). The variables included on the Program Profile and the Parent Profile were identified in Chapter IV. These variables are described in detail below and the rationale behind each variable is explained. The items on the Parent Behavior Assessment, on the other hand, were developed by other investigators. Their rationale is also described below.

Program Profile

The Program Profile (Appendix A) was developed for use in this study. Items included in the questionnaire were selected on the basis of the
hypothesized relationship between these variables and changes in parents' reported behaviors.

The Program Profile consists of 28 items, both short answer and multiple choice. Several items can have more than one answer, i.e., program leaders could check all that applied rather than the single most appropriate response. Although this flexibility presents some difficult analysis problems, nevertheless, the value in allowing program leaders to describe as fully as possible the operation of their programs seemed to outweigh any potential analysis problems.

**Sponsoring agency.** Most parent education programs are sponsored by an overarching agency. This agency, in addition to providing resources, may directly or indirectly influence the operation of the program in such ways as limiting class size and/or enrollment, dictating content or techniques, certifying program leaders, etc. If a sponsoring agency does exert these types of influences, the programs sponsored by that agency are probably more similar to one another than are programs sponsored by a different agency, i.e., the programs are not independent. This raises conceptual as well as statistical problems in examining the data and drawing conclusions from the results.

**Number of meetings.** Auerbach (1968) found the optimal number of meetings for programs in her study ranged between eight and 12, and likewise programs sponsored by Effectiveness Training Associates (P.E.T. programs) are designed to run nine weeks. However, the programs directed by Hereford (1963) met only for a series of six weekly meetings.
Frequency of meetings. The most common format for parent education groups found in the literature is a series of weekly meetings. However, this too can vary depending upon the needs of the group. For example, if the parents are assembled because of a common crisis experience they all are currently sharing, more frequent meetings may be necessary. On the other hand, outside constraints may require meetings to be spaced further apart. Shapiro (1956), for instance, held his groups every three weeks.

Duration of each meeting. Aitchison and Liberman (1973) identify a series of key variables which they propose should be included in any evaluation of parent education programs. One set of variables which they suggest is the number and duration of each meeting. The hypothesis derived from this and previous variables is that the total length of time parents are exposed to the program should affect the changes demonstrated by the parents. For example, parents who attend 60 hours of training would be hypothesized to show greater changes than parents who had only 10 hours of class time.

Class size. For many years, regulatory agencies have proposed guidelines for appropriate teacher:child ratios in classrooms. Theoretically, smaller classes are more desirable since they allow more individual attention for each student. This concept can clearly be extended to adult programs as well as to programs for children. Auerbach (1962) found the optimal size of a program in her study to be approximately 15 numbers. However, as Pickarts and Fargo (1971) note, the appropriate size of the
group depends on many other factors such as the parents' previous experiences in working with groups.

Collection of fees. One of the criticisms which has been raised against Parent Effectiveness Training Programs is that these programs generally charge a high fee ($50) which thereby excludes many lower income parents from participating. The hypothesis to be investigated by this variable is whether or not programs charging no or minimal ($10 or less) fees differ from programs charging higher fees.

Recruitment procedures. Another set of variables identified by Aitchison and Liberman (1973) are the recruitment, selection, and screening procedures employed by parent education programs. Since parent characteristics were one of the major types of variables investigated in this study, then any program variables likely to influence the types of parents enrolled also should be examined.

Methods used to encourage both parents to attend. Fears (1976) reported that "following participation, parents reported less agreement with their spouses about childrearing techniques. Since, in most cases, only one parent from a family attended a parent study group, this decrease in agreement is worth noting" (p. 329). Thus, a potentially important variable influencing changes in parents' reported behaviors could be the methods used to encourage simultaneous participation by both parents.

Percentage of parents attending together. This variable merely measures the degree to which the program succeeded in achieving participation by parent dyads.
Attendance. Arnold, Rowe and Tolbert (1978) indicate that one of the factors which distinguish groups oriented primarily toward therapy from groups geared more toward guidance is the attendance requirements. Therapy oriented groups generally require a commitment from the parents to attend faithfully, whereas the programs focusing more on guidance allow parents to attend the group without any necessary commitment to consistency. This distinction is interesting to keep in mind, particularly since research results on attendance are somewhat contradictory. Hereford (1963), on the other hand, found that parents "who attended four or more meetings in the series of group discussion achieved significantly greater change than did those who attended three or fewer meetings." (p. 158)

Follow-up on nonattenders. One of the ways to increase attendance is to follow-up on those parents who do not attend more than one meeting. Moreover, some parents may need extra encouragement in order to remain involved with the program.

Additional organized follow-up after program ended. Parents often express a desire for the group, or at least the parent education process, to continue beyond the scheduled end of the program. The degree to which they are willing and able to meet this need may affect parents' final perceptions of their experiences.

Follow-up evaluation of parents. In addition to organized group experiences which continue beyond the scheduled end of the program, individual contact with participating parents is sometimes maintained on a regular basis.
Crisis intervention services provided. Parents often become involved in parents' education groups because of upheavals they are currently experiencing. At times, these disturbances may reach a crisis level and often the program leader is called upon as a resource and/or service provider.

Reference materials provided. Although methods employed in the program are discussed below, one element of program method is the type of reference materials provided to parents. Courses with a heavy emphasis on written homework assignments seem, at least on the surface, quite different from programs which provide parents with few, if any, written materials or assignments.

Feedback to parents concerning progress. The type of feedback given to parents is an indication of the nature and degree of interaction between the parents and program leaders. For example, the more directly structured programs, such as a behavior modification approach, provide more formal feedback to parents than programs such as the one described by Hereford (1963) in which a nonprofessional directed the meetings. Fine (1975) used Teacher Effectiveness Training (based on principles of P.E.T.) to train 53 student teachers in human relations. She found that giving the students objective feedback about specific teaching behaviors helped them make constructive changes, particularly if another person participated in the feedback sessions. Self appraisal showed no such changes.

Educational background of leaders. The educational background of the program leaders was hypothesized to be a variable which could potentially
affect changes in parents' reported behaviors. That is, program leaders with similar educational backgrounds would be more likely to conduct parent education programs in similar ways as compared to leaders with quite different educational backgrounds.

**Additional training of leaders.** The educational background of the leaders may be less important than the specific, additional training leaders may receive before or during their teaching. Parent Effectiveness Training leaders, for example, are required to receive specialized training in the P.E.T. techniques before they can offer the course.

**Other experiences of leaders.** In addition to educational background and other training, the leaders previous experience in directing parent education programs could also be an important factor in changing parental behaviors.

**Number of hours per week leader devoted to class.** In addition to class time, leaders must also spend time preparing for the next meeting, contacting parents or other involved persons, reading homework assignments etc.

**Sources of information for program content.** The materials used to build the curriculum as well as the sources of these materials was another variable investigated in this study.

**Program content.** Program content and the next variable, methods employed, represent two of the most visible differences between programs. The very fact that a program decides to include certain topics, and thereby exclude others, indicates that certain assumptions about the
nature of a parent education program have been made by the curriculum
developers. The hypothesis was that differences in these underlying
assumptions would be evidenced by differences in changes of parental
behaviors.

Items were derived from the conceptual framework. Fifteen different
areas of program emphasis were used to describe the various content areas
stressed by parent education approaches reviewed. Program leaders were
asked to rate these fifteen topics twice. The first time they rated the
items to reflect what they emphasized in their program. The second time
leaders were asked to rate the same concepts which had been rewritten to
reflect parent competencies. The second rating was designed to determine
the parental competencies program leaders felt were most important.
Comparisons could be both within programs across the two ratings as well
as between programs on the same ratings.

Methods employed. The methods employed in conducting the parent
education classes also reflected certain premises about the nature of
that experience. Two program leaders may, indeed, claim to be striving
toward the same end goals and objectives but use different techniques to
arrive at these ends. As a result, the ends which they reach and the
outcomes they achieve may be quite different.

Aitchison and Liberman (1973) suggested the following as techniques
to investigate: lecture, outside reading, demonstrations (films,
transparencies, etc.), testimonials from parents, role playing and
modelling.
**Flexibility of the program.** One of the criteria used to discriminate between various approaches to parent education in the review of literature was the flexibility of the program, i.e., the degree to which parent input and involvement was used to shape the direction of the course. The influence of this program variable was also investigated in the study.

The Program Profile was field tested with seven parent education teachers whose groups did not meet the criteria for inclusion in the study or who did not have groups functioning at the time of the study. All were able to answer the questions in the form presented, and no changes were suggested. Therefore, the field test version was used in the actual study.

**Parent Profile**

This instrument (Appendix B) was developed for use in the study. The variables were selected based on their hypothesized relationship to changes in parents' reported behaviors. Previous research (Crim, 1965; Clarke-Stewart, 1977; Datta, 1973; Hereford, 1963; Barnes & Zehrbach, 1975) supports the potential impact of sex of parent, family income, education of parent, marital status, ethnic origin, number and age of children in the family and working status of the parents on changes in parental attitudes and/or behaviors.

Other variables may, and probably do, affect a parents' experience in a program. One such variable is the child's opportunity for interaction with other adults. If the child regularly spends time with relatives or
neighbors, for example, then she/he is influenced by other persons as well. Different childrearing attitudes on the part of these various individuals can present difficulties for both the parents and the children. On the other hand, such persons can also relieve some of the daily burden of childrearing from the individual parent(s).

Another variable hypothesized to affect changes in behaviors was the parental expectations from the program. A parent forced to attend the classes is much less likely to benefit from the experience than the parent who has actively sought such involvement. The reason that the parent is enrolled in the program is likely to affect the outcomes. Parents who see the program as solving all their difficulties are apt to interpret the experience differently than those who are enrolled primarily for personal enrichment. Moreover, parents attending because they are having serious difficulties with their children probably react differently than parents who see the program as a preventive measure.

Finally, the parent's satisfaction with his/her parenting role and with family life in general is likely to influence parental behaviors. Although related to program expectations, this variable examines the parent's current perception of him/herself and his/her family. Once again, the hypothesis was that parents who are very dissatisfied are likely to have different reactions to the program than parents who are, on the whole, satisfied with their family life.

The Parent Profile was field tested with 30 parents in the morning and afternoon preschool classes of Campbell Hall Nursery School which
enrolls three and four year old children. Responses indicated that parents were able to answer all questions. However, results from the field test also showed a reluctance on the part of many parents to answer the question regarding family income. Although nonresponse on this item presented some difficulties in the analysis because of missing data, the item seemed important enough to warrant its remaining in the Profile. The field test version was used in the final study.

Parent Behavior Assessment

The critical concept in the entire process of parent education is one phrase: an effective and competent parent. This is the goal program leaders are attempting to achieve, and it is the concept evaluators are trying to measure. However, as was noted before, no operational definition has been widely accepted which adequately described this concept. This raises some assessment problems.

Every educational outcome, in theory, is measurable. That is not to suggest that accurate tools are currently available, or even that every outcome can be measured by a particular technique, e.g., a paper-and-pencil test. However, as Ebel (1972) points out, "If they are known to be important, they must be measurable" (p. 37).

How, then, can valid and reliable measurements of the competency and effectiveness of parents be developed? First, one must clarify the purpose of the assessment. Ebel (1972) explains that part of the difficulty in measuring such traits as motivation stem from a confusion
between measurement and prediction. Thus, measurement of motivation would entail the assessment of the motivation a person has shown in the past, whereas prediction clearly involves a statement about future events. "Difficult as the problems of measuring some complex human traits are, they are much simpler than the problems of predicting unusual future success, especially if that success requires a fortunate coincidence of many influences" (Ebel, 1972, p. 40).

In terms of parent education, the competence and effectiveness demonstrated by the parent at given points in time can be assessed if long-term follow-up is possible. Analysis of the outcomes of such assessments over several time periods and situations would eventually enable any trend or pattern that was present to be detected and thereby a reasonably reliable prediction of future parenting behaviors to be made. Any single test, however, is unlikely to provide enough information on which to base such predictions.

The two major difficulties faced by the test constructor are what to measure and how to measure it. Clearly, the latter depends on the former. For example, it would make little sense to measure the physical development of a child by a paper-and-pencil test. Certain observations of the child are essential if an accurate assessment of his/her physical development is to be made.

The question of what is to be measured is an extremely complex one. Different programs have different goals and objectives; they emphasize different competencies and knowledge; in fact, they may even take
contradictory positions on some topics. To construct a single instrument which incorporates the input from all these sources is indeed a difficult task. If one is to realistically begin such a project, a framework within which to view the entity to be measured must be constructed.

Earlier a distinction was made between competence and effectiveness. Argyris (1970) argued that competence is reflected in an individual's ability to respond appropriately in a variety of situations at different periods in time. Effectiveness, on the other hand, reflects his/her response in any given situation. That is, a person could be judged to be a "good parent", i.e., a competent parent, and yet in a specific situation not be particularly effective. Similarly, in a particular situation a person may be highly effective and yet overall his/her behavior would not judge to be competent. Obviously, a goal of parent education is to increase each parent's competence and effectiveness.

The probability of being able to measure parental competence by a single instrument is low. Results of a single assessment are unlikely to permit a judgment about parents' behaviors over time and across situations. However, if the instrument is valid, and reliable, this probability will increase.

An instrument is valid if it measure what it was intended to measure, that is, if the instrument actually measures parent behaviors. On the other hand, an instrument is reliable if it consistently measures what it was designed to assess (Scriven & Roth, 1977). Thus, by choosing valid and reliable instruments, the conclusions reached about parental effectiveness and competence would be stronger.
Once the decision to use a questionnaire was made, investigation of potential existing tools was begun since it was not feasible to develop a questionnaire for this study. Instrument development is a costly and time-consuming research project. Moreover, existing instruments generally have reliability and/or validity measures which can be used as evidence to increase the generalizability of the results.

One of the most widely used instruments, the Parent Attitude Scale developed by Hereford (1963), was determined to be inappropriate for this study. The Parent Attitude Scale measures parental attitudes and beliefs. However, previous research (Fishbein, 1967) has shown a low correspondence between attitudes and behaviors. The decision was made to focus the outcome measures on parental behaviors, rather than on attitudes.

An instrument which has been used to examine several parent education programs is the Adlerian Parental Assessment of Child Behavior Scale (APACBS) developed by McKay (1976). This instrument was designed to assess parents' perceptions of their child's behavior. Hence, the instrument is behaviorally anchored and for that reason seemed appropriate to the study. However, the APACBS also places primary emphasis on measuring behaviors which would be expected to change after parents had completed a program based on an Adlerian approach. Since other programs which are not Adlerian in focus were to be included in the study, a second instrument was necessary.
The first part (questions 1-32) of the Parent Behavior Profile (Appendix C) are the items from the APACES. In developing the instrument, McKay had three judges rate the content validity of the instrument. He also performed two tests of reliability: (1) Cronbach's alpha to test for internal consistency (results ranged from .90 to .91) and the Pearson r to test for stability over time (r = .97). When McKay actually used the instrument to evaluate programs, he found reliability coefficients of .81 to .89 for Cronbach's alpha and .83 for the Pearson r.

The sample on which these reliability coefficients were derived consisted of mothers who: (1) resided in a specified school district area of Tucson, which consists of persons of the middle and upper-middle socioeconomic stratae; (2) had at least one child between the ages of 4 and 13; and (3) attended at least seven of the nine treatment sessions (McKay, 1976). Most of the parents included in this study (see "Results" chapter, questions 1 and 3) met most of these criteria except, of course, area of residence. Thus, although reliability coefficients were not calculated, the similarity of McKay's population and the sample in this study would support the premise that this instrument has fairly high reliability.

The second instrument chosen for use in the study was the Iowa Parent Behavior Inventory (IPBI) developed by Clarke, Crase and Pease (1976) (see Appendix E for permission to use the instrument). The overall purpose of the IPBI is to measure the parents' behaviors in relation to their children and thus also is firmly anchored in behaviors, not attitudes.
or beliefs. Although the IPDI asks each parent to rate both his/her own behavior and the spouse's behavior, only the parents' ratings of their own behaviors were used in this study. Separate versions of the IPBI are used for mothers and fathers. This presented some analysis difficulties (see "Score Derivation, p. 26).

The IPBI uses a rating scale of 1 to 99. This presented two problems. First, since the Adlerian Parental Assessment of Child Behavior Scale uses a 7-point rating scale, the two parts of the instrument would not have the same rating scale. Parents, it was felt, would be confused by having to switch from a 7-point scale to a 99-point scale. In addition, the primary thrust of this study was to detect changes in parents' responses between the pretest and posttest. A 99-point scale might produce artifically significant results by detecting differences which are not theoretically meaningful. That is, a statistical test of changes in parents' reported behavior may indicate a statistically significant difference. However, examination of the data may show that his difference was only three points on the 99 point rating scale. This would probably not be considered a meaningful change in parental behaviors. Thus, for the sake of clarity and ease of parents' responses as well as standardization of the measurement scale, the IPBI scale was changed to a seven-point rating scale. The scale descriptions were derived from the original IPBI scale.

Although the IPBI is still in its developmental phase, it has gone through two revisions based upon the results of factor analysis from two pilot studies. Reliability and validity coefficients were not available.
The IPBI identified three factors concerned with the parents' relationship to the child. These factors concentrated on the parents' initiation of involvement, performance of responsibility and predictable discipline as well as recognition and support of the child's needs. The items in the Parental Involvement with Child factor indicate warmth, affection and respect for the child. They also relate to the parent's willingness to be involved with the child in activities. On the other hand, the factor entitled "Responsible Discipline with Child" describes the predictability of the parent's own behavior and the ability of the parent to set clear and firmly applied limits. Finally, items under "Supportive Response to Child" indicate a willingness of the parent to respond quickly, appropriately and in a supportive manner to the child's expression of need.

