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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of the Creative Parenting Program on the parent participants in the program. The investigation was conducted using a scientific research approach with standardized instruments designed to measure change or lack of change in the parents' perceptions of their approaches to child-rearing.

A critical review of the related literature showed no evaluation of parent education programs such as the Creative Parenting Program, based theoretically in the psychology of human development using a lecture style format. The parent education programs evaluated were primarily skill training programs. As each study used different instruments to measure different effects and also different populations, it was not possible to accurately assess the overall effectiveness of the programs. The literature suggested that more research is required to establish significant statistical evidence that the programs change the parental attitudes toward the parent-child relationship.

It was hypothesized (null form) that there would be no statistically significant difference between the experimental groups and the control groups of the parents' perceptions in: (1) acceptance of their children; (2) family cohesion and family adaptability; (3) use of authority with their children and (4) family disharmony.
The posttest score means among groups showed statistically significant changes toward a higher level of acceptance of their children and a decrease in parental use of their authority. On the family interactional dimensions of family cohesion and family adaptability no significant changes were shown. With the dimension of family disharmony no significant changes were shown on the posttest score means among groups.

The results of the study suggest that the Creative Parenting program is effective in promoting change in the parental attitudes of acceptance of children and reduced use of authority, two factors thought to be basic to effective parenting. It is felt that the principles and concepts presented in the Creative Parenting Program offer a significant contribution to the field of parent education.
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CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION

In the field of parent education programs the Creative Parenting program offers a perspective and approach that differs from the more well known and established parent education programs such as Parent Effectiveness Training (PET) program, based in communication skill training, (Gordon, T., 1975) and systematic Training for Effective Parenting (STEP), an Adlerian theory based program (Dinkmeyer & McKay, 1976).

The perspective that the Creative Parenting program offers is based in the psychology of human development. Historically, such a perspective finds its roots in the writings of Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778). Rousseau proposed that development proceeds according to an inner biological timetable which unfolds into a series of developmental stages. During these stages, children experience the world in different ways and make decisions for themselves based on their own experiences and understandings (Crain, 1980). John Bowlby's theory of attachment behaviors and Jean Piaget's theory of cognitive development further expanded Rousseau's key concepts (Bowlby, 1969 and Piaget, 1964). It is these theories of developmental psychology that form the basis for the concepts presented in the Creative Parenting program.

The approach the Creative Parenting program takes is a lecture format designed to develop and effect change in parents' perceptions and underlying philosophy in their parental attitudes and approaches toward their children. Parent participants are provided with an understanding of children's development psychologically and parenting behaviors related
to nurturing and supporting this development. As children develop normatively and effectively, at each stage of development the children have specific developmental needs. Participants in the program learn that parents' roles need to change with the development of their children. Furthermore, it is assumed that parents can develop parenting approaches which enable them to become more effective in their parenting responsibilities.

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of the Creative Parenting program to bring about changes in the parent participants' attitudes and approaches toward their children. More specifically, does Creative Parenting influence parents' acceptance of their children? Do parents become more positive in the approach they take with child rearing behaviors? Does the family adaptability and cohesion become more balanced as perceived by the parents following their participation in the Creative Parenting program?

Psychologists, psychiatrists and social workers have long recognized the key role of parents in fostering positive development in their children. Most of the parent education programs seen as successful have focused predominantly on enhancing parents' interactional skills with their children (Stevens, 1984). However, in addition, effective parenting includes the ability to understand children's needs and the specific tasks of parenting related to those needs (Ballenski & Cook, 1982). Furthermore, the parents' role requires change with the development of their children (Duvall, 1971). Yet, education for parents have been viewed and labelled as a "frill" or "add on" service in the spectrum of family support systems (Anglin, 1980).
Historical Background

The history of parent groups in North America can be traced back as early as 1815 in the area of Portland, Maine where the "Maternal Associations" met to discuss such topics as "Breaking the Will of the Child" (Brim, 1965). These earliest groups were based primarily on moral and religious teaching and drew largely on the guidance of prayer and biblical texts. In the middle of the nineteenth century, the participants in these groups along with the whole of the Western world were experiencing not only the "industrial revolution" but also an "ideological revolution" of values and attitudes which questioned religious and moral values in the face of the impact of experimental science (Steere, 1964). This questioning of religious and moral values has had a profound influence that has been carried into our contemporary period (Anglin, 1984).