Score derivation. The same instrument was administered for both the pretest and posttest. Change scores were derived by subtracting the item rating on the posttest from the item rating on the pretest. However, not all items predicted change in the same direction. For some items an increase in the parents' responses on the rating scale, i.e., a positive difference between posttest rating and pretest rating indicated a desirable change in parents' reported behaviors. These items were assigned a weight of "+1". Conversely, the same difference between posttest and pretest on other items indicated an undesirable change. These items were assigned a weight of "-1". The positive and negative
weights were determined by examination of the items. Appendix 5 contains all items on the Parent Behavior Assessment together with their assigned weights.

The item change score for each mother was calculated by multiplying the difference between the posttest rating and the pretest rating on each item by the weighting factor for that item. For example, item 1 has a "+1" weight. Suppose a mother had given item 1 a rating of 3 on the pretest and a rating of 5 on the posttest. Her change score for item 1 would be +2 = (5-3)(+1). Similarly, item 2 has a "-1" weight and so a change from a 5 rating on the pretest to a 2 rating on the posttest would yield a change score on item 2 of +3 = (2-5)(-1). The total change score for each mother was obtained by summing the 68 item change scores for that mother. Thus, with the total change score or the individual item change scores could be used in subsequent analyses.

Often parents did not respond to one or more of the items. If parents did not answer 17 or more of the 68 items, they were omitted from the analysis of changes in behavior. However, if fewer than 17 items were missing, mean responses for all parents in the program in which the parent was participating for the particular item that was missing on either the pretest or posttest, as appropriate, was inserted for the missing value.

The final 36 items were different for mothers and fathers (see above). Since only seven fathers participated in the study, a separate analysis of fathers could not be done. Therefore, fathers were omitted from all analyses except those involving only the Parent Profile.
Four criteria were used to select programs for inclusion in this study. All programs which meet these criteria were included in the sample. The program had to:

1. Meet the definition of a parent education program, i.e., the program must:
   a. Be a social system with well-defined roles.
   b. Be deliberately established.
   c. Have duration over time, i.e., is not a one-time occurrence.
   d. Facilitate learning, i.e., increase parental competence and effectiveness.
   e. Involve more than one learner, i.e., is a group process, not a home-based intervention.

2. Focus on parents with children between the age of three and twelve, i.e., programs which are not geared specifically for parents of infants or teenagers.


4. Meet the design requirements. That is, the program leader had to agree to complete the program questionnaire and some parents had to agree to complete the background questionnaires and the outcome measures.

The Family Life Education Council (FLEC) compiled a directory of agencies offering programs in Franklin County, Ohio. This directory, published by Community Coordinated Child in 1976, provided the list from which programs meeting the above criteria were selected. All programs included in the study met the above criteria. Other programs were excluded. Typical reasons included: (1) focus was on children
outside identified age groups, e.g., infants or teenagers; (2) programs of limited duration, e.g., a weekend retreat; (3) program goals which were not to facilitate learning but rather to provide therapy; and (4) program leader unwilling or unable to participate.

Fourteen parent education programs meeting the above criteria were identified. Two of these programs, however, failed to have any parents complete both a pretest and a posttest. Therefore, only twelve programs were included in the final study.

A total of 207 parents were enrolled in the twelve groups. Of the number, 112 (54.1%) agreed to participate and completed some or all of the necessary questionnaires. Unfortunately, the design of the study did not facilitate use of partial data. Parents needed to respond to the Parent Profile and both the pretest and posttest versions of the Parent Behavior Assessment in order to be included in all the analyses. All parents who filled out the Parent Profile were included in the study. However, parents who completed either the pretest or the posttest, but not both, had to be eliminated in the analysis of changes in behaviors. With the twelve groups, a total of 68 parents (32.9%) had complete data sets and could be included in all analyses. This relatively low final response rate was probably due to a combination of several factors:

1. Parent education is a sensitive and personal topic. Many parents were uneasy about answering somewhat intimate questions.

2. Participation in the study was voluntary. Parents could withdraw at any time.
3. A previous agreement between the program leaders and the researcher prevented any follow-up on the non-respondents (see "Procedures" below). This severely limited the options for increasing the return rate. Most program leaders did not feel it was appropriate for them to repeatedly request parents to complete the forms.

**Procedures**

Preliminary conversations with individual parent education program leaders were conducted before the start of the data collection phase. At this time, several leaders indicated that they preferred to distribute the questionnaires. The major concern was that part of the process of parent education was rapport-building and group cohesiveness. They felt the introduction of a stranger into the program would be too disruptive and would make many parents very uneasy. Thus, at no time did the researcher have any contact with the participating parents. Moreover, direct observations of the group meetings was also prohibited. Each program leader was contacted either directly by the researcher or through the agency coordinator. Eleven different leaders participated in the study. The researcher spoke directly with ten of these leaders while the agency coordinator met with and discussed the program with the other leaders. In all cases, the leaders received both a verbal and written explanation of the study. The written summary of the research was suitable for use in presenting the questionnaires to the parents. However, all leaders preferred to describe the research in their own terms.
Program leaders were given a packet of questionnaires before the first group meeting. The packet included one Program Profile and permission form (a sufficient number of Parent Profiles and permission forms) and two sets of Parent Behavior Assessments (one for the pretest and one for the posttest).

Parent Profiles were distributed on the first day of each class. Each Profile had a consent form attached to the front of it. This consent form, as well as the verbal explanations by the program leaders, emphasized the voluntary nature of participation in the project. This consent form was approved by The Ohio State University Human Subjects Review Committee (see Appendix E for approval).

In addition to completing the Parent Profile, participating parents also were asked to complete the Parent Behavior Assessment (pretest) on the first day of class. Then, on the final day of class, each leader gave participating parents the Parent Behavior Assessment the second time. The leaders collected all questionnaires and returned them to the researcher.

Feedback from the program leaders indicated that approximately 20 minutes of class time was required for the parents to complete the Parent Behavior Assessment. An additional 15-20 minutes were needed on the first day since the purpose of the study had to be explained and the Parent Profile needed to be completed. No leaders felt this represented an undue amount of time from their schedule, although a few leaders said classes did run a little longer occasionally.
Program leaders were given the Program Profile before the course began and returned it with the parent materials at the conclusion of the course. Some of the questions on the Program Profile could be answered during the weeks the program was in operation, e.g., background of staff, whereas other questions could only be completed after the program ended, e.g., attendance. Most leaders indicated it took about one hour to answer all the questions, although this time was often divided into two or three different sessions. Only one leader asked for any assistance in filling out the Profile. She sought help in translating attendance figures into percentages.

A phone interview was held with several program leaders after their materials were returned to gather their impressions of the study and to get any suggestions for improvement. Two leaders noted some initial problems in gaining parents' confidence. This, they felt, explained the somewhat low response rate on the part of parents. One leader suggested that the questionnaires be introduced at the second or later session when parents had more trust in the leader and would be more willing to answer the questions.

Five leaders particularly noted the relevancy of the questions on the Parent Behavior Assessment. One of the sponsoring agencies asked permission to use the instrument in subsequent courses. One leader indicated that she did not feel the questionnaire would adequately reflect changes in attitude, i.e., the parents' behavior might not have changed but he/she no longer had the guilt associated with childrearing and, therefore, had a more positive attitude.
All results were returned by July 1978. Each Program Profile, Parent Profile and Parent Behavior Assessment was coded and keypunched. All programs and parents are identified by number only in the computer and no master list of names is stored on computer files. This was done to insure that the parents' and programs' confidentiality rights were respected.

The statistical analyses are described in detail in the next chapter. However, it was necessary to employ different techniques to answer each of the four major research questions, since each question required a somewhat different view of the data.

Limitations

All research studies, particularly those with limited resources and time, are beset with limitations. These limitations represent cautions to bear in mind while reviewing the findings. Moreover, they point out the pitfalls in conducting this type of research and can be used to help others with the same mistakes.

The first limitation concerns the sample for the study. While twelve programs were included in the final study, these programs were given only in the Central Ohio area. Hence, they represent a narrow geographic sample. In addition, programs in the study were limited to those which began between the specified dates (October 1, 1977 through May 31, 1978) and thus operated during a somewhat limited period of time.
A second limitation is also related to the sample. All programs included in the study were existing, intact groups, i.e., the experimenter did not randomly assign subjects to groups of treatments to groups. The nonequivalence of these groups poses several threats to internal validity. This would be particularly true if a traditional analysis of the results were planned. However, since the major intent of the study was not necessarily to detect differences between groups, but rather to assess the impact of common components across groups, the sampling biases are somewhat reduced because parents do not remain in the same unit of analysis in the various tests of the hypotheses. That is, sampling biases represent threats to internal validity when they indicate participants in various groups were differentially selected and when these selection criteria influence the measured outcomes. In this study only the first two questions (see "Research Questions and Hypotheses") require analysis of the individual programs, and only the second question analyzes the effects of these programs. The other questions require parents in the different programs to be reclassified according to program or parent characteristics.

Although sampling biases may still threaten internal validity, recombining the groups causes the possible biases to be distributed differently depending upon the nature of the newly formed units of analysis.

A final limitation of the study related to the sample is the possible selection biases which could have resulted from the voluntary nature of participation. Both program leaders and parents voluntarily decided
whether or not they wished to be included in the study. As noted above (see "Sampling"), a large percentage of parents (43.4%) did not agree to participate and an additional 17.9% did not complete all parts of the study. No follow-up on nonrespondents was possible because contact between the researcher and the parents was prohibited. Therefore, it was impossible to assess the potential biases resulting from a large pool of nonrespondents.

A key element in detecting differences between programs was variability in the approaches. On the other hand, a standard definition of parent education had to be employed to determine what programs could be included in the study. This definition of parent education, however, specifically excluded certain types of programs, e.g., home-based approaches. This reduced the amount of variability which could have been present in the data and thereby limited both the changes of detecting differences as well as the generalizability of the findings.

Finally, a critical element in any research is the instruments used to measure outcome. A paper-and-pencil questionnaire has several limitations which were discussed above (see "Methodological Considerations"). Despite these rather obvious deficits, questionnaires also have many strengths which made them the most reasonable alternative in the study. The two instruments chosen for use in this study, however, have been shown to measure change in parents. Moreover, the APACDS also has been used in conjunction with other measuring devices and has shown consistent degrees of change. Although some research (Larson, 1972) has found a low
correlation between various measures of parents' behaviors, there is no evidence to suggest that one method is clearly superior to another. As discussed in the "Methodological Considerations" section above, direct observation of the parent in either the home or a structured setting, while intuitively much more appealing, nonetheless also has some serious methodological problems.

Although it is important to keep these limitations in mind while reviewing the results in the next chapter, it is equally important to bear in mind the purpose in the study. The aim was not to conclusively identify the single best approach to parent education. In fact, the design was purposively developed to evaluate the strengths of several different approaches. Moreover, this study represents a first, somewhat tentative, step using an exploratory approach in program analysis. It was designed to identify potentially controllable factors so that subsequent research and program development would have a foundation upon which to build.
CHAPTER V
RESULTS

The overall purpose in the study was to quantitatively describe the components of parent education programs and to determine the relationship between these components and parental outcomes. With this purpose in mind, four research questions were posed, hypotheses were generated, a design was developed, and the strategies were implemented. The statistical analyses and results described in this Chapter reflect these processes and hence are organized around the four questions.

Differences in Parent Education Programs

The first question asked was, "How do parent education programs differ?" Parent education programs were evaluated along two dimensions: (1) program characteristics and (2) parent characteristics. Thus, the analysis of this question was the examination of 12 programs with respect to the variables identified on the Program Profile and the Parent Profile. Program variables are described first, followed by an analysis of the parent variables.

Program Variables

The Program Profile was designed to measure 24 variables. A description of the 12 programs in the study with respect to these 24 variables
is included below. Table 1 outlines a summary of some selected program characteristics and serves as a quick reference for future discussions.

**Sponsoring agency.** Two agencies were the primary sponsors of all programs in the study. Agency 1 is a private, nonprofit organization comprised primarily of concerned mothers. It is a local group which sponsors not only parent education courses, but also leader and volunteer courses and supports a 24-hour crisis hotline. Agency 2, on the other hand, is a government subsidized child welfare agency. Parent education, although a major thrust of the agency, represents only one component of this multifaceted agency. Leaders in these programs were paid for their time. The 12 programs were taught by 11 different leaders. Two groups did have the same leader. However, since only one leader had two groups, no analysis of leader effects across different programs was possible.

The eight programs sponsored by Agency 1 were entitled Family Living Courses. All leaders in these courses have received special training by Agency 1 in addition to whatever previous background they may have had. The leaders are not paid for their time but do receive a small reimbursement to cover gasoline and/or babysitting costs.

The four programs sponsored by Agency 2, on the other hand, represent a fairly wide range of approaches. One course followed the Parent Effectiveness Training model, the second was a Family Living Course, the third focused primarily on communication, whereas the fourth was targeted for parents of preschoolers.

**Number of meetings.** The number of meetings did not vary greatly between programs. As Table 1 indicates, although the range was quite
Table 1
Summary of Selected Program Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Leader</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th># in Class</th>
<th># in Sample*</th>
<th>Total of Meetings</th>
<th>Duration of Meetings (hours)</th>
<th>Total Exposure (hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 17.25 9.33 9.42 2.50 26.33
Standard Deviation: 5.31 2.39 3.48 0.82 23.45

* Included in some or all of the analyses.
large (6 to 20 meetings), all but three of the programs met either eight or nine times. Auerbach (1968) noted that the optimal number of meetings in her study ranged between 8 and 12. Thus, the data in this study seem fairly consistent with her findings.

**Frequency of meetings.** All groups met once per week.

**Duration of each meeting.** The data with respect to the duration of the meetings were even more uniform than the number of meetings. All but one program met between two and three hours.

The total possible exposure of parents to the program, i.e., number of hours they met with the group if they attended all classes, is calculated by multiplying the number of meetings times the duration of each meeting. One program clearly inflated the data due to the large number of class meetings. However, enough variability in the total duration of the program seems to be present and could suggest a potentially important variable.

**Class size.** Class size varied widely between programs from a low of eight to a high of 28. The mean of 17.25 parents is close to the figure of approximately 15 parents which Auerbach (1968) stated was desirable for parent education groups.

**Collection of fees.** Collection of fees was the sixth variable identified on the Program Profile. The eight programs sponsored by Agency 1 charged a $10 fee, while the remaining four programs charged no fees. Since these results coincided exactly with those from the
agency analysis, no further analysis of this variable was planned. Moreover, since $10 was defined as a minimal fee, the impact of varying fee rates were not tested.

Recruitment procedures. Parent characteristics were one of the two major types of variables investigated in this study. If differences between programs with respect to parent variables did appear, then recruitment procedures could represent one possible explanation of these observed differences.

Table 2 depicts the recruitment procedures identified in the 12 groups. Program leaders were given the first six options from which they could choose one or several responses with the option of identifying others. As the data indicate, most leaders seemed to use the same types of recruitment procedures. Only four program leaders offered any additional recruitment techniques.

Methods used to encourage both parents to attend. In two-parent families, the involvement of one parent in a parent education program can cause considerable strain on the relationship between the two parents (Fears, 1976). The techniques employed by program leaders to encourage both parents to participate are described in Table 3. The next variable measured their success in achieving dual participation.

Two techniques were most frequently used: evening or weekend classes and babysitting services. No program leaders indicated that they restricted enrollment to couples or offered lower rates as a means of ensuring participation by both mothers and fathers.
Table 2
Recruitment Procedures in Each Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recruitment Procedure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement in media</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephoning</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door-to-door canvassing</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referrals from agencies</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club or group members</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word-of-mouth</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotline</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posters</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker's Bureau</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fliers</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ = Program leader indicated procedure used.
Table 3
Methods Used to Encourage Both Parents to Enroll

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment Technique</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evening/weekend classes</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babysitting</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower rates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation provided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrict enrollment to couples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percentage of parents attending together. An indication of the degree to which program organizers were successful in getting parents to attend together is the percentage of both parents in the program. Figure 6 is a histogram showing these percentages.

As Figure 6 indicates, only one program had more than 50% of the parents attending together. Moreover, half of the programs in the study had no jointly attending couples. If Fears (1976) is correct in her evaluation of the negative impact of parent education programs on the husband-wife relationship, such low turnout of both parents could have serious unintended outcomes resulting from parent education programs.

Attendance. The regularity with which participants attend a series of group meetings has been considered an indication of program success and/or participants' enjoyment of the sessions. As noted above (see "Program Profile"), however, the evidence concerning the impact of attendance on changes in parents is somewhat contradictory.
Question 10 on the Program Profile asked program leaders to calculate the percentage of parents falling into three attendance groups: two or fewer sessions, about half the sessions, and all or most of the sessions. Nine of the 12 program leaders responded to this question in part or in full. Histograms diagramming the program leaders' responses to each of these items are presented in Figure 7.

In only one program did more than 10% of the class drop out after attending two or fewer sessions. All program leaders who responded to the item "all or most of the sessions" indicated 50% or more of the class attended most sessions. This is a particularly compelling statistic since eight programs took place during some of the winter months when travel was often quite difficult.

Follow-up on nonattenders. Although several procedures which program leaders could use to follow-up on nonattenders were suggested, only two were frequently noted: telephone call (9 programs) and inquiry among friends (9 programs). One other leader indicated that she used a call to the referring person, who in this case, was the caseworker. Both telephone calls and inquiries among friends are very low-pressure techniques. This seems consistent with the voluntary participation of parents in most of these programs.

Additional organized follow-up after program ended. Three leaders indicated in a follow-up conversation that parents in their groups had requested additional courses and/or a continuation of this course. The programs in this study provided a variety of means for meeting these
Figure 7. Histograms depicting the attendance rates in the parent education programs in the study.
needs. Seven program leaders said that additional advanced courses were offered and/or that they helped parents to form continuing programs. Six program leaders also referred parents to other agencies and/or programs which they knew of in the community. Finally, four leaders indicated that they encouraged the parents to contact them individually in the future. This wide variety of responses may indicate that the program leaders felt both a need of parents for continuing support and a commitment to provide that support.

Follow-up evaluation of parents. The parent education groups in this study were community programs with, on the whole, voluntary participants. Therefore, as expected very little follow-up evaluation was possible. Five program leaders indicated that they used no follow-up procedures and four noted informal contact when the opportunity arose. In two programs, parents regularly were contacted (by mail) after the completion of the course. Since follow-up is expensive in terms of manpower and since programs were educational rather than research oriented, lack of follow-up evaluations is probably a very common practice.

Crisis intervention services provided. Often parents experience crises during the course of the parent education program. Leaders are usually one of the first sources to whom these parents turn for help. The program leaders in this study noted that the following services were available:
1. Additional, individual counseling (4 programs)
2. Referral to an appropriate agency (9 programs)
3. Support from other parents (6 programs)
4. 24-hour hotline (3 programs)

Thus, except for additional, individual counseling, the leaders in this program had three other direct services which they could provide. The support from other parents in the groups seems to reinforce the widely held belief that the group rapport and mutual support are essential to the success of parent education programs.

Reference materials provided. Parents are literally besieged by the amount of information on childrearing now available in the mass media. McGrath (1976) notes that the average bookstore has at least 30 different publications related to child care. As Bigner (1972) remarked, the mass media has replaced grandmother in giving parents advice on childrearing.

One of the functions which parent education program leaders serve is to filter this information and to put it into some sort of integrated perspective. The reference materials provided to parents is one element of this sorting process. Nine leaders (75%) provide parents with books and pamphlets concerning the general program and seven leaders even provide handouts on the goals and objectives of the program. In keeping with the educational orientation of these programs, 10 leaders gave parents worksheets and/or homework activities. Finally, five groups
were given the names and phone numbers of other parents and/or the staff and three received lists of available community resources.

**Feedback to parents concerning progress.** The goal of parent education is to increase parents' competence and effectiveness. This goal clearly implies anticipated change in parents' attitudes, beliefs and/or behaviors. One way of evaluating this change is to assess parents' progress during the program. This was not a strategy used by most program leaders. In fact, eight leaders indicated they did no formal assessment of parent progress. However, some leaders did note strategies they employed: (1) two used ongoing, written assessments by leader; (2) four used ongoing, verbal assessments; (3) one used parent interviews; (4) one used parent logs evaluated by leader; and (5) two used ongoing, verbal assessment by other parents. It appears that either program leaders do not value structured feedback as part of their class organization and/or that they rely totally on more informal mechanisms which they believe are sufficient. Comments from leaders indicate that most of them encourage parents to share their experiences with the group and then to have the group (or themselves) comment.

**Educational background of leaders.** The educational background of leaders in this study varied widely. Most leaders had little or no specific background in parent education (no leaders), child development (two leaders), or family relations (one leader). In fact, five leaders indicated that they had no formal educational background. The most
common background was in education (four programs), while two leaders had a religious affiliation and one leader had a degree in counseling.

At least two explanations for these results are possible. First, specialized training at the college level may not be necessary to effectively lead parent education groups. A second, somewhat parallel explanation also could be that such training is simply not available.

Additional training of leaders. Only one leader indicated that she had received no additional training before teaching this course. Nine had participated in a special course designed for teaching this program and eight had attended a series of workshops for staff development. Four leaders completed courses offered by other agencies to supplement their knowledge. This cross-fertilization of ideas from other agencies probably accounts for the observed differences between programs within the same agency (see "Program Content" below). Finally, feedback from the director or from another leader was used by eight leaders to further develop their professional skills.

Other experience of leaders. The third aspect of staff training was additional experience based upon years of teaching parent education courses, number of courses taught, other related courses, etc. However, since five program leaders responded in any way to this question, no analysis of the effects of any of these variables was possible.

Number of hours per week leader devoted to class. Finally, the amount of time the program leader spent on the course outside of class was also investigated. A histogram of the data (Figure 3) shows that
most teachers spent 5-6 hours outside class (mean = 5.67 hours). Again, the results indicate a fairly consistent pattern across programs. The one program leader who spent 11 hours said she was redesigning the course for next year and that accounted for the additional hours.

Figure 8. Histogram depicting the amount of time leaders spent on the program outside class meetings.

Sources of information for program content. A wide variety of sources are available to program leaders for formulating the goals and policies of their programs. Several generic sources were noted by leaders: (1) communication with parents and professionals in the field (8 leaders); (2) published reports of parent education (9 leaders); (3) published reports on family, marriage and child development (8 leaders); (4) published reports on counseling and therapy (10 leaders); (5) published reports on group processes (6 leaders); and (6) personal experience (7 leaders).

In addition to noting the sources of information, leaders were also asked to list the books and/or theoreticians which they relied
upon in the course. As the list below indicates, a wide variety of sources were used. Books listed by more than one leader have the number of leaders listed in parentheses.

- Parent Effectiveness Training (8 programs)
- Person to Person (3 programs)
- On Becoming a Person
- Your Child's Self Esteem (8 programs)
- Liberated Parents - Liberated Children (4 programs)
- I'm OK - You're OK (3 programs)
- Born to Win
- P.E.T. in Action (2 programs)
- Between Parent and Child (3 programs)
- Between Parent and Teenager (2 programs)
- Meeting Yourself Halfway
- Values Clarification (3 programs)
- Intimate Enemy (2 programs)
- Peoplemaking
- Gesell Institute of Child Development
- How to Become an Encouraging Person - Turning People On
- What Every Child Needs
- What's a Parent to Do?
- Children the Challenge
- Step
- Child Care (2 programs)
Other parent education specialists listed included Eda LeShan, Ira Gordon, Carl Rogers and Mary Evans.

Program Content. A list of fifteen concepts emphasized in various parent education programs was derived from a review of the literature. These fifteen concepts were then formulated into two questions. The first question (#23 on the "Program Profile") asked leaders to rate the concepts they emphasized in the course. The second question (#25 on the "Program Profile") asked leaders to rate the competencies parents were expected to gain from the program. The same concepts appeared in both questions, although the concepts in question #25 were translated from program elements (question #23) to parent competencies (question #25). The concepts were also randomly ordered so that leaders could not simply transcribe the first set of ranks to the second set (see Appendix F for the translations). Ranking fifteen items is an extremely difficult task. Therefore, leaders were asked only to rate the top three concepts and the bottom three concepts, i.e., the three most important and the three least important.

Two sets of questions were investigated: (1) How did program leaders rank the concepts? (2) Were there any differences between the relative ranks? The answer to these questions determines whether or not the programs emphasized the same content.

The rankings of the fifteen concepts are presented in Table 4. In terms of the concepts, several interesting patterns emerge. Some
Table 4

Relative Rankings of Parent Education Concepts by Program Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theories/facts concerning child growth &amp; development</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative life &amp; family styles, kinship patterns &amp; societal interactions</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures to help parents examine their own values</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals of children's misbehavior</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theories/facts of behavior modification principles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of rewards &amp; punishment</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active or reflective listening principles</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills in conveying positive &amp; negative feelings</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems analysis as related to family</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaches to problem solving</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family rules &amp; family organizations</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group processes and communication</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual trust and respect in family</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining and setting appropriate limits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching role of parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = highest rating, most emphasis
15 = lowest rating, least emphasis
concepts receive uniformly high (or low) rankings while others were not ranked at all. A few concepts, on the other hand, received somewhat mixed rankings.

Three concepts received consistently high ratings: (1) procedures to help parents examine their own values; (2) active or reflective listening principles; and (3) skills in conveying positive and negative feelings. In general, these concepts promote self-exploration and self-understanding on the part of parents. The content reflected in these concepts is not intended to convey specific facts about childrearing.

Determining what, if any, differences between programs in terms of the relative importance of the concepts is difficult at best since only six of the 15 concepts were ranked. Moreover, rankings do not represent an interval scale, i.e., the difference between ranks of 1 and 2 may be greater than the difference between ranks of 2 and 3, although arithmetically, the differences are exactly equal. The lack of an interval scale makes the use of most parametric tests invalid. No valid nonparametric statistical tests were identified which could be used with this amount of missing data.

Program leaders also were asked to rank parent competencies. Their relative ranks are presented in Table 5. Once again, some interesting patterns emerge. Two competencies were ranked uniformly high: skill in use of reflective listening and skill in conveying positive and negative feelings. Both of these competencies were reflected in the parent education concepts leaders ranked highly. However, the third
### Table 5
Relative Ranking of Parent Competencies by Program Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of child growth &amp; development</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of social interest</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of introspection</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding causes of child's misbehaviors</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of reinforcement principles</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill in use of reward and punishment</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill in use of reflective listening</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill in conveying positive and negative feelings</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to detect family interrelationships</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative problem solving techniques</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of family rules</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegate responsibility and encourage group planning</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage mutual respect</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine and set appropriate limits</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of parent's teaching role</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = highest rating, most important
15 = lowest rating, least important
concept - procedures to help parents examine their own values - received somewhat mixed ranking when translated into the parent competency of developing intraspection. Although six program leaders ranked this competency quite high, two other leaders ranked it much lower.

Certain competencies/concepts are ranked uniformly low. These rankings are relative and a low ranking does not necessarily mean that the competency or concept is unimportant but rather that it is relatively less important than the other items.

In summary, differences between programs with respect to content were not able to be completely analyzed. Some similarities and differences between programs seem to exist, but without complete rankings of all 15 items, statistical tests cannot be used.

Methods employed. The methods employed by program leaders are summarized in Table 6. Leaders were asked to indicate if they used a technique and if so, the approximate percentage of class time spent in each activity. These percentages are listed in Table 6 when they were provided. If no percentages were listed, a "+" sign indicates that the leader utilized that particular method but did not specify amount of time.

Program leaders seemed to use many of the same techniques although they varied in the amount of time devoted to each. Thus, all leaders used group discussion time, and most used small group activities, role playing and lectures. However, the relative emphasis on each method varied somewhat.
Table 6

Methods Employed by Program Leaders and the Percentage of Time Each Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10  11  12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group discussion time</td>
<td>30  +  33  25  35  +  25  25  50  20  30  10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small group activities</td>
<td>10  +  16  20  15  +  15  25  25  30  20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role playing</td>
<td>+  16  20  15  +  25  5   60  5   10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>60  +  33  25  35  +  60  20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiovisual presentations</td>
<td>10  +  5   5   5   15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human behavior exercises</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured learning activities</td>
<td>+  10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual parent counseling</td>
<td>+  +  15  10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading assignments</td>
<td>+  +  +  +  +  +</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ = Program leader employed, no percentage of time indicated
Statistical analysis of these data once again is limited by three problems. First, two program leaders did not supply percentages and therefore missing data are a problem. In addition, percentages for one other program (11) do not sum to 100%. Without having some understanding of how the remaining time was spent, conclusions concerning the program would be tentative at best. Finally, several leaders indicated they used the same methods an equal percentage of time. If each program leader could have identified a single method most frequently used, certain analyses could also be done.

With this caution in mind, a Friedman Test was performed on the 10 programs in which the methods were ranked. Ties in the data were assigned the mean rank, and no response was treated as zero percentage of time. A Chi-square statistic is calculated. In this case, the $\chi^2$ with nine degrees of freedom has an obtained value of 14.85. The critical value for $\chi^2_9$ at the 95% confidence level is 16.9. Thus, there is not a significant difference between programs with respect to methods employed.

Flexibility of the program. The final program variable investigated was the flexibility of the program. Program leaders were asked to rate the amount of structure they imposed on the class versus the amount of flexibility given to parents to establish the content. The four point rating scale assigned a one to fairly firm adherence to schedule and a four to participation by parents higher priority than specific content.

The histogram below (Figure 9) depicts the responses of the program leaders. Clearly, the leaders in this study placed a heavy emphasis on parent participation in the program.
Figure 9. Histogram depicting the flexibility of parent education programs.

Summary of the program variables. The Program Profile, completed by the leaders of the 12 programs in the study, assesses program with respect to 24 variables. As the above discussion indicates, programs differed widely on some variables and showed no significant differences on others. Those variables on which programs differed to some degree are included in subsequent analyses. These variables included: sponsoring agency, duration of class, class size, recruitment procedures, methods used to encourage both parents to attend, attendance, follow-up on nonattenders, additional organized follow-up after program ended, follow-up evaluation of parents, crises intervention services provided, reference materials provided, feedback to parents concerning progress, educational background of leaders, additional training of leaders, number of hours per week leader devoted to class, sources of information for program content, program content, methods employed, and flexibility of the program.
Parent Variables

Not only could programs differ in terms of the variables measured on the Program Profile, but they also could differ in terms of the types of parents who participated. Since the ultimate goal of this study was not to evaluate individual programs but rather to examine the components of these programs, all parents in the study were analyzed at one time, i.e., parent characteristics were not reported on a program by program basis. The data from each parent variable on the Parent Profile are described below. A total of 111 parents completed the Parent Profile.

Age. The mean age of parents in this study was 31.1 years. However, the range of ages was quite wide: 17 years to 49 years. Figure 10 is a histogram which illustrates the age breakdown of parents.

Sex. A total of 101 mothers and 10 fathers completed the Parent Profile.

Number of children. The mean number of children in the families of this study was 2.49 children. The range was from 1 child to 6. Figure 11 graphically represents these data in a histogram.

Age of children. Although parents with children of any age possibly can benefit from parent education programs, programs are generally oriented toward a particular age range of children. As indicated in Figure 12, the majority of children (80.8%) in this study were 12 years old or less. The criteria used to select the sample for this study specifically eliminated programs whose major focus was on parents of teenagers, so
Figure 10. Histogram depicting age distribution of parents in the study. Based on responses from 99 parents; 12 parents did not respond.
Figure 11. Histogram illustrating the number of children of each parent in the study. Two parents did not respond; data based on a sample of 109 parents.
Figure 12. Histogram of the age of children distribution.
the fewer number of adolescents is not too surprising. Moreover, since the mean age of the parents was only 31.1 years, it would seem unlikely that a large majority would have older children.

**Sex of children.** The children in this sample were evenly distributed in terms of sex: 51.55% females and 48.45% males.

**Number of adults in the household.** The family, it has been argued, is in crisis. The extended family-grandparents, aunts, uncles, etc. - no longer lives in the same house or even in the same city. Moreover, parents often are divorced and/or never married and thus are raising children as single parents. Several questions on the Parent Profile addressed these issues (see "Marital Status and Relatives Assisting in Child Care" below).

In terms of the number of adults (over 18) in the household, the parents in this sample exhibited a strong pattern of two adults. Of the 111 parents who responded to this question, 96 (86.5%) indicated there were two adults in the house. Eight parents said only one adult lived in the house, whereas the remaining seven said either three or four adults lived in the house.

**Marital status.** The parents' responses to the question concerning marital status once again showed strong support for a two adult family. Over 89% (99 parents) were married: 87 were married, 7 were separated, and 5 were remarried. An additional five parents were not married but were living with someone. Including the seven parents who were separated at the time of this study, only 12.5% of the parents were raising their children alone.
**Ethnic origin.** Nearly all of the parents in the study (106 parents) were white. Only four black parents and one Asian parent participated. It is impossible to determine, based on the data collected, whether this racial imbalance is due to recruitment procedures, unwillingness or inability of certain ethnic groups to participate, or a combination of these and other factors.

**Education.** Parents in this study varied considerably in terms of their educational background. Figure 13 illustrates the different education levels of the 111 parents. Nearly 70% of the parents had some post high school training, and over 40% received advanced degrees (associate, bachelor, or graduate/professional degree). Most parents, it would seem, were well educated and had had some training outside of the public schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not finish high school</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college or technical school</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate degree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional degree</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 13. Histogram depicting the educational level of parents.
Family income. Field testing of the Parent Profile had indicated that some parents were unwilling or unable to respond to the question regarding family income. This was confirmed in the study since 39 parents (35.1%) who completed the Parent Profile did not supply income figures. The mean income of parents who did respond was quite high: $19,755.75. Incomes ranged from $204 to $55,000 with the modal response being $15,000.

Years lived in Columbus. A variable often cited as contributing to disturbances in children and families is the number of times the family moves, particularly between cities or states. Americans, it is argued, are a highly mobile society and families are experiencing crises as a result of these frequent moves.

This high mobility was not found in the sample of parents in this study. Indeed, the mean number of years in Columbus reported by the 109 parents who responded was 13.31 years. This ranged from less than one year to 37 years. Several parents indicated they had been reared in Columbus.

Relatives assisting in child care. One of the criteria for determining if parents have an extended family for support in times of need is the existence of relatives nearby who can help with child care. Most parents (73.0%) in this study did not have such a support system of relatives.

Parents in this study seemed to have many similarities with the so called isolated nuclear family (Parsons, 1965). Families were small,
typically two married adults with an average of 2.49 children. They were
generally geographically stable but, on the other hand, few had relatives
who could assist in child care.

Working status. Figures for the general population indicate that
nearly half of all mothers now work. "For mothers of children 6 to 17,
the figure is 55% and rising. And for mothers of children under 6, the
trend is especially strong. By 1975, 39% of preschool children's mothers
were in the work force, compared with only 14% in 1950" (Beels, 1975,
p. 25). The percentage of working mothers in this study was not as high-
32.4%. Considering the high mean income of over $19,000, this figure
may be fairly representative of that higher income population.