This "ideological revolution" of values and attitudes produced dramatic societal transformations. These transformations have been traced by Berger (1974) to the outward manifestations in the social environment and the inward changes in the way in which individuals, families and communities perceive the world around them. As a result of these changes previous generations have failed to effectively transmit socio-cultural traditions down the generations and at the same time these traditions were seen as inadequate in the preparation for contemporary life (Dinkmeyer & McKay, 1976, Gordon, 1970 and Morris, 1977).
Without traditions to rely on and changes in the perceptions families have of the world around them, the parent role and methods for rearing children have been significantly influenced and changed. The tasks and demands of parenthood have increased to such an extent that often the modern family experiences crises which ultimately result in reduced communication within the family and uncertainty on the part of the parent (Van Wyk, Eloff and Heyes, 1983). A decrease in supporting structures in the family and society, an educational environment which differs socio-ecologically and technologically from the past have combined to create an uncertainty for parents in their roles and responsibilities. Parents' primary responsibility is to facilitate their children's physical and emotional development (Therriem, 1979). What social/psychological factors are of significance in meeting such responsibilities? It is the parent-child relationships that have become a struggle for both parent and child (Therriem, 1979). The myth that parenting skills are inborn, natural and magically available has served to stigmatize training. And yet, if effective training was available, the needs of the parents and children could be more fully satisfied (Therriem, 1979).

In the literature, the parent education programs have been developed into models with a variety of theoretical orientations. Some program models include manuals or outlines of study, and others are less structured. The program, Creative Parenting, was the subject of study by this investigator. It offers parents a basis of understanding their parenting role through which to meet the challenges of raising children today. Creative Parenting is a parent education program developed by
Dr. Gordon Neufeld, psychologist from the University of British Columbia. The program consists of a variety of materials designed to enhance an understanding and applications of the concepts of the program. Through lectures, discussions, listening, viewing of visual materials and specific task assignments such as a journal kept by the parents between sessions, the program provides for individual learning styles. It contains a leader's manual, parents' handout materials, cassette and specific assignments for application of the principles taught in each session.

**Purpose**

Since 1980 Creative Parenting has been offered by the U.B.C. Continuing Education Department at community centres in Vancouver. Fraser Valley College has offered the program in Chilliwack, Abbotsford, and Mission. In addition, Family Community Services in the Fraser Valley has given the program in a small group discussion format. Approximately fifteen sections have been given in churches in the Lower Mainland area. More than a thousand people have completed the program.

The long range goal for Creative Parenting is to develop the program into a continuous on-going parent education program in outlying areas in British Columbia in addition to the Lower Mainland. Trained leaders need to take courses in developmental psychology at the university level and be well acquainted with the concepts of the Creative Parenting program. The program can be adapted to the needs of
the community. There are plans to initiate this process of adaptation in the near future.

An evaluation of the effectiveness of the Creative Parenting program would be of interest to the Department of Continuing Education at the University of British Columbia and the Fraser Valley College. Originally the program was only offered through these education facilities. If these institutions of higher learning were to consider offering the program again in the future, an evaluation of the effectiveness of the program would be of value.

Although there was subjective evidence that the program was perceived as effective by parent participants evaluating the program at its conclusion, there was no objective information on how parents changed because of their experience in the program. It was believed that the parents were most likely to change favorably with exposure to the Creative Parenting program. However, there was no empirical evidence to support or dispute such a notion.

**Statement of the Problem**

In the present era of flexible, rapidly changing lifestyles and new evolving family structures, a surge of interest in parent education programs has developed. Numerous parent education programs have been developed with numerous approaches to parenting education (Croake & Glover, 1977; Harman & Brim, 1980; Fine, 1980).
The general format of the Creative Parenting program could be described as a "structured program" for parents to enhance their functioning as parents (p.1). With this description, the specific benefits of the program for parent participants are not indicated. What does the Creative Parenting program offer parents to enhance their role as parents? What, potentially, would change for parents based on their experience in the program? These are questions that are asked by both parents and professionals in the field of parent education. This study proposed to investigate such questions using a scientifically oriented research approach using standardized instruments designed to measure change or lack of change in the parents' perceptions in following areas:

(1) acceptance of their children,
(2) family cohesion and family adaptability,
(3) use of their authority with their children, and
(4) family disharmony.

**Operational Definitions**

1. **Creative Parenting**: A structured 10 session parent education program based on developmental psychological theory, taught in weekly two hour meetings. The topics and format of the program are outlined in the Creative Parenting leader's manual.

2. **Effectiveness**: For the purpose of this study, this term will refer to the influence or responsibility for producing positive changes in parental perceptions of their parenting approaches.
3. **Participants**: A parent or parents who have at least one child and who were part of the 10-session program.

4. **Control Parents**: Parents who were tested over the same ten week period of time as the experimental group in the January to March session before they attended the Creative Parenting session from April to June.

5. **Favourable Change**: To cause to become different in a positive direction such as parents becoming more accepting of their children following the Creative Parenting program.

6. **Approach**: For the purpose of this study the term will refer to taking an attitude toward and dealing with the issue or subject such as parental attitudes toward their children.