Child care arrangements. Only 90 of the 111 parents responded to
the question regarding child care arrangements. Once again, the most
common pattern was for one of the parents to care for the children.
Forty parents said one of the parents cared for the children and an
additional 31 said no child care was needed. Thus, 71 parents (78.89%)
needed no child care outside the home. This figure is quite predictable
since only 32.4% of the mothers worked and some mothers had older
children who needed no special child care arrangements.

Parental satisfaction. Parents also were asked to rate their
satisfaction with themselves as parents. The scale ranged from one (very
dissatisfied) to four (very satisfied). All but six parents responded
to this question. The overall mean was 2.97 which seems to indicate that in general, parents were somewhat satisfied with their role. One parent, however, found this question offensive since, she believed, it was obvious she wasn't satisfied or she wouldn't have come to the classes!

**Expectations from the programs.** Parents often have varied reasons for coming to parent education classes. Parents could choose any number of eight options listed that they might have hoped to gain from the program. Each option and the number of parents (out of the total sample of 111) who checked that item are listed below:

1. Solve my problems with the children  
2. Meet new people  
3. Get away from home for a while  
4. Prove to others I am a good parent  
5. Get new ideas for things to do  
6. Learn the best way to raise children  
7. Learn to enjoy parenting more  
8. Nothing

Twelve additional reasons were given by parents: (1) refine parenting skills, (2) understand self better, (3) self development, (4) develop better communication, (5) share information with others, (6) learn to deal with family problems, (7) learn ways to approach future problems, (8) learn to get along with others, (9) promised spouse, (10) compare own ideas with experts, (11) had to come, and (12) enhance child's future.
The range of responses seemed to indicate that parents generally had high expectations of the programs, but they were not expecting the programs to solve all their problems.

Finally, parents also were asked to list any special problems they were having with their children. Problems fall into three general categories: (1) child problems; (2) parent/family problems; and (3) external/societal problems. Answers by some parents did not clearly fit into any category. The responses given by parents are presented in Figure 14. Most of the problems listed were concerned either with the child directly or with the child's relationship to the parent and/or others in the family.

**Summary of Program Differences**

Numerous differences between programs, and between parents in the programs, were identified and discussed above. Some variables were uniform across all respondents, e.g., all programs met once per week. Other variables, e.g., income of the parents, showed marked variability. The potential impact of each variable on changes in parents' reported behaviors is discussed in questions three and four below. However, first it must be determined if parents did indeed change. That is the subject of the next section.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Child Problems</strong></th>
<th><strong>Parent/Family Problems</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Sleep problems</td>
<td>• Learn to treat children with respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tantrums</td>
<td>• Sibling rivalry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Child too dependent</td>
<td>• Twin problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attention-getting</td>
<td>• Motivating child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Child's self esteem</td>
<td>• Communicating with children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teenage problems</td>
<td>• Rejection by child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Child's emotional problems</td>
<td>• Coping with divorce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stubbornness</td>
<td>• Discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bed wetting</td>
<td>• Getting children back</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>External/Societal Problems</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Low academic achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fast learner - needs extra motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Moving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Peer relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School truancy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 14. Special problems parents reported having with their children.
Analysis of Changes in Parents' Reported Behaviors

A second question asked in the present study was, "Do parent education programs significantly affect changes in parents' reported behaviors?"

The overall goal of the study was the quantitatively describe components of parent education programs and to determine the relationship between those components and changes in parents' reported behaviors. However, unless significant changes were reported by parents, the effort to identify program and/or parent variables related to these changes would be in vain. Therefore, two statistical hypotheses were investigated. Each is discussed in detail below.

Parents Will Show No Significant Changes Between Pretest and Posttest Ratings on the Parent Behavior Assessment.

The basis for determining if parents significantly changed after participation in the parent education program was the difference between their pretest and posttest responses on the Parent Behavior Assessment. The difference for each item was calculated by subtracting the pretest rating from the posttest rating and multiplying the obtained difference by a weighting factor. A total score was obtained by summing the calculated ratings for all 68 items (see "Score Deviation", p. 86).

As noted previously, the last 36 items for fathers were different than those answered by mothers. Since only eight fathers had complete data sets, they could not be analyzed separately and hence were eliminated from the change score analysis.
A series of one-sided t-tests were conducted to determine if all mothers from all groups changed significantly and if mothers in each group changed significantly. Table 7 illustrates the results of the 13 t-tests.

The data in Table 7 point to several interesting conclusions. First, although the overall analysis was significant at the .05 level, only one of the 12 groups (Group 12) reached this level of significance, and in fact, only one other group even approached significance. A major contributing factor to the lack of significance could be the nature of the t-statistic. Most of the individual groups had very small sample sizes, and a small sample makes rejection of the hypothesis using a t-test quite difficult, i.e., t-tests are not very powerful with small sample sizes.

Thus, overall the parents in the parent education programs did show significant change in their reported behaviors. However, in only one group did parents clearly demonstrate significant changes.

The t-tests in Table 7 used a total score as the dependent variable. The overall mean for all mothers in all programs was 4.68, with a range between -37 and 68. The standard deviation was 18.02. Thus, although a great deal of variability was present in the data, overall change was small.

Total score often is a useful method of summarizing the data. However, it also can present some difficulties: (1) Total score can be close to zero, but many changes can occur on individual items which
Table 7
Analysis of Total Change Scores of Mothers in the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All groups</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>T-Statistic</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All groups</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>0.049*</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>From -37 To 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>-4 To 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.464</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>-22 To 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>-37 To 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>-4.00</td>
<td>-23 To 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.937</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-14 To 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>12 To 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>-18 To 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.584</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>-21 To 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
<td>0.434</td>
<td>-6.83</td>
<td>-31 To 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.937</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-12 To 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>-8 To 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>0.042*</td>
<td>18.40</td>
<td>4 To 41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05
cancel each other out in the summing process. (2) If the test is not unidimensional, total score does not accurately represent the data; and (3) Any summary process looses pieces of information, namely item differences, which could be potentially very interesting. Thus, although total score was one possible way of examining the data, a second stage of analysis was needed.

Programs Did Not Significantly Affect Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors.

This hypothesis was partially addressed by the t-tests in the previous section. However, subsequent analyses also were conducted to determine overall effects.

The method of analysis was a two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with repeated measures on change scores for each item. Thus, the main effects of the 12 groups were analyzed as well as the item effects for each of the 63 items on the Parent Behavior Assessment. Finally, the interaction between program and item effects also was examined. A series of three questions were asked: (1) Were there significant differences between programs in the effects on mothers' change scores? (2) Did the mothers respond differently to the different items on the test? and (3) Was there an interaction between program effects and two individual items, i.e., did mothers in different programs respond differently to the various items? Table 8 shows the results of this ANOVA on the change scores for 60 mothers.
Table 8

Two-Way ANOVA on Programs' Effects on Mothers' Change Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob. F Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program effects</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the ANOVA table indicates, no effects were significant at the .05 level, although item effects did indicate somewhat of a trend. Thus, no significant differences between programs, mothers' responses to items, or interactions were identified and the hypothesis could not be rejected.

These results may appear to be somewhat contradictory to those reported in Table 7. To a degree, however, they confirm those findings. The ANOVA was designed to look at group differences. The error term used to test these differences is the between subject variability. However, as Table 7 indicates, most of the groups' scores were not significantly different from zero, but overall mothers did differ. This would indicate a strong influence of between subject variability which would, in turn, reduce the chances of finding significant group differences because the error-term would be so large.
Influence of Parent Variables on Changes in Reported Behaviors

The third question posed was, "What influence does the background of the participating parents have upon changes in their reported behaviors? Several parent variables were identified and measured on the Parent Profile. However, it would not be appropriate to test every variable since, as described above, unless some degree of variability in the independent variable exists, it is impossible to reliably test hypotheses concerning that variable. Moreover, repeated analyses of the same data seriously lowers the probability of a Type I error. For this reason, the \( \alpha \) level used to test the hypotheses below was set at .01.

The relationship between six variables and changes in mothers' reported behaviors were investigated through a series of statistical hypotheses. The statistical technique employed to test each hypotheses was a two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with repeated measures. The two different effects examined in the ANOVA are the main effects of the variable being tested, e.g., number of children, and the effects of 68 items on the Parent Behavior Assessment. Repeated measures are used so that mothers' responses to each of the items can be examined. Therefore, this statistical technique tests for the overall effects of each hypothesized variable, the item effects, and the interaction between the variable and item effects. Data from 60 mothers were used in each analysis.

The Number of Children in the Family Will Not Affect Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors.

Mothers were divided into two groups: those with two or fewer children and those with three or more children. The mean change score
for the 68 items was .122 for mothers with two or fewer children and .013 for mothers with three or more children. Since the average family size in America is approximately two children, this seemed an appropriate division. The results of the two-way ANOVA are presented in Table 9.

The hypothesis that the number of children in the family does not affect changes in mothers' reported behaviors failed to be rejected at the .01 level.

Table 9
Two-Way ANOVA on Number of Children Effects on Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob. F Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of children effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Education Level of the Mother Will Have No Effect on Changes in Mother's Reported Behaviors.

As Figure 13 indicated, there were some differences between parents with respect to education. Therefore, three groups were formed: (a) mothers with a high school diploma or less; (b) mothers who have had some college or technical school; and (c) mothers with post-high school degree.
The mean change scores were .012, .162 and .354, respectively. As Table 10 indicates, the main effects (education) and interaction were not significant. That is, the hypothesis failed to be rejected. However, in this analysis, the item effects were significant at the .01 level. That is, the mothers responded differently to the various items of the Parent Behavior Assessment. Since test development is not a particular focus of this study, these main effects for this item would be expected and have little or no importance in the present study. Thus, although item effects are presented in subsequent ANOVA tables, they are not included in the discussion of the results.

### Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob. F Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education effects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction effects</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Family Income Will Have No Effect on Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors.

Parents were divided into three groups based on family income: (a) incomes of less than $15,000; (b) incomes between $15,000 and $25,000;
and (c) incomes greater than $25,000. Only 43 of the 60 mothers provided income information and, therefore, the total sample size in this analysis is 43 instead of 60. The mean change scores for the three groups were .057 (less than $15,000), .090 ($15,000 to $25,000), and .075 (over $25,000). The results of this analysis (Table 11) were quite similar to those in the previous analysis in that no significant main effects or interaction effects were found. Thus, the hypothesis failed to be rejected.

Table 11

Two-Way ANOVA on Income Effects on Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob. F. Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income effects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction effects</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>2680</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Age of the Mothers Will Not Affect Changes in Their Reported Behaviors.

The age distribution of parents, depicted in Figure 10, was quite large, ranging from 17 to 49. Thus, age was one variable which could potentially impact on parents' reactions to the programs. Mothers were divided into five groups based on five year intervals beginning at age 15.
The mothers over 35 were collapsed into a single group. The mean change scores for each group were: (a) -.033 (less than 20 years), (b) .081 (20 to 25 years), (c) .210 (26-30 years), (d) .093 (31-35 years), and (e) -.013 (over 35 years). The most impact in terms of change scores seemed to be with mothers in the middle age ranges. This could be due to the focus of the outcome measures on children aged three to 12.

The same pattern of nonsignificant main effects and interaction can be seen in Table 12. The results suggest no overall impact of the age of the mother variable, i.e., the hypothesis failed to be rejected.

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob. F Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age effects</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>0.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction effects</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3685</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Working Status of the Family Will Have No Effect on Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors.

Working status, particularly working mothers, has gained public attention recently. The impact of this variable, therefore, seemed important
to assess. Mothers were divided into three groups. The mean change scores for each group are in parentheses: (a) both parents working (two-parent family) or one parent working (single parent family) (.064), (b) one parent working (two parent family) (.150), and (c) neither parent working (-.028). In terms of the effects on mothers' changes in reported behaviors, working status had no significant effect (Table 13), although a trend toward a significant interaction is present. This interaction means that working mothers tended to change on different items than did nonworking mothers. The hypothesis, however, failed to be rejected.

Table 13

Two-Way ANOVA on Working Status Effects on Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob. F Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working status effects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction effects</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Satisfaction of Mothers With the Parenting Role Will Not Affect Changes in Their Reported Behaviors.

The final parent variable investigated was parental satisfaction with the parenting role. Since a four-point rating scale was used, mothers were divided into two groups based upon whether their satisfaction rating was above 2.5 or below 2.5. Mothers who expressed initial low satisfaction with their parenting role had a slightly larger mean change score (.132) than did mothers with higher initial satisfaction (.042). This could indicate a regression toward the mean effect in which the more satisfied mothers had less area for change than did the mothers expressing less satisfaction.

The results, however, did not indicate any significant effects. That is, precourse parental satisfaction with the parenting role did not significantly affect changes in mothers' reported behaviors and thus, the hypothesis failed to be rejected.

Table 14

Two-Way ANOVA on Satisfaction Effects on Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob. F Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3086</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Influence of Program Variables on Changes in Reported Behaviors

The final question asked in this study is, "What are the important variables of parent education programs which affect changes in parents' reported behaviors?"

The Program Profile assessed programs on 24 variables. Each of these variables was discussed in Question 1 above, and the results of program leaders' responses were described. As noted before, unless there was variability in the responses, hypotheses regarding the impact of these variables were not testable. All variables on which at least three program leaders responded differently than the remaining nine leaders were included in future analyses.

Since program leaders could select more than one response on several questions, separate analyses were conducted on each possible response, on a given variable. A total of 34 separate ANOVA's with repeated measures were so calculated. Conducting this many analyses on the same set of data poses serious threats to the actual significance level. That is, although the obtained probability in any given test may be small, e.g., .025, this result would not be conclusively significant at the .05 level since the true α level would be much larger than .05. In fact, since 34 analyses were conducted, the probability of at least one Type I error, if the level of significance is set at .01, is \(1-(1-.01)^{33} = .282\). On the other hand, if set at .05, the probability of a Type I error is .316. Thus, a significance level of .01 was used to test all hypotheses.
In each of the 34 hypotheses, programs (and mothers in the programs) were assigned to groups based on the leaders' responses to the variable being tested. The programs categorized in each group are described in the discussion of each hypotheses. Since leaders' responses clearly differed across items, the array of programs comprising the group in each hypotheses also vary.

The Agency Sponsoring the Program Will Not Affect Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors.

Since all programs were sponsored by one of two agencies, the first variable of interest was the sponsoring agency. A two-way ANOVA with repeated measures was performed on the 68 mothers in the programs sponsored by these two agencies. The mean change score for the 60 mothers in Agency 1 was .096, whereas the mean change score for the other 18 mothers in Agency 2 was .006.

Table 15

Two-Way ANOVA on Agency Effects on Mothers' Change Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob. F Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Table 15 indicates, no agency effects were identified, and the hypothesis failed to be rejected. However, there was also a trend toward significant interaction. The interaction effect indicates that mothers going to programs sponsored by one agency tended to change on some items while mothers participating in programs sponsored by the other agency changed on different items.

**Duration of Class Will Have No Effect on Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors.**

The variable "Duration of Class" was calculated by multiplying the length of each class by the number of classes. Three groups were created: (1) less than 20 hours (programs 6, 8, 10, 11), (2) 20-25 hours (programs 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 12), and (3) more than 25 hours (programs 2, 9). The results of the ANOVA are presented in Table 16. The mean change scores were as follows: .125 for the 15 mothers in programs lasting less than 20 hours; .069 for the 34 mothers in programs lasting 20 to 25 hours; and -.009 for the 11 mothers in programs lasting more than 25 hours.

**Table 16**

Two-Way ANOVA on Duration of Class Effects on Mothers' Change Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob. F Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duration of class effects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction effects</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since the probability $F$ exceeded was only .112 for the duration of class effects, the hypothesis failed to be rejected.

Class Size Will Not Effect Mothers' Change Scores.

Programs were classified into one of three groups: (1) less than 15 parents (programs 5, 6, 10, 11, 12 totalling 21 mothers in the study), (2) 15-20 parents (programs 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8 totalling 33 mothers in the study), and (3) more than 20 parents (program 9 totalling 6 mothers in the study). The mean change scores for the three groups were .123, .66, and -.101, respectively.

Table 17

Two-Way ANOVA on Class Size Effects on Mothers' Change Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Prob. $F$ Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class size effects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction effects</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the data in Table 17 indicate, class size effects were not significant and the hypothesis failed to be rejected. However, in this analysis, the interaction effects were significant. Figure 15 diagrams the mean change scores on each item for the three groups. No clearly identifiable pattern of nonparallel lines, indication of interaction, is present.
Figure 15. Mean change scores for three groups of parent education programs classified by class size.
However, group 3 contributes a majority of the large differences between groups, and hence probably accounts for the significant interaction. Since only one program was included in group 3, and the program had only six mothers with complete data, these means are much less stable (and hence subject to more variability) than the means of the other groups. Nevertheless, on only 20 of the 68 subjects did the mean change scores from group 3 equal or exceed one unit on the rating scale. No means from groups 1 or 2 equalled or exceeded one. Thus, while these differences are statistically quite significant, the theoretical importance of such small changes seems minimal.

The Use of Club or Group Members to Recruit Participants in Parent Education Programs Will Not Affect Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors.

Programs 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 12 (38 mothers participating) used club or group members to recruit participants, whereas programs 4, 8, 9, 10 and 11 (22 mothers participating) did not use club or group members. Mothers in programs using club or group members to recruit had a mean change score of .112, whereas mothers in the other programs had a mean change score of -.006. The two-way ANOVA with repeated measures therefore was conducted on these two subgroups. The results are summarized in Table 13 below.
Table 13
Two-Way ANOVA on Club/Group Member Recruitment Procedure Effects on Mothers' Change Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob. F Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Club/group member</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>338</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although club/group member and interaction effects are not significant, the interaction effects do tend toward significance. This indicates that mothers in programs which used club/group members to recruit tended to change in different items than mothers in programs which did not use this technique. Thus, a direction for future investigation is suggested despite the failure to reject the hypothesis.

Programs Which Offered in the Evening or on Weekends Will Not Differ in Their Effect on Mothers' Reported Behaviors from Programs Offered During the Daytime Only.

Eight program leaders (programs 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12) said classes were available in evening or on weekends, whereas the remaining four programs (2, 9, 10, 11) had daytime only classes. The 43 mothers in the programs offered in the evening or on weekends had a mean change score of .097. On the other hand, the 17 mothers in the daytime only classes
had a mean change score of -.002. The availability of evening or weekend classes would enable parents who worked during the day to attend. The results of the two-way ANOVA with repeated measures (Table 19), however, showed no significant differences in either evening vs. daytime class effects or interaction effects. Therefore, the hypothesis was not rejected.

Table 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob. F Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evening vs. daytime classes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Percentage of Parents Attending as Couples Will Not Change in Mothers' Reported Behaviors.

Only nine of the 12 program leaders responded to the question regarding percentage of parents attending as couples. These nine programs were divided into four groups: (1) 100% attending alone (programs 3, 4, 6 with 20 mothers participating); (2) 1-19% attending together (programs 5, 9, 11, 12 with 24 mothers participating); (3) 20-39% attending together
(program 7 with 2 mothers participating); and (4) 60-79% attending together (program 8 with 6 mothers participating). Mean change scores for the four groups were .080, .038, .110 and .105, respectively. The results of the two-way ANOVA with repeated measures, presented in Table 19 showed no significant differences in terms of dual attendance effects, item effects, or interaction effects. The hypothesis, therefore, failed to be rejected.

Table 19
Two-Way ANOVA on Dual Attendance Effects on Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob. F Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dual attendance effects</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction effects</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3685</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Percentage of Parents in a Class Who Attend All or Most of the Sessions Will Not Affect Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors.

Data from only nine of the 12 programs were available for this analysis since the other program leaders did not respond to the questions. The nine programs were classified into three groups based on the reported percentage of parents attending all or most of the sessions: (a) 26-50% (program 9); (b) 51-75% (programs 2 and 4); and (c) 76-100% (programs 3,
A fourth group was comprised of the three programs whose leaders did not respond to the question. The mean change scores were as follows: (a) -.100 for the six mothers in the first group, (b) .029 for the nine mothers in programs with 51-75% group, (c) .082 for the 35 mothers in the third group, and (d) .159 for the 10 mothers in the nonresponse group.

As the data in Table 20 indicate, main effects for percentage of attendance were not significant and the hypothesis was not rejected. However, the interaction effects were significant. The mean change scores for each of these four groups on the 68 items are diagrammed in Figure 16. The pattern seems to be relatively the same on most items, although group 1 (program 9) had the most variation. This was the same program which accounted for the great differences in the previous significant interaction (see Figure 15).

Table 20

Two-Way ANOVA on Percentage of Regular Attendees' Effects on Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob. F Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent regular attenders effects</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction effects</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3752</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 16. Mean change scores of four groups of regular attendance classes.
The Use of the Telephone to Follow-Up on Nonattenders Will Not Affect Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors.

The 12 programs were classified into two groups: (a) those whose leaders used the telephone to follow-up on nonattenders (programs 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11 and 12 with 32 mothers participating) and (b) those whose leaders did not use telephone follow-up (programs 3, 6, 8 and 9 with 28 mothers participating). The mean change scores were .098 and .028, respectively. Table 21 shows that the hypothesis was not rejected since no results were significant at the .01 level.

Table 21

Two-Way ANOVA on Telephone Follow-Up Effects on Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob. F Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telephone follow-up</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td></td>
<td>3886</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inquiry Among Friends to Follow-Up on Nonattenders Will Not Affect Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors.

A second follow-up technique which differentiated between programs was inquiry among friends. Program leaders in programs 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11 and 12 (37 mothers participating) used inquiry among friends,
whereas the leaders in programs 3, 9 and 10 (23 mothers participating) did not use this technique. The mean change scores were .076 for mothers in programs in which inquiry was used and .003 for mothers in the other programs. The results of the two-way ANOVA with repeated measured showed no significant differences between groups, items or interaction effects (Table 22), and the hypothesis failed to be rejected.

Table 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob. F Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Potential for Participation in Advanced Courses Will Not Affect Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors.

Advanced courses were available to parents in programs 4, 5, 8, 9, 10 and 12, whereas program leaders in programs 1, 2, 3, 6, 7 and 11 said no courses were available. The 32 mothers in the first group had a mean change score of .036, whereas the 28 mothers in the second group had a mean change score of .107. This variable as found to have no impact on mothers' behaviors as evidenced by the nonsignificant results in Table 23. Therefore, the hypothesis was not rejected.
Table 23

Two-Way ANOVA on Advanced Course Availability
Effects on Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob. F Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced courses effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Availability of Continuing Groups Will Have No Effect on Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors.

Another follow-up support service which leaders in programs 3, 4, 5, 6, 9 and 11 said was available to their 35 mothers was continuing groups. No such groups were available to the 25 mothers in programs 1, 2, 7, 8, 10 and 12. The mean change scores for the two groups were .163 (continuing group) and .029 (no continuing group). This variable did not show significant effects in the ANOVA (Table 24) and the hypothesis failed to be rejected.
Table 24

Two-Way ANOVA on Continuing Groups Availability Effects on Changes in 'others' Reported Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob. F Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuing groups effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Encouragement of Individual Contact With the Leader Will Not Affect Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors.

Some program leaders (programs 4, 6, 8 and 12) felt a strong commitment to maintaining contact with the parents in their groups, whereas other leaders (programs 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 9, 10 and 11) did not encourage such contact. The mean change scores for these groups were .163 (18 mothers) and .029 (42 mothers), respectively. However, as was the case with the other follow-up support variables above, no significant effects due to such encouragement were identified (Table 25), and the hypothesis was not rejected.
Table 25

Two-Way ANOVA on Encouragement of Contact Effects on Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob. F Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Referral of Parents to Other agencies for Additional Courses has No Effect on Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors.

Six program leaders (programs 4, 5, 8, 9, 10 and 12) reported that they referred parents to other agencies for additional courses offered by these agencies. The other six leaders did not report that they made such referrals. These two groups correspond exactly to the two groups used in the ANOVA in Table 23. Since the ANOVA tables and the corresponding conclusions are the same, they are not repeated here.

The Follow-Up of Parents Through Informal Contact Does Not Affect Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors.

Since both mothers and program leaders completed their questionnaires at the completion of the course, the impact of such follow-up could not be fully evaluated. However, since leaders did report differences in their use of informal contact, the analysis was completed. Leaders of programs 3, 6, 8 and 12 reported they used informal contact, whereas
the leaders of programs 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10 and 11 did not use informal contact. The mean change score for the 27 mothers in programs whose leaders used informal contact was .142. On the other hand, the mean change score for the 33 mothers in programs in which the leaders did not use informal contact was .009. No results were significant at the .01 level (Table 26). Therefore, the hypothesis failed to be rejected.

Table 26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob. F Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>follow-up effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Provision of Individual Counseling During Crisis Situations Will Not Effect Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors.

Four leaders (programs 6, 9, 10 and 12) reported that they offered parents in crisis situations individual counseling. The other eight leaders (programs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 8) provided no counseling. Mean change scores for the two groups were .109 (18 mothers) and .051 (42 mothers), respectively. These small change scores also were evidenced by the lack of significant differences in Table 27, and the hypothesis was not rejected.
### Table 27

Two-Way ANOVA on Individual Counseling Effects on Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob. F Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counseling effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Referral of Parents to Appropriate Agencies During Crisis Situations Will Not Affect Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors.

A second type of crisis service program leaders could provide for parents in need was referral to an appropriate agency. Nine leaders (programs 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10 and 12) said they used this technique, whereas three leaders (programs 2, 9 and 11) did not report that they referred parents. The mean change score for the 47 mothers in the first group was .089 and was -.005 for the 13 mothers in the second group. The hypothesis failed to be rejected since referral effects were not significant (Table 28).
Table 28
Two-Way ANOVA on Referral to Agencies
Effects on Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob. F Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referral effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Encouragement From Other Parents Will Not Affect Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors.

One of the primary mechanisms employed in parent education is developing group rapport and support. Six leaders (programs 3, 4, 5, 6, 9 and 12 with 38 mothers in the study) reported that they used support from other parents to assist parents in crisis situations. The other leaders did not use this technique. Mean change scores were slightly different: .061 for the first group and .022 for the second group. This was confirmed by the lack of significant differences in the results found in Table 29.
Table 29

Two-Way ANOVA on Support from Other Parents' Effects on Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob. F Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Provision of Reference Books Will Not Affect Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors.

Reference books were provided to parents in programs 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11 and 12 (37 mothers in the study). The other programs (3, 9 and 10 with 23 mothers in the study) provided no books. Some differences in mean change scores between the two groups were noted (.109 for programs with books vs. .004 for program without books). However, these changes were not sufficient to provide significant results (Table 30) and the hypothesis failed to be rejected.
Table 30

Two-Way ANOVA on Reference Books Effects on Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob. F Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>0.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Provision of Reference Handouts Will Have No Effect on Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors.

Handouts were given to parents in programs 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9 and 12. On the other hand, leaders in programs 1, 7, 8, 10 and 11 did not distribute handouts. The 43 mothers who received handout had a mean change score of .066, whereas the 17 mothers who did not get handouts had a mean change score of .077. The slight differences between the two groups appeared in Table 31 as large probabilities that F was exceeded, and hence the hypothesis was not rejected.
Table 31

Two-Way ANOVA on Handout Effects on Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob. F Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Handout effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Provision of Lists of Community Resources Will Not Affect Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors.

Lists of community resources can serve as additional references for parents. Leaders in programs 3, 5, and 12 (25 participating mothers) distributed such lists, while the leaders in the remaining nine programs (1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 with 35 participating mothers) did not handout such lists. As the results in Table 32 indicate, the hypothesis failed to be rejected. This was confirmed by the small differences between mothers receiving resource lists (.079) and those not receiving lists (.061).
The final type of reference materials which leaders differentially provided to parents was the phone numbers of other parents in the program. Phone numbers were distributed in programs 3, 4, 5, 6, and 12 and were not handed out in programs 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11. A total of 32 mothers in the study received phone numbers. They had a mean change score of 0.091. The remaining 28 mothers, who did not get phone numbers of other parents in the class, had a mean change score of 0.043. As was the case with all other reference materials, the hypothesis was not rejected at the .01 level (Table 33).
Giving Parents Ongoing, Verbal Feedback Will Have No Affect on Changes In Mother's Reported Behaviors.

Several feedback mechanisms are possible, but only ongoing, verbal assessment was noted by different leaders. Leaders in programs 6, 8, 9 and 11 used this technique whereas the leaders in the other eight programs (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10 and 12) did not. The 17 mothers in the verbal feedback group had a mean change score of .074. The remaining 43 mothers in the no verbal feedback group, on the other hand, had a mean change score of .067. Thus, the mothers in both groups seemed to change approximately the same amount. This is reflected in Table 34 by the nonsignificant verbal feedback effects. The hypothesis, therefore, failed to be rejected.
Table 34

Two-Way ANOVA on Verbal Feedback Effects on Changes in Mothers’ Reported Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob. F Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal feedback effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Educational Background of the Leaders Will Not Affect Changes in Mothers’ Reported Behaviors.

Four leaders (programs 2, 3, 5, and 6) had degrees in education which the other leaders (programs 1, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12) did not. Leaders with education degrees had a total of 28 mothers participating in the study. These mothers had a mean change score of .082. Leaders who did not have education degrees had 32 mothers in the study whose mean change score was .057. The two-way ANOVA with repeated measured showed no significant differences between these two groups (Table 35), and the hypothesis was not rejected.
A Special Course for Leaders Will Not Affect Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors.

The next four hypotheses concern the effects of additional leader training on changes in mothers' reported behaviors. The first hypothesis concerns the impact of special courses which leaders are required to completed before conducting a parent education programs. Leaders of programs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 12) completed such courses (not necessarily the same course) while the leaders of programs 9, 10 and 11 did not. The mothers in the two groups did have somewhat different mean change scores: the 48 mothers in the first group (leaders with a special course) had a mean change score of .097 and the 12 mothers in the second group had a mean change score of -.044.

As indicated in Table 36, the special course effects were not
significant, but the interaction effects were highly significant. This can be interpreted to mean that although no overall differences between the groups were found, i.e., the hypothesis is not rejected, differences between the way mothers responded were identified. As Table 36 indicates, both item and interaction effects were significant at the .01 level.

Table 36
Two-Way ANOVA on Leader Course Effects on Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob. F Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>0.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interaction effects, diagrammed in Figure 17 point to nine items (7, 12, 15, 25, 26, 27, 33, 57 and 59) which showed differences between mean change scores greater than 1. On the other hand, eight items (3, 6, 17, 21, 23, 30, 37 and 41) had mean change score differences of less than 1. Since the response scale given to parents only permitted them to respond in whole units, i.e., 1, 2, 3, etc., these differences, while statistically significant, seem to have limited theoretical value. However, they do point to possible directions for future investigation.
Leader Participation in a Series of Parent Education Workshops Will Not Affect Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors.

The second leader training variable is participation in a series of workshops for professional development. Leaders in programs sponsored by Agency 1 (Programs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 12) participated in such workshops, whereas the leaders in programs sponsored by Agency 2 did not. Since the analysis of this data corresponds exactly to the analysis by sponsoring agency (see Table 15), the results are not duplicated. As with the hypothesis concerning sponsoring agency, this hypothesis was not rejected.

Feedback to the Leaders From Their Supervisors Will Have No Effect on Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors.

Another mechanism for professional development is feedback from the leaders' supervisors for course improvement. Leaders in programs 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9 and 12 received such feedback, whereas the leaders in programs 2, 8, 10 and 11 did not. The 43 mothers in programs whose leaders received feedback had a mean change score of .068 compared to a mean change score of .071 for the 17 mothers whose leaders received no such feedback. The data in Table 37 confirm the lack of differences between the two groups. Therefore, the hypothesis was not rejected.
Figure 17. Mean change scores of mothers in programs whose leaders took a special course versus programs whose leaders took no such course.
Table 37

Two-Way ANOVA on Supervisor Feedback Effects on Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob. F Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedback effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3386</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participation in Other Courses Will Have No Effect on Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors.

The final additional leader training variable is participation in other courses. The programs whose leaders took such courses were 2, 4, 5, and 6. The remaining eight programs did not have leaders who took these courses. The mean change score for the 19 mothers in the first group was .074, whereas the 41 mothers in the second group had a mean change score of .066. However, the findings (Table 38) were no significant differences. Thus, the hypothesis failed to be rejected at the .01 level.
Table 38

Two-Way ANOVA on Other Leader Courses' Effects on Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob. F Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other courses' effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Number of Hours the Leader Devoted to the Course Will Have No Effect on Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors.

Leaders were asked to indicate how much time, on the average, they spent on the course including class time, preparation, etc. Programs were divided into three groups: (a) less than four hours (programs 8 and 10 including 10 participating mothers), (b) four to six hours (programs 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 11 and 12 including 41 participating mothers), and (c) more than six hours (programs 5 and 7 including 9 participating mothers). The mean change scores were 0.066, 0.080 and 0.021, respectively. With such small differences between the three groups, no significant differences were found (Table 39). The hypothesis, therefore, was not rejected.
Table 39
Two-Way ANOVA on Leader Hours on Course Effects on Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob. F Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hours effects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction effects</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Communication With Parents and Other Professionals to Formulate Course Content Will Not Affect Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors.

The next five hypotheses concern the courses used for course content. The first concerns communication with parents and other professionals. Leaders in programs 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 12 (41 mothers in the study) indicated they used this source. The remaining three programs (3, 10 and 11 with 19 responding mothers), leaders did not use such communication. The mean change score for mothers in programs whose leaders used communication with parents and professionals was .083. On the other hand, the mean change score for mothers in programs whose leaders did not use this communication was .039. Table 40 shows the results of the two-way ANOVA with repeated measures. No significant differences appear, hence the hypothesis was not rejected.
Table 40

Two-Way ANOVA of Parent/Professional Communication Effects on Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob. F Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td></td>
<td>3286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Use of Parent Education Reports to Formulate Course Content Will Not Affect Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors.

The mothers were divided into two groups: (a) those whose leaders used parent education reports (33 mothers in programs 2, 5, 6, 7, 11 and 12) and (b) those whose leaders did not use parent education reports (22 mothers in programs 1, 3, 7 and 10). The mean change scores for the two groups were .075 and .059, respectively. The results (Table 41) were similar to those for communication with parents or professionals (Table 40), i.e., no significant differences between groups were found and the hypothesis failed to be rejected.
Table 41
Two-Way ANOVA on Parent Education Reports to Formulate Course Effects on Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob. F Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Use of Counseling and Therapy Reports to Formulate Course Content Will Have No Effect on Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors.

The third source of information noted by leaders was counseling and therapy reports. Leaders in programs 2, 4, 5, 6, 9 and 12 used such reports whereas the leaders in programs 1, 3, 7, 8, 10 and 11 did not. Thirty mothers were in programs in which counseling and therapy reports were used as a basis for course content. Their mean change score was .072. The other 30 mothers were in programs which did not use these reports to formulate course content. Their mean change score was .066. As the results in Table 42 indicate, no significant differences between groups were found. Therefore, the hypothesis was not rejected.
Table 42
Two-Way ANOVA on Counseling and Therapy Reports to Formulate Course Content Effects on Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob. F Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counseling/therapy reports effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item effect</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Use of Group Processes Reports to Formulate Course Content Will Not Affect Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors.