7. **Balanced**: This term will refer to a state of pleasing harmony which creates a sense of flexible equilibrium within the family's interactional processes.

**Data Base**

This multi-level evaluation of the Creative Parenting program includes measurement of:

1. **Parental Acceptance of Children** defined as feelings and behaviors on the part of the parent which are characterized by the unconditional love for the child, a recognition of the child as a person with feelings who has a right and a need to express those feelings, a value for the unique makeup of the child and a recognition of the child's need to differentiate and separate himself from his parents in becoming an autonomous individual. Operationally, the constructs are measured by the **Parental Acceptance Scale** (Porter, 1954).
2. **Family Adaptability** defined as the ability of a marital/family system to change its power structure, role relationships and relationship rules in response to situational and developmental stress as measured by *Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scales* (FACES) (Olson, Bell & Portner, 1974).

3. **Family Cohesion** defined as the emotional bonding which members have toward one another and the individual autonomy that a person has in the family system as measured by the *Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scales* (FACES) (Olson, Bell & Portner, J., 1979).

4. **Parental Authoritarianism** defined as behavior that discourages verbalization, breaks the will of the child, excludes outside influences, intrudes on the child's rights, is strict and inflexible. Operationally the constructs are measured by the *Report of Parent Behavior Inventory* (RPBI) (Schulderman & Schulderman, 1979).

5. **Family Disharmony** defined as attitudes reflecting irritability, rejection of family responsibilities and family members, inconsideration for rights of others, intolerance, aggressiveness and marital conflict as measured by the *Report of Parent Behavior Inventory* (RPBI) (Schulderman & Schulderman, 1979).
Overview

This thesis was organized into five chapters plus references and an appendix. The first chapter provides an introduction and the historical perspective to parent education programs. Chapter II provides an overview of literature which reports the effectiveness of various parent education programs upon their participants and their children. Comparative studies evaluating the effectiveness of programs one to another is also presented. Chapter III describes the research methodology while Chapter IV presents the results of the data analyses. The fifth chapter provides the discussion, summary, and suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER II - REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Child development authorities have recognized and accepted the assumption that parents and family have an instrumental and significant influence on the development of the child's present and future emotional health (Summerlin & Ward, 1978). To help parents become more informed and effective in their key parenting role a multitude of educational and skill training programs have been developed. To meet the wide and varied needs of the parents, the list of programs documented in recent literature ranges from parent support groups for families of mentally handicapped children (Holland, 1980) to life skills for parents (Schumaker, 1980). Anglin (1984) has described the wide variety of parenting programs metaphorically as a "field with a thousand flowers blooming". (p.3)

Parent education and training groups can be more specifically categorized as: primarily information, primarily skills, primarily support, information and skills, skills and support, information and support, information skills and support (Anglin, 1984). In addition to these areas, there are also a wide diversity of parent programs differentiated by theoretical orientations (Gordon, 1957; Forehand, 1979; Fine, 1979; Sirridge, 1980; Ellis, 1978; Dinkmeyer and McKay, 1976). While some programs are designed from one theoretical framework such as Parent Effectiveness Training, (Gordon, 1975) and Systematic Training for Effective Parenting, (Dinkmeyer & McKay, 1979), other programs integrate several theories within the model such as Positive Parenting, (Green, 1975).
The literature reviewed here concerns the effectiveness of parent education programs which are primarily categorized as informational and skill building as well as dealing with developmental issues and parenting techniques. Fine (1980) defines parent education programs as "systematic and conceptually based programs intended to impart information, awareness or skills to the participants on aspects of parenting". (p.5). It is the effectiveness of these education programs in influencing the parents' acceptance of their children and their approaches to parenting that is particularly relevant to this study. This empirical research study is concerned specifically with the effect of a parent education program upon the parent participants in their approaches to parenting.

In the following section a description of each theoretical orientation to parent education is presented followed by the research evaluating the programs derived from each theory. A review of the research comparing the effectiveness of programs with different theoretical bases is then presented. This chapter concludes with a statement of the hypotheses to be tested in this study.

**Behavior Modification**

The behavior modification approach places emphasis on teaching parents direct behavior change methods. Parents are taught how to use reinforcing or punishing responses to antecedent stimuli to modify the behavior of their children. The focus is on observable and measurable behavior change rather than on feelings or interactions (Berkowitz, D.P. and Grazino, A.M., 1972).
Research Investigating Effectiveness of Behavior Modification Parent Training Programs

A majority of the behavioral parent training programs are oriented towards parents who have children with behavioral problems or special needs. These programs were developed earlier than many current programs today and the literature reviews date back to the 1960's. Studies showed these techniques to be effective (Berkowitz and Grazino, 1977; Forehand and Atkeson, 1977; Johnston and Katz, 1973; O'Dell, 1974) for changing specific overt behaviors such as self injurious behavior (Wolfe et al, 1976), school phobia (Tahminian & MacReynolds, 1971) or overt behaviors such as aggressiveness (Patterson, 1974).