Group processes reports were used by leaders in programs 2, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10 and 12 and were not used by leaders in programs 1, 3, 7, 8 and 11. The mean change score for the 34 mothers in courses based in part on group processes reports was 0.064. The remaining 26 mothers had a mean change score of 0.075. The small differences between the two groups also were evidenced by a failure to reject the hypothesis (Table 43).
Table 43
Two-Way ANOVA of Group Processes Reports to Formulate Course Effects on Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob. F Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group processes reports effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Use of Personal Experiences to Formulate Course Content Will Not Affect Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors.

The final source of course information chosen by different leaders was personal experience. Only leaders in three programs (1, 3 and 7) did not indicate they used this source. The 18 mothers in this group had a mean change score of .070. Conversely, leaders in the other nine programs indicated they used personal experience. The 42 mothers in these programs had a mean change score of .068. The findings (Table 44) showed no significant differences between the groups and hence, the hypothesis was not rejected.
Table 44

Two-Way ANOVA on Personal Experiences to Formulate Course Content Effects on Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob. F Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal experiences effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Flexibility in the Program Will Not Affect Changes in Parents' Reported Behaviors.

Leaders were asked to rate their programs' flexibility on a scale from one (most structured) to four (most flexible). Mothers were assigned three groups based on the flexibility rating given by the leader: (a) less than or equal to two (program 7 with 2 mothers); (b) greater than two, but less than or equal to three (programs 1, 3, 5, and 6 with 26 mothers) and (c) greater than three (programs 2, 4, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 with 32 mothers). Mean change scores for the three groups were .110, .084 and .054, respectively. The results of the two-way ANOVA with repeated measures (Table 45) shows no significant results. Therefore, the hypothesis failed to be rejected.
Table 45
Two-Way ANOVA on Program Flexibility Effects on Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob. F Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility effects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction effects</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Method Most Frequently Employed During the Course Will Not Affect Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors.

The methods employed by program leaders and the percentage of time each method was used were described in Table 2. Two leaders (programs 2 and 6) did not assign any percentages to the various methods, and four other leaders did not have a technique which was used most frequently, i.e., two or more methods were employed an equally high percentage of the time. With so much data unavailable for inclusion in the analysis, this hypothesis could not be reliably tested.

The Parent Education Concept Most Highly Rated by the Program Leader Will Have No Effect on Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors.

Program leaders were asked to rank the top and bottom three parent education concepts from a list of 15 concepts. Since it would not be feasible nor would it be statistically sound to test all 15 concepts,
only those concepts which were ranked "1" (top) were tested by means of a two-way ANOVA with repeated measures. Six concepts emerged as ranking first: procedures to develop skill in conveying positive and negative feelings (programs 1, 7 and 10), presentation of the principles of active or reflective listening (programs 2, 3 and 8), procedures to help parents examine and become aware of their own values (programs 4, 5 and 6), presentation of different approaches to problem solving (program 12), introduction of theories of group processes and communication (program 9), and emphasis on the crucial role parents play in teaching and guiding children (program 11).

Mean change scores for these six varied greatly. The six groups, together with the mean change score, and the number of mothers in each group are listed below.

1. Skill in conveying positive and negative feelings, .070 (9 mothers).
2. Principles of active or reflective listening, .075 (24 mothers).
3. Values examination, .065 (14 mothers).
4. Problem solving approaches, .271 (5 mothers).
5. Theories of group processes and communication, .100 (6 mothers).
6. Role of parent in teaching and guiding children, .022 (2 mothers).

The results in Table 46 indicate no effects of content but significant item and interaction effects were identified. Thus, although the hypothesis failed to be rejected, other interesting results were found. Since six different categories were used in testing the content effects, a graph of the interaction would be extremely cumbersome and probably
too complicated to be helpful. In examining the mean scores on an item by item basis, however, much larger discrepancies between groups were found than in previous analyses. Unlike previous analyses in which, few questions had differences between means of groups greater than one, nearly every item in this analysis had at least two groups in which the mean change score differed by more than one, in some instances greater than 2.5 units. These relatively large differences in mothers' responses to various items depending upon the primary emphasis of the program, i.e., significant interaction, indicates that the relationship between content emphasis and changes in mothers' reported behaviors is probably more complicated than a simple direct correspondence. That is, mothers in some programs demonstrate changes on certain items whereas mothers in other programs show changes on different items. This suggest possible areas for future inquiry.

Table 46

Two-Way ANOVA on Content Effects on Changes in Mothers' Reported Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob. F Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content effects</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item effects</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction effects</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3618</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of the Results

A three-step process was undertaken to determine the relationship between program components and parental outcomes. First, programs and the parents participating in the programs were described on a variety of variables. The purpose in this analysis was to determine which of the 40 program and parent variables had enough variability to warrant further investigation. Nineteen program variables (sponsoring agency, duration of class, class size, recruitment procedures, methods used to encourage both parents to attend, attendance, follow-up on nonattenders, additional organized follow-up after program ended, follow-up evaluation of parents, crisis intervention services provided, reference materials provided, feedback to parents about their progress during the course, educational background of leaders, additional training of leaders, number of hours per week leader devoted to class, sources of information for program content, program content, methods employed, and flexibility of the program) were identified. A total of 36 hypotheses were generated from leaders' responses to these 19 variables. Similarly, six parent variables (number of children, education, family income, age, working status and satisfaction with parenting role) were selected for subsequent investigation.

The second step in the analysis process was to determine if the parent education programs were effective in affecting changes in mothers' reported behaviors. The results indicated that, overall, mothers did change significantly between pretest and posttest. However, when each program was analyzed separately, significant change was found in only one program.
The final analysis process was to test the 42 hypotheses generated from the potentially important parent and program variables identified in the descriptive analysis. Although no significant effects from any of these variables were found, some trends in the data are noteworthy. First, significant item effects were present in 15 analyses, and several others approached significance. These significant item effects indicate that mothers responded differently to different items. Although instrument development was not a purpose in this study, the various response patterns to the items could provide useful information for future instrument refinement.

In addition to significant item effect, significant interactions also were found in four analysis and strong trends toward significance ($p < .02$) in six others. The presence of significant interactions combined with the significant item effects probably indicates that the changes in mothers identified in the data cannot be explained by simple analyses of the effects of the individual variables. Rather, a much larger scale study, in which more program and more parents are involved, would be needed to identify the complex patterns which may impact on changes. For example, it may be that a leader with an education background teaching a class of 20 parents with college degrees is a very effective parent education strategy. However, a very large sample size is needed in order to be able to test such intricate patterns for many thousands of combinations are possible even with the number of variables examined in this study. However, the variables in this study which showed significant interactions are a good place to begin such a process.
CHAPTER VI
DISCUSSION

The systems approach was used as the basis for organizing the design of the study. All six steps have been completed. Each is reviewed briefly below and some revisions are suggested. Finally, directions for future research are proposed.

Systems Approach Reviewed

Need Identified

The need identified in the first chapter was for "direct evidence relating specific characteristics of programs to the outcomes" (Stevens, 1973, p. 59). Two categories of variables formed the "specific characteristics of programs": (1) variables related to the parents participating in the programs and (2) variables concerning the programs' operations. However, the second element required to assess the identified need is a measure of outcomes. Thus, not only must characteristics of programs be identified, but these characteristics must be systematically investigated to determine their relationship to a valid and reliable set of outcomes. Although difficulties in instrumentation are discussed below, the need identified for this study was clearly more difficult to meet because of the lack of appropriate assessment tools. Hence, while the need for evidence relating program characteristics to outcomes still remains, other needs for valid and reliable measurement tools also become paramount.
Problems Selected

The purpose of the study was to quantitatively describe the components of parent education programs and to determine the relationship between those components and parental outcomes. In order to investigate this problem, four research questions were posed: (1) How do parent education programs differ? (2) Do parent education programs significantly affect changes in parents' reported behaviors? (3) What influence does the background of the participating parents have upon changes in their reported programs which affect changes in parents' reported behaviors? (4) What are the important variables of parent education programs which affect changes in parents' reported behaviors?

Revisions to the problem, therefore, could be related either to the problem statement itself or to its translation into the research questions. This problem has been identified by several authors (Bryk & Weisberg, 1977; Larson, 1972; and Stevens, 1978) and appears to be an important one. A solution to this problem would provide parent education program developers with quantitative information to use to systematically modify their programs.

The four questions developed for this study, on the other hand, were logical deductions from the more global problem. That is, first some description of the parents and programs was necessary in order to determine exactly what was being evaluated. Although this seems very simplistic, there was a surprising dearth of quantitative descriptions of various programs and their participants in the literature reviewed. The second
issue addressed in these questions in input, i.e., what characteristics do parents entering the program possess and how are these related to later changes they do or do not make? The primary focus of the study was relationship between the parent and program variables and parental outcomes. Therefore, the parent and program variables had to be defined, and then the relationship of these variables to changes in parents was investigated.

Possible Solutions Generated

Identification of possible solutions is a two-step process. First, overall strategies must be explored and then each strategy must be further investigated to suggest the various specific methodologies which could be used to implement it.

In terms of the need and problems of this study, two general strategies were considered: planned variation of parent education variables through different parent education courses or evaluation of existing parent education programs. Since resources were limited and since previous research had not identified potentially significant variables which would need to be systematically introduced, an evaluation approach was chosen. The goal of the evaluation was to quantitatively describe selected existing programs and the parents in those programs and then to statistically test possible relationships between the program (and parent) variables and outcomes.
The Methodology Section of Chapter III suggested several approaches to assessing parent behaviors: (1) parent interviews, (2) conjoint family interviews, (3) structured observations, (4) unstructured observations, (5) parental diary and parent as observed, and (6) questionnaires. Many of these techniques could also be employed to evaluate the programs: (1) interview with staff, (2) interviews with supervisors, (3) direct observation, (4) interview with parents, (5) examination of existing materials and documents used in the course, (6) questionnaires, and (7) exploration of unintended outcomes resulting from the course. In addition to collecting information from parents and program staff, the children in the participating families also could have provided important information. Researchers have shown that the child's perception of parental behavior, rather than the parent's report of that behavior, is a more direct influence upon a child's growth and development (Ausubel, et al., 1954; Cox, 1970). Other researchers have shown that children influence their parents' behavior, not simply that parents affect the behavior of their children (Osofsky, 1970; Saxe & Stollak, 1971). Thus, even when an overall approach of evaluating existing programs is decided upon, a myriad of other methodological options are still available.

Solution Selected

The final strategy selected was determined by a variety of factors including manpower resources, time available, confidentiality issues,
and the wishes of the participating program leaders. All program leaders expressed a desire to limit the involvement of people in the classes who were not part of the group. Most teachers were quite willing to have the researcher join the group as a participant. However, since this would have limited the number of groups which could be included and also might have confounded the results by introducing experimenter bias, the program leaders implemented the research design in the classroom.

Since direct contact between the researcher and the participating parents was discouraged, the technique chosen for measuring parental outcomes was a pretest-posttest written questionnaire (Parent Behavior Assessment). Two existing questionnaires (Iowa Parent Behavior Inventory and Adlerian Parental Assessment of Child Behavior Scale) which measure parental behaviors were employed (Clarke, Crase & Pease, 1976; McKay, 1976). These instruments were chosen because they focused on behaviors rather than attitudes and because previous research using each had demonstrated their ability to detect changes in parents.

Reactions from both program leaders and the participating parents (reported by the leaders) to the questionnaire were quite positive. Several leaders noted that the parents really like the form, that they found it insightful in looking at their children, and that it definitely added to the class. These comments seem to indicate that the instruments were quite appropriate, in terms of face validity, for use in assessing the outcomes of parent education programs.

The instrument used to evaluate the programs, the Program Profile, relied solely on the leaders' self-reports. One program leader, familiar
with other programs in the study, reported that the lack of differences on most program variables did not accurately reflect what she knew about other programs. This highlights the problem that because no check on actual program implementation was done, the degree of correspondence between responses on the questionnaire and actual classroom behaviors may have been low. Some means of assessing the reliability of the data, perhaps through use of several techniques designed to convergently measure the same variables, is desirable (see "Recommendations" below).

One possible solution could be to conduct systematic interviews with the leaders, either by phone or in person, to probe deeper into the responses on the Program Profile. In addition to providing a crosscheck on the data, the interview would supply more in-depth information and could also be used to fill in any missing data. This technique nevertheless is still relying primarily upon leaders' self-reports. The major variation is in terms of a different method of collecting data which permits follow-up on unclear or interesting elements.

A second solution could be the evaluation of the program by supervisors. This information could be compared with the responses of the leaders to check for reliability. Since seven of the 11 leaders said they received feedback from their supervisors, this may represent a viable alternative. However, supervisors clearly have a different perspective regarding the program and are not without biases themselves.

The third and probably most desirable solution could be to actually observe the program and to systematically record the transactions.
again, this technique is not without problems since it introduces experimenter bias, increases costs of the study, and may limit sample size. Moreover, a standard observation tool which would reliably measure all parent education programs would need to be developed.

An even more difficult problem is the self-reports of parents on the Parent Profile. People generally have problems recalling even seemingly simple information such as age, income, years of residence. Daring significant intrusion into the personal lives of the parents in the study and probably unjustifiably breaching their confidentiality, crosscheck on the parent data would be quite difficult to obtain.

Method/Means Implementation

The implementation strategy was to provide the parent and program questionnaires to the program leaders. These leaders then were responsible for distributing the questionnaires to the class and completing the Program Profile. As noted above, circumstances prevented any direct contact between the parents and the researchers and, by inference, between their children and the researcher. Moreover, no direct observation of classroom activities was possible. Inclusion of some observations and/or structured interviews with parents would probably have been desirable, since this would have provided a crosscheck on the degree of change noted on the Parent Behavior Assessment as well as have provided more in-depth information about parents' reactions to the program. In addition, increased contact between parents and the experimenter may also have raised the response rate.
A second important consideration is the time at which the posttest was administered (the final session). The studies reviewed before (Ferber, Keeley & Shemberg, 1974; Johnson & Christensen, 1974) present mixed results concerning the durability of the effects. A follow-up of participating parents at three and six months would provide valuable information to answer this question. One agency is planning a follow-up course in which many of the same parents would be enrolled. The possibility of using the same instruments for follow-along has been explained.

Results Evaluated

The results of the study were, at best, mixed. Although there was a great deal of variability in terms of parent background characteristics, in general these characteristics were not statistically related to changes in parents. Moreover, numerous program variables also showed variability, but these variables also were not related to parent changes. Two explanations seem likely. First, an increase in sample size could have added to the power of the tests for the effects of these variables which may, in turn, have pointed to significant results. In addition, a wider sample of parent education approaches could have been included in the sample. This would have increased the variability in the data as well as adding to the sample size, both of which could have contributed to identifying potentially important variables. Finally, the significant item and interaction effects in the data may point to the need for a research design which will allow the exploration of the effects of several variables in combination, not merely the examination of a single variable at a time.
A second consideration in reviewing the results is the potential impact of the nonrespondents. Most programs had more parents enrolled than participants in the study. Since the researcher has no means of contacting these nonrespondents, it was impossible to assess the influence they may have had on the group's total impact. A follow-up on nonrespondents would have greatly increased the understanding of the impact of the programs. Inclusion of all program participants would not only have added to the sample size, but probably also would have increased the variability in the data. Both these factors would have increased the chances of finding significant results.

Recommendations for Further Research

A Taxonomy of Parent Education Programs Should Be Developed Which Differentiate Between the Various Approaches to Parent Education.

A technique often employed in both evaluation and research is stratified sampling. "A sample is said to be stratified if it has been deliberately chosen so as to include an appropriate number of entities from each of several population subgroups." (Scriven & Roth, 1977, p. 31). If an appropriate classification system for parent education programs could be developed, then a stratified sample from each category could be drawn. This would probably increase the variability in program characteristics and more clearly identify potentially significant variables. Moreover, it would enable a clearer determination of variables which do not differ significantly between programs, i.e., variables which are uniform across programs in all categories.
One of the reasons that few significant results were identified in this study probably was the lack of variability between programs. To a large extent, the programs included in the study used similar, although not identical, approaches to parent education. This lack of variability greatly reduced the chances of detecting significant relationships between the variables and parental outcomes. A taxonomy of parent education programs, which describes the various approaches to parent education in sufficient detail, would permit the selection of programs which varied widely on the critical components of interest. This would both focus the study in the appropriate direction as well as increase the probability of detecting any relationships between the variables and parental outcomes.

Instruments Which Validly and Reliably Measure Parental Outcomes in Terms of the Program Goals Need to be Developed.

The purpose in the study was to determine relationships between program components and parental outcomes. The instruments used to measure parental outcomes had been tested in other projects, and the Adlerian Parental Assessment of Child Behavior Scale had reliability and validity coefficients available. However, these instruments were not tested to determine if they accurately measured the outcomes anticipated by various approaches to parent education. That is, one of the ways in which parent education programs differ is the emphasis they place on certain goals, e.g., better communication, more effective discipline techniques, etc. Therefore, in order for an instrument to validly and reliably measure the impact of different programs, items related to each of the program goals should be included.
The significant item and interaction effects in this study can be used to identify potential starting points for the development of such an instrument. For example, clusters of items which seem to measure the same goal area could be constructed, and the relationship between parental responses to items within each cluster could be compared to determine if the items were actually assessing parental competence in that goal area. Thus, the test development process would include calculation of validity and reliability for each goal area, and then final construction of an overall instrument to measure all major goals.

It is probably unrealistic to expect any single tool to comprehensively measure a wide variety of program and parental outcomes. A more feasible approach would be to develop a battery of assessment instruments which could be used in conjunction with one another. This would serve to validate each tool with measurements from the others as well as filling in the gaps in information which could not be collected via the other approaches.

Parents Representing a Broad Range of Characteristics Should Be Included In the Sample.

The sample of parents included in this study was not representative of the general population. For example, study parents had a higher mean income ($19,755.75), more children (2.49), less racial heterogeneity (95% white), and higher education (nearly 70% had post high school training) than do parents in the general population. Two factors could account for this: (1) sampling bias of parents enrolled in the programs but not
participating in the study and/or (2) selection bias on the part of the leaders/agencies recruiting parents for the programs. However, in order to assess the impact of, for example, racial background, parents from various racial groups need to be included. One of the sampling criteria which could be used for selection of programs to be included in future studies thus might be the general characteristics of the participating parents. This would ensure greater variability on the key characteristics of interest.

Parents Who Participate in Parent Education Programs Should Be Followed Up at Three, Six and 12 Months to Assess the Long-Term Effects of the Program.

As noted previously, the durability of the effects of participation in parent education programs has not been well investigated. Although it is probably unrealistic to believe that short-term, one-time-only programs can have significant, lasting effects on parents, many program models do provide for periodic "refresher" courses, and often parents spontaneously form groups which continue beyond the end of the formal course. Moreover, the ability to change a limited number of behavior patterns, which the parents can then generalize to a wide range of behaviors, may be possible in a limited duration course. Without a determination of the durability of the effects, evidence that particular program components are related to parental changes would have little practical significance in terms of the overall value of parent education programs. As Datta (1973) points out, "While early data are encouraging
with respect to parents as learners, it is too soon to tell whether parent behavior will return to its original levels without further support, and if children will continue to show good behavioral development." (p. 26).

The Impact on the Whole Family as a Result of Parents' Participation in Parent Education Programs Should be Assessed.

The primary goal of parent education programs is to help parents increase their competence and effectiveness in childrearing. "Basically, competence implies the accomplishing of a desire effect by one's act" (Edmonson, 1974, p. 114). Therefore, in order to assess competence both the parents' behaviors and their children's behaviors should be examined. Changes in parents' behaviors indicate conscious choices to modify their actions. Changes in children's behaviors, on the other hand, indicate whether or not the new behavior patterns are actually improving family relations. Actions do not occur in a vacuum. Parental behaviors which may be quite appropriate with one child can be highly inappropriate with another. Parent participation in a program could have very positive effects on one child and very negative effects on another. Moreover, previous research (Fears, 1976) has shown that the involvement of only one parent in a parent education program can cause considerable strain on the relationship between the two parents. Thus, the entire scope of the impact of parental participation must be examined and both the intended and unintended outcomes must be measured.
In this study, assessment of the impact of mothers' participation in parent education programs on either their children or their spouses was not possible. However, the low percentage of parent dyads attending suggests that if Fears (1976) concerns are justified, participation in parent education programs may present problems for many couples.

**Evaluation and Research Into the Impact of Parent Education Programs Should Provide Feedback to Program Implementors Which Would Enable Them to Critically Examine and Systematically Modify Their Own Programs.**

Earlier in the discussion of the "Possible Solutions Generated", it was stated that this study represents a bridge between evaluation and research. This is quite apparent in the intended use of the information. Although the study clearly was designed as a research effort which would attempt to discover new and generalizable knowledge, it also had a definite evaluation component. One of the conditions upon which every program leader based his/her agreement to participate in the study was an assurance that he/she would be given feedback about the results and about his/her individual program. All program leaders expressed a genuine desire to modify their courses if they could be shown evidence to suggest the need for such changes. Although the results from this study do not conclusively identify any specific directions for change, program leaders can use the information to compare their program to others in the study and also can use the data which did show significant relationships to begin to think about possible modifications they may wish to make.
Parent education is a complex and often frustrating endeavor. Group leaders are required to assimilate information from a wide variety of fields and to form a cohesive program. In addition, they are asked to make the content of the course appropriate to parents with a great diversity of problems and experiences. Moreover, they are expected, by both parents and researchers, to demonstrate significant changes in a relatively short period of time. Perhaps the greatest challenge of the "experts" investigating the field of parent education is to make their research as meaningful and relevant to program implementors as those leaders are expected to make program content meaningful and relevant for the parents.


Aston, P. Jean and Dobson, Gillian: "Family Interaction and Social
Adjustment in a Sample of Normal School Children", Journal of Child

Auerbach, Aline B.: Parents Learn Through Discussion: Principles and
Practices of Parent Group Education. New York: John Wiley & Sons,
Inc., 1968.

Ausubel, David P., Balthazar, Earl E., Rosenthal, Irene, Blackman,
Leonard S., Schpoont, Seymour H. and Welkowitz, Joan: "Perceived
Parent Attitudes as Determinants of Children's Ego Structure",

Babcock, Dorothy E. and Keepers, Terry D.: Raising Kids O.K.: Transac­

Bank Street College of Education Analysis of Head Start Parent Interviews,

Becker, Wesley: Parents Are Teachers. Champaign, IL: Research Press

Becker, Wesley C. and Becker, Janis W.: Successful Parenthood: How to
Teach Your Child Values, Competence and Responsibility. Chicago:


Bell, John Elderkin: "A Theoretical Position for Family Group Therapy",

Bell, Richard Q.: "Structuring Parent-Child Interaction Situations for
Direct Observation", Child Development, Vol. 35, No. 4 (Dec. 1964),
pp. 1008-1029.

Benne, Kenneth D.: "Some Philsophic Issues in Adult Education", Adult

Benson, Loren, Berger, Michael and Mease, William: "Family Communications
Systems", Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, Vol. 7, No. 3


Hendrickson, Morejane Johnston: "A Brief History of Parent Education in the United States", Center for Adult Education, The Ohio State University, Columbus Ohio, 1963b.


Sanders, Donald P.: "A Proposal for School Self-Analysis" unpublished manuscript.


Verner, Coolie and Davidson, Catherine V.: *Psychological Factors in Adult Learning and Instruction*. Tallahassee, Florida: Adult Education Research-Information Processing Center, 1971.


Williams, Ben F. and Sanders, Beverly: "A Comparative Study of the Relative Effectiveness of Parent Effectiveness Training and a Program of Behavior Modification". Study done at the Alamance-Caswell Area Mental Health Center, Burlington, NC and supported by the Division of Program Evaluation, N.C. Dept. of Mental Health.


APPENDIX A

Program Profile
I consent to participate in the research project entitled: "A Conceptual Framework of Parent Education." This research is performed under the direction of Dr. Jean Dickerscheid from Ohio State University.

I understand the general purpose and nature of the research, including the materials I am expected to complete and the duties I am asked to perform.

I understand that any further inquiries I make concerning this procedure will be answered. I understand my identity will not be revealed in any publication, document, computer data storage, or in any other way which relates to this research. Further, I understand that the program will be identified by a general description, not by name. Finally, I understand that I am free to withdraw my consent and discontinue participation at any time following the notification of the Project Director.

Signed

Job Title

Program'

Date
PROGRAM PROFILE

In order to describe a program, some basic information concerning the program's operation is necessary. Although you may have more than one program and/or teacher, please focus your comments on the particular program chosen for this study. Certainly unusual circumstances arise during a program which may necessitate alterations in the course. Please answer these questions concerning the normal operation of your program.

If you have any question while completing this profile, please feel free to call me, Karen Reiser, at 252-2004.

1. Please fill in the name and title of the person completing this profile.
   Name
   Title

2. What is the name of the program and, if applicable, the agency conducting the program?
   Program
   Agency

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

3. How many sessions are involved in this program and what is the average duration of each meeting? (For example, 3 meetings, once a week, each lasting approximately 2 hours.)
   Number of meetings
   Frequency of meetings
   Duration of each meeting

4. How many parents are enrolled in an average class? How many are enrolled in this particular class?
   Average class
   This class

5. Do you receive financial support for your program from an agency such as United Way or a local church? If so, please specify which agency and the approximate percentage of the total operating costs which this support covers.
   Agency support: Yes ______ No ______
   Supporting Agency
   Percentage of Costs
6. Do you collect fees from parents who participate in the program? If so, what is the fee schedule and approximately what percentage of the costs of the program do parents' fees cover?

Collect fees: Yes ________  No ________
Percentage of costs: ____________

Fee Schedule

7. What procedures are used to recruit parent participants? (You may check more than one.)

- Advertisement in media
- Telephoning in given areas
- Door-to-door canvassing
- Referrals from agencies
- Club or group members
- Word-of-mouth
- No specific procedure
- Other (please specify)

8. What methods, if any, are used to encourage participation of both parents in the program? (You may check more than one.)

- Evening or weekend classes
- Babysitting provided
- Lower rates if both attend
- Transportation provided
- Restrict enrollment to couples
- No procedures
- Other (please specify)

9. Approximately what percentage of the class has both parents attending together? (For example, about one-third of the parents come alone, while two-thirds come with one another.)

Percent attending together ________
Percent attending alone (includes single parents) ________
No information ________

10. Approximately what percentage of parents attend:

- 2 or fewer sessions ________
- About half of the sessions ________
- All or most of the sessions ________
- No information ________

11. What procedures, if any, are employed to follow-up on non-attenders? (You may check more than one.)

- Telephone call
- Home visit
- Inquiry among friends
- Call to referring person
- Refusal to refund fees
- No procedures
- Other (please specify)
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12. What methods, if any, are used to provide follow-up support for parents after classes are completed? (You may check more than one.)

- Additional, advanced courses offered
- Individual contact with staff encouraged
- Formation of continuing group of interested parents
- Referral to other agencies and/or programs
- No specific plan
- Other (please specify)

13. What, if any, formal follow-up of parents after completion of the course is conducted? (You may check more than one.)

- Phone contact at specified time periods
- Home visits at specified time periods
- Mail contact at specified time periods
- Informal contact when opportunity arises
- No procedures
- Other (please specify)

14. What services, if any, are provided for parents involved in a crisis situation? (You may check more than one.)

- Additional individual counseling
- Referral to appropriate agency
- Support from other parents encouraged
- No provisions
- Other (please specify)

15. What reference materials are provided to parents who enroll? Is there a charge for these materials? (You may check more than one.)

- Books and pamphlets concerning general program theory
- Handouts on the goals and objectives of the program
- Worksheets/homework activities
- Lists of available community resources
- Names and phone numbers of other parents and/or staff
- Other (please specify)

16. What, if any, feedback of parent progress is given? (You may check more than one.)

- Ongoing, written assessment by teacher
- Ongoing, verbal assessment by teacher
- Parent projects evaluated by teacher
- Parent interviews to assess progress
- Written quizzes
- Parent logs evaluated by teacher
- No formal assessment
- Other (please specify)
STAFF INFORMATION

The following questions concern the staff conducting the program. If you have more than one teacher directly responsible for this program, please answer each question by designating teacher 1, teacher 2, etc.

17. What is the educational background of the teacher? (You may check more than one.)

   Degree in parent education
   Degree in counseling
   Religious affiliation (minister, priest, rabbi)
   Education degree
   Degree in child development
   No specific educational background
   Other (please specify)

18. What additional training do staff members receive? (You may check more than one.)

   Special course designed for teaching this program
   Series of workshops for staff development
   Feedback from director or other teacher
   Courses offered by other agencies to supplement knowledge
   No additional training
   Other (please specify)

19. Briefly describe the experience of the teacher conducting the course (e.g., years of teaching parent education courses, number of courses taught, other related courses taught, etc.).

20. How many hours per week does the teacher spend on this course? (Include preparation time, consulting with parents outside class, and actual class time.)

   ____________________(number of hours)

COURSE CONTENT

21. Are the goals and objectives of the program available in written form? If so, are copies provided to the parents? To prospective participants?

   Parents: Yes ☐ No ☐
   Prospective participants: Yes ☐ No ☐
22. Which of the following has been utilized as sources of information to formulate the goals and policies of the program? (You may check more than one.)

- Communication with parents and professionals in the field
- Published reports of parent education
- Published reports on family, marriage, and child development
- Published reports on counseling and therapy
- Published reports on group processes
- Personal experience
- Other (please specify) ____________________________________________________________________

23. Below are fifteen elements which are included in some parent education programs. Please choose the three which you would rank as most important to your program. Assign a rank of 1 to the highest priority item, 2 to the next, and 3 to the next. Then choose the three items you rank as least important to your program. Assign a rank of 15 to the least priority item, 14 to the next, and 13 to the next. These items represent what you actually emphasize in class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of theories/facts concerning child growth and development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration of alternative life and family styles, kinship patterns and societal institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures to help parents examine and become aware of their own values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of the goals of children's misbehavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outline of the theories/facts of behavior modification principles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination of effective use of rewards and punishment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of the principles of active or reflective listening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures to develop skill in conveying positive and negative feelings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of systems analysis concepts as related to the family in terms of the interrelationships between members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of different approaches to problem solving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of theories of group processes and communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress upon the importance of mutual trust and respect among family members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures for determining and setting appropriate limits for children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on the crucial role parents play in teaching and guiding children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. Please list the books and/or theorists in the field of parent education which you rely upon in your course. Circle those books you recommend to parents.
25. Parents are expected to gain certain knowledge and skills from participating in a parent education program. Below are listed fifteen such competencies. Please choose the three items which you feel are most important for parents to possess. Assign a rank of 1 to the highest priority item, 2 to the next, and 3 to the next. Then choose the three items you think are least important for effective parenting. Assign a rank of 15 to the least priority item, 14 to the next, and 13 to the next. These items are characteristics you want "good" parents to possess. The ranks need not correspond to those in question 23.

- Knowledge of child growth and development
- Development of introspection - a knowledge of one's self and one's own parenting style
- Development of social interest - a sense of man's place in society and one's own role in society
- Knowledge of reinforcement principles
- Skill in use of rewards and punishments
- Understanding of the underlying causes of a child's misbehavior
- Skill in the use of reflective (active) listening
- Awareness of the importance of the parent's role as teacher and guide of their children
- Skill in conveying feelings, both positive and negative
- Ability to determine and set appropriate limits for children
- Ability to detect the interrelationships in the family in order to determine the effects on individuals
- Ability to encourage mutual respect for other family members
- Awareness of alternative techniques for creative problem solving
- Ability to delegate responsibility and encourage family group planning and initiative
- Explicit identification of the rules and procedures by which the family operates

26. Different programs use different methods. Below are listed some common techniques. Indicate which one you use and the approximate percentage of time you spend in each activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use?</th>
<th>% of Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group discussion time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small group activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role-playing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture/presentation by experts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewing films and visual materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual counseling of parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading assignments outside class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. Parents often have comments and/or concerns which are voiced during the meeting. Sometimes these comments are not directly related to the topic of discussion, and yet there may be widespread group interest in the problem. Clearly any program must provide structure if the goals are to be accomplished, but some flexibility is also needed at times. On the scale below, please indicate how much flexibility in the classroom agenda you feel is present in your program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fairly firm adherence to</td>
<td>comments limited to specified times</td>
<td>comments encouraged but certain topics required to be covered</td>
<td>participation by parents higher priority than specific content</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. In the space below, please make any further comments concerning your program which you feel are important to understanding the nature of the experience you provide for parents.
APPENDIX B

Parent Profile
PARENTAL PERMISSION FORM

I consent to participate in the research project entitled: "A Conceptual Framework of Parent Education." This research is performed under the direction of Dr. Jean Dickerscheid from Ohio State University.

I understand the general purpose and nature of the research, including the materials I am expected to complete.

I understand that any further inquiries I make concerning this procedure will be answered. I understand my identity will not be revealed in any publication, document, computer data storage, or in any other way which relates to this research. Finally, I understand that I am free to withdraw my consent and discontinue participation at any time following the notification of the classroom teacher.

Signed ____________________________
Program ____________________________
Date ________________________________
**PARENT PROFILE**

This project is designed to look at parent education programs around Ohio. In addition to information about the program, we also would like to know a few things about you. The questions below are intended to give us a better understanding of you and your family as well as your reasons for coming to this program. All the information you give will be kept strictly confidential. You will not be identified in the results in any way. Please try to answer all the questions as completely as you can.

1. Did you come here alone or did someone come with you? Check whichever is appropriate.
   - Alone _____
   - With spouse _____
   - With friend _____
   - With relative _____

2. How many children do you have? ________ (number of children)

In the space below please give the age of each child and check whether they are a boy or girl. Use more space if necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>GIRL</th>
<th>BOY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How many adults (over 18) are living in the house with you? Count yourself as well as anyone else.
   ________ (number of adults)

4. Are you: (marital status)
   - Married _____
   - Separated _____
   - Widowed _____
   - Divorced _____
   - Remarried _____
   - Single, living alone _____
   - Single, living with someone _____

5. Are you: (ethnic origin)
   - White _____
   - Black _____
   - Asian _____
   - American Indian _____
   - Mexican American _____
   - Other (please specify) ____________________________

6. Please check the last year of school you finished.
   - Did not finish high school _____
   - High school _____
   - Some college or technical school _____
   - Associate degree _____
   - Bachelor's degree _____
   - Graduate or professional degree _____
7. What was your family's total income for last year? $ ______________

8. How long have you lived in Columbus? ______________ (number of years)

9. Do you have relatives close to you who help care for the children? Yes ____ No ____
   What is their relation to you (mother, aunt, brother, etc.)?

10. Do you work? Yes ____ No ____
    If yes, is it parttime (less than 30 hours per week)? ____
        fulltime (30 hours or more per week)? ____
    What is your job? (Please be as specific as possible.)

11. Does your husband (or wife) work? Yes ____ No ____ Not married ____
    If yes, is it parttime? __
        fulltime? ____
    What is her (his) job? (please be as specific as possible.)

12. Who cares for the young children (under 10) during the day?
    One of the parents ____
    Relative ____
    Babysitter ____
    Older brother/sister ____
    Day care/preschool center ____
    None needed ____
    Other (please specify) ____________________________

13. On the scale below, mark how satisfied you feel as a parent.
    1 2 3 4
    1_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _
    very dissatisfied somewhat dissatisfied somewhat satisfied very satisfied

14. What do you hope to gain from this program? (You may choose more than one.)
    Solve my problems with the children ____
    Get new ideas for things to do ____
    Meet new people ____
    Learn the best way to raise children ____
    Get away from home for a while ____
    Learn to enjoy parenting more ____
    Prove to others I am a good parent ____
    Nothing ____
    Other reasons (please specify) ______________________________________________________________

15. Are you having any special problems with your children? If so, please briefly explain.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION IN COMPLETING THIS FORM.
7. What was your family's total income for last year? $ ____________

8. How long have you lived in Columbus? ____________ (number of years)

9. Do you have relatives close to you who help care for the children? Yes ____ No ____
   What is their relation to you (mother, aunt, brother, etc.)?

10. Do you work? Yes ____ No ____
    If yes, is it parttime (less than 30 hours per week)? ____
    fulltime (30 hours or more per week)? ____
    What is your job? (Please be as specific as possible.)

11. Does your husband (or wife) work? Yes ____ No ____ Not married ____
    If yes, is it parttime? ____
    fulltime? ____
    What is her (her) job? (please be as specific as possible.)

12. Who cares for the young children (under 10) during the day?
    One of the parents ____ Day care/preschool center ____
    Relative ____ None needed ____
    Babysitter ____ Other (please specify) ____
    Older brother/sister ____

13. On the scale below, mark how satisfied you feel as a parent.

   1 2 3 4
very dissatisfied somewhat dissatisfied somewhat satisfied very satisfied

14. What do you hope to gain from this program? (You may choose more than one.)
    Solve my problems with the children ____
    Get new ideas for things to do ____
    Meet new people ____
    Learn the best way to raise children ____
    Get away from home for a while ____
    Learn to enjoy parenting more ____
    Prove to others I am a good parent ____
    Nothing ____
    Other reasons (please specify) ____________________________

15. Are you having any special problems with your children? If so, please briefly explain.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION IN COMPLETING THIS FORM.
APPENDIX C

Parent Behavior Assessment
PARENT BEHAVIOR ASSESSMENT

We are interested in the way children and parents relate to one another. The following statements represent a variety of ways of looking at these relations. You will need to choose one of your children and answer all the following questions with only that child in mind.

Child's sex: Male ______ Female ______
Child's age: ______

PART I

Please circle the number for each item which best describes your identified child's behavior as you see it. Consider each item separately and please try to respond to every item. Your responses will be held in strictest confidence.

Your Identified Child:

1. Has to be called more than once to get out of bed in the morning. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. Gets dressed for school without being coaxed. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3. Remembers to take lunch money, books, etc. to school. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4. Leaves for school without being coaxed. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5. Makes helpful suggestions during family discussions. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6. Involves you in resolving verbal arguments with other children (for example: brothers or sisters, or children in the neighborhood.) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7. Involves you in resolving physical fights with other children (for example: brothers or sisters, or children in the neighborhood.) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
8. Does chores without being coaxed. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Items from Adlerian Parent Assessment of Child Behavior Scale. Reprinted with permission of author.
Your Identified Child:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALWAYS</th>
<th>VERY OFTEN</th>
<th>OFTEN</th>
<th>SOMETIMES</th>
<th>REDUCED</th>
<th>NEVER</th>
<th>RARE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Figures out solutions to his/her own problems.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Changes behavior when told that it bothers you.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Puts dirty clothes in hamper without being reminded.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Argues with you.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Leaves belongings scattered around the house.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Interrupts you at inappropriate times.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Is on time for meals.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Eats most foods offered without being coaxed.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Has table manners which are acceptable to you.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Tattles on other children (for example: brothers or sisters, or children in the neighborhood.)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Throws temper tantrums.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Shares problems (s)he is facing with you.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Is considerate of your feelings.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Requests help on tasks (s)he can do independently.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Cleans up after snacking without being reminded.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Behaves in such a way that you find yourself feeling hurt.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Behaves in such a way that you find yourself feeling annoyed.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Behaves in such a way that you find yourself feeling discouraged, believing that the child cannot improve.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Behaves in such a way that you find yourself feeling angry.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
28. Stays with difficult tasks until they are completed.

29. Disturbs you when you are driving.

30. Remembers where (s)he puts personal belongings.

31. Has to be told more than once to go to bed.

32. Is quiet after going to bed.

PART II

These next statements ask you to respond in the way that best represents your behavior to your identified child. Once again, please try to answer every item. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers.

TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU:

1. Excuse yourself from invited guests when your child asks for help with such things as pasting, sewing, or model building?

2. Require your child to remain seated in the car while you are driving?

3. Give your child things (s)he especially likes when (s)he is ill?

4. Go to your child quickly when you see his/her feelings are hurt?

5. Find children's books, reference books or records that you and your child can share together?

6. Explain to your child the consequences related to her/his behavior?

7. Restrict the times your children can have friends over to play?

Items from the Iowa Parent Behavior Inventory. Reprinted with permission of the authors.
Find crafts such as painting, coloring, woodworking or needlework you and your child can do together on cold rainy days?

Listen when your child tells you of a disagreement (s)he has had with another child?

Interrupt a telephone conversation to assist your child if (s)he can't find such things as scissors, thread, or paste?

Require your child to put away his/her clothes?

Enforce your child's established bedtimes when (s)he ignores them?

Restrict the kinds of food your child eats?

Listen to your child when (s)he is upset even though you feel (s)he has nothing to be upset about?

Tell your spouse of your annoyance with a neighbor or employer while your child is listening?

Insist your child speak politely to you as opposed to being sassy?

Remind your child when (s)he forgets to do daily household chores?

Explain to your child, when (s)he behaves in an unacceptable way, your reasons for not approving that kind of behavior?

Hold, pat or hug your child?

Point out to your child the acceptable choices of behavior when (s)he misbehaves?

Maintain the limits you have set for your child's television watching?

Change plans to attend a night meeting so you can be with your child if (s)he becomes ill?
<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Go immediately to your child when you see him/her hurt from a fall off a bicycle?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Disagree with your spouse when your child is present?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Ask your child for her/his reasons when (s)he misbehaves?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Go to your child quickly when you hear her/him sobbing?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Get out of bed at night to go to your child as soon as you hear her/him crying?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Let your child know that you are afraid during fear provoking situations such as storms?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Make special efforts to stay with your child when (s)he is ill?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Hug or kiss your spouse in the presence of your child?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Help your child to recognize another person's point of view?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Take your child with you when you visit friends?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Tell your child when you are in agreement with her/him?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Cry if you feel like crying when your child is present?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Work together with your child on household and yard cleaning tasks?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Hold, pat and/or hug your child when other children are watching?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
APPENDIX D

Weighting Scale for Parent Behavior Assessment
PARENT BEHAVIOR ASSESSMENT

We are interested in the way children and parents relate to one another. The following statements represent a variety of ways of looking at these relations. You will need to choose one of your children and answer all the following questions with only that child in mind.

Child's sex: Male Female
Child's age: 

PART I

Please circle the number for each item which best describes your identified child's behavior as you see it. Consider each item separately and please try to respond to every item. Your responses will be held in strictest confidence.

+ means increase (e.g., 4-5) indicates positive change
- means decrease (e.g., 3-1) indicates positive change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Identified Child:</th>
<th>ALWAYS</th>
<th>VERY OFTEN</th>
<th>OFTEN</th>
<th>SOMETIMES</th>
<th>NOT AT ALL</th>
<th>VERY RARE</th>
<th>NEVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Has to be called more than once to get out of bed in the morning. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
2. Gets dressed for school without being coaxed. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
3. Remembers to take lunch money, books, etc. to school. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
4. Leaves for school without being coaxed. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
5. Makes helpful suggestions during family discussions. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
6. Involves you in resolving verbal arguments with other children (for example: brothers or sisters, or children in the neighborhood.) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
7. Involves you in resolving physical fights with other children (for example: brothers or sisters, or children in the neighborhood.) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
8. Does chores without being coaxed. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |

*Items from Adlerian Parent Assessment of Child Behavior Scale. Reprinted with permission of author.
<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>Your Identified Child:</strong> Figures out solutions to his/her own problems.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td>Changes behavior when told that it bothers you.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td>Puts dirty clothes in hamper <strong>without</strong> being reminded.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td>Argues with you.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td>Leaves belongings scattered around the house.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td>Interrupts you at inappropriate times.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td>Is on time for meals.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td>Eats most foods offered <strong>without</strong> being coaxed.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td>Has table manners which are acceptable to you.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td>Tattles on other children (for example: brothers or sisters, or children in the neighborhood.)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td>Throws temper tantrums.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td>Shares problems (s)he is facing with you.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td>Is considerate of your feelings.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td>Requests help on tasks (s)he can do independently.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td>Cleans up after snacking <strong>without</strong> being reminded.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td>Behaves in such a way that you find yourself feeling hurt.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td>Behaves in such a way that you find yourself feeling annoyed.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td>Behaves in such a way that you find yourself feeling discouraged, believing that the child <strong>cannot</strong> improve.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td>Behaves in such a way that you find yourself feeling angry.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Your Identified Child:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28. Stays with difficult tasks until they are completed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Disturbs you when you are driving.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Remembers where (s)he puts personal belongings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Has to be told more than once to go to bed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Is quiet after going to bed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PART II**

These next statements ask you to respond in the way that best represents your behavior to your identified child. Once again, please try to answer every item. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Excuse yourself from invited guests when your child asks for help with such things as pasting, sewing, or model building?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Require your child to remain seated in the car while you are driving?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Give your child things (s)he especially likes when (s)he is ill?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Go to your child quickly when you see his/her feelings are hurt?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Find children's books, reference books or records that you and your child can share together?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Explain to your child the consequences related to her/his behavior?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Restrict the times your children can have friends over to play?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>ALWAYS</td>
<td>VERY OFTEN</td>
<td>OCCASIONAL</td>
<td>SOMETIMES</td>
<td>NOT FREQUENTLY</td>
<td>NEVER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Find crafts such as painting, coloring, woodworking or needlework you and your child can do together on cold rainy days?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Listen when your child tells you of a disagreement (s)he has had with another child?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Interrupt a telephone conversation to assist your child if (s)he can't find such things as scissors, thread, or paste?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Require your child to put away his/her clothes?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Enforce your child's established bedtimes when (s)he ignores them?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Restrict the kinds of food your child eats?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Listen to your child when (s)he is upset even though you feel (s)he has nothing to be upset about?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Tell your spouse of your annoyance with a neighbor or employer while your child is listening?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Insist your child speak politely to you as opposed to being sassy?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Remind your child when (s)he forgets to do daily household chores?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Explain to your child, when (s)he behaves in an unacceptable way, your reasons for not approving that kind of behavior?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Hold, pat or hug your child?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Point out to your child the acceptable choices of behavior when (s)he misbehaves?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Maintain the limits you have set for your child's television watching?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Change plans to attend a night meeting so you can be with your child if (s)he becomes ill?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>SOMETIMES</td>
<td>VERY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23. Go immediately to your child when you see him/her hurt from a fall off a bicycle?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>24. Disagree with your spouse when your child is present?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25. Ask your child for her/his reasons when (s)he misbehaves?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26. Go to your child quickly when you hear her/his sobbing?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>27. Get out of bed at night to go to your child as soon as you hear her/him crying?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>28. Let your child know that you are afraid during fear provoking situations such as storms?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>29. Make special efforts to stay with your child when (s)he is ill?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30. Hug or kiss your spouse in the presence of your child?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31. Help your child to recognize another person's point of view?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>32. Take your child with you when you visit friends?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>33. Tell your child when you are in agreement with her/him?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>34. Cry if you feel like crying when your child is present?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35. Work together with your child on household and yard cleaning tasks?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>36. Hold, pat and/or hug your child when other children are watching?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
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Permission Forms
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS

PROPOSED USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS: ACTION OF THE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Behavioral Sciences Review Committee has taken the following action:

1. Approve
2. Approve with Conditions
3. Disapprove

with regard to the employment of human subjects in the proposed research entitled: A Conceptual Framework of Parent Education

Jean D. Dickerscheid/Karen Gehr is listed as the principal investigator.

The conditions, if any, are attached and are signed by the committee chairperson and the principal investigator. If disapproved, the reasons are attached and are signed by the committee chairperson.

It is the responsibility of the principal investigator to retain a copy of each signed consent form for at least four (4) years beyond the termination of the subject's participation in the proposed activity. Should the principal investigator leave the University, signed consent forms are to be transferred to the Human Subject Review Committee for the required retention period.

Date May 5, 1977

Signed (Chairperson)
10/11/77

Dear Karen,

"Better late than never." I have no objection to you making the propose changes in the form of the APACBS. For my norming purposes, I simply request that your demo. data be exactly as I have on my form so that I get the same information from all the test copies from all my sources. I think you can appreciate this need. Also, for the purposes of simplying preparing the data for computer scoring, could you attach a copy of the demo. data to each test form you return? I need individual data for each subject.

The stipulation about publishing refers to books or journal articles, not inclusion in dissertations. I understand that your committee would require the instrument be included in your dissertation.

I don't know who's running STEP groups in Ohio, I thought Kent Hamdorf of the Extension Division of Ohio State had some going, but perhaps I'm in error on that. I would suggest you contact American Guidance Service, Inc. Publisher's Bldg., Circle Pines, MN 55014 -- 612 786 4343. Tell them your intentions and that I suggested you contact them. Ask them for names and addresses of large purchasers in Ohio.

Sincerely,

Gary D. McKay, Ph.D.
Aug. 4, 1977

Ms. Karen E. Gehr
456-A Alexandria Colony North
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Dear Ms. Gehr:

I am enclosing a copy of the APACBS which you may use if you are willing to adhere to the following conditions.

1. The instrument may be used for the purpose of your research only.
2. On each copy of the instrument used, the phrase "Reprinted with permission of the author" must appear.
3. If you publish your dissertation, permission must be obtained from me concerning including the instrument in your publication.

I am also enclosing a copy of instructions for reporting data to me. We are still in the process of norming the instrument and can use more data.

In a separate mailing, I am sending you a copy of my dissertation which will answer the questions you proposed. Please send me $5.00 to cover the cost of reproduction and mailing.

Good luck in your venture.

Sincerely,

Gary D. McKay, Ph.D.

PS Are you going to be using the STEP program in your research?
June 10, 1977

Karen E. Gehr
436-A Alexandria Colony North
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Dear Ms. Gehr:

I have received your letter in which you express interest in using the Iowa Parent Behavior Inventory. Due to your request I have consulted with the other authors of the inventory and they concur with me that we should make it available to you for your use. Therefore please find enclosed the following:

1. A copy of the original 67-item IPBI. - included in the manual
2. A copy of the manual developed to accompany the original 67-item IPBI.
3. A copy of the recent 36-item mother form for the IPBI.
4. A copy of the recent 36-item father form for the IPBI.

The 36-item mother and father forms result from a factor analysis based on data from Wisconsin, Nebraska, Kansas, and Iowa, involving approximately responses from 300 mothers and 300 fathers. Due to the recency of this factorial analysis we have no clearly written data on the 36-item scales.

Because the IPBI is in a developmental stage, it is not at this point considered to be a finished product. We do feel that the instrument has promise as a useful research tool. We are anxious to make it available to other researchers but caution that any results obtained through the use of the instrument will need to be considered tentative. We also ask that if you use the instrument you give appropriate credit to the instrument authors.

If I can provide further information or be of further assistance, please let me know. In the meantime, accept my best wishes for your research efforts.

Yours very truly,

Sam Clark
Professor and Head

Enclosures
APPENDIX F

Comparison of Items Measuring Program Elements to Items Measuring Parent Competencies
### Comparison of Items Measuring Program Elements to Items Measuring Parent Competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Elements (Question 23, Program Profile)</th>
<th>Parent Competencies (Question 25, Program Profile)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of theories/facts concerning child growth and development</td>
<td>Knowledge of child growth and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration of alternative life and family styles, kinship patterns and societal institutions</td>
<td>Development of social interest - a sense of man's place in society and one's own role in society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures to help parents examine and become aware of their own values</td>
<td>Development of introspection - a knowledge of one's self and one's own parenting style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of the goals and children's misbehaviors</td>
<td>Understanding the underlying causes of a child's misbehavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outline of the theories/facts of behavior modification principles</td>
<td>Knowledge of reinforcement principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination of the effective use of rewards and punishments</td>
<td>Skill in use of rewards and punishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of the principles of active or reflective listening</td>
<td>Skill in use of reflective (active) listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures to develop skill in conveying positive and negative feelings</td>
<td>Skill in conveying feelings, both positive and negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of systems analysis concepts as related to the family in terms of the interrelationships between members</td>
<td>Ability to detect the interrelationships in the family in order to determine the effects on individuals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Elements</th>
<th>Parent Competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of different approaches to problem solving</td>
<td>Awareness of alternative techniques for creative problem solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of various family rules, both hidden and open, and family organizations such as the family counsel</td>
<td>Explicit identification of the rules and procedures by which the family operates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of the theories of group processes and communication</td>
<td>Ability to delegate responsibility and encourage family group planning and initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress upon the importance of mutual trust and respect among family members</td>
<td>Ability to encourage mutual respect for other family members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures for determining and setting appropriate limits for children</td>
<td>Ability to determine and set appropriate limits for children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on the crucial role parents play in teaching and guiding children</td>
<td>Awareness of the importance of the parent's role as teacher and guide of their children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>