Recent literature which described studies that have evaluated the behavior modification programs as effective are: Forehand, Griest, Wells, 1979; Ebert, Shelia, M. Matarozzo, 1980; Forehand, Wells, Griest, 1980; Petersen, Bruce P., 1980; Walley, Furey, Steffe, Forehand, 1983; MacMahon, Robert, Fiedemann, Forehand, Griest, 1984.

These studies are not cited in detail in this review as the parenting training programs researched were developed for parents of children with behavioral problems who had come into the program by a referral. These programs were held in a clinic setting and therefore may not generalize across different settings, behaviors and time. However, in reviewing behavior modification parent training programs that have been evaluated, these studies are representative. Later in this review, behavior modification parent training programs research
results are cited in studies that have been designed to compare the effectiveness of behavior modification parent training programs to parent training programs with different theoretical bases.

The research results of the programs in the comparative studies using behavior modification parent education programs were seen as more relevant to this study than research studies investigating only behavior modification programs. The behavior modification programs in the comparative studies were conducted in the community, not a clinic, using a random sample selection rather than referral. The program researched in this study, the Creative Parenting program was given in a community setting and the sample had voluntarily enrolled in the program and the research study. As the variables of setting and enrollment in the program were similar to the Creative Parenting program, the results of the comparative studies using behavior modification programs were viewed as more appropriate to cite in more detail in this review than studies evaluating only behavior modification parent training programs. (They appear later in this chapter.)

**Communication Oriented Programs**

Methods employed in these programs have the primary aim to improve parent-child communication and indirectly the parent-child relationship. Often these programs have evolved out of counselling literature and focus on skills of empathic responding, reflective listening and self-awareness. Although others have developed communication skill based courses (e.g. Carkhuff), currently the most widely used and researched program is Gordon's Parent Effectiveness Training (1975) (Pain, 1984).
Parent Effectiveness Training has had a significant influence in the parent training program field. In 1976 Gordon and Sands reported 250,000 parents had taken the program, over 8000 leaders were trained and a million copies of Parent Effectiveness Training (commonly known as P.E.T.) had been sold. Course methods and concepts are described in Gordon (1975) and Gordon and Sands (1976).

Research Investigating Effectiveness of Communication Oriented Parent Training Programs

Stearn, 1971, studied Parent Effectiveness Training (PET) to determine if attending the PET program would enhance communication between parent and child. If communication was enhanced it was assumed certain changes would take place within the child and parent relationship, specifically, attitude changes regarding family life. If parents' attitudes changed, parental behavior would change and such a change would be perceived by the child.

In Stearn's study three groups were used for the study - one experimental group and two control groups. The experimental group was obtained from three different classes of PET participants. The control group, obtained from parents who responded to a PTA newsletter regarding parental communication, was subsequently divided into two groups. One control group were parents who responded affirmatively to the question, "Would you take PET if you had the opportunity?". The other control group were those parents who responded negatively to the question. The parents participating in PET were given the Traditional Family Ideology
Test (TFI) prior to the first class, while the parents of control groups one and two were given the TFI before they heard the lecture about PET. The experimental group had 18 parents and 33 children. Control group one had 13 parents and 25 children. Control group two had 14 parents and 26 children.

Parents of all groups completed two tests to measure the parents' perceptions of each child in the family: the Coopersmith test on self-esteem, and the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Scale. Each parent and child was given the same tests eight and fourteen weeks later which were subsequently mailed to the investigator. The results indicated that the experimental group showed more democratic attitudes toward their family than did either control group. Children from the experimental and control groups with a democratic attitude toward family life showed similar gains in self-esteem compared to the autocratic group (measured by the Traditional Family Ideology Test), which had no significant gain. However, there appeared to be no positive relationship between democratic attitude of parents and the perceived acceptance of the child.

Therriem's study (1979) assessed PET effectiveness in training parents to function at higher levels of empathy. A four month follow-up procedure was included to assess the stability of the skill over time.

Thirty parents volunteered to participate in the PET classes as an experimental group and 17 others volunteered to be pre and post-tested and follow-up tested by measures to form a control group. Using
three sets of child stimuli statements, parents were asked to write exactly what they would say, word for word, if their child were to say the stimulus statement to them. (Each set, 6 statements, hypothetically made by the child, conveyed feelings of embarrassment, loneliness, frustration, excitement, resentment and ambivalence). Two experienced raters independently rated each response on the Truax Accurate Empathy Scale. Raters were not aware of pre-test, post-test, follow-up experimental-control designations.

Results of the study indicated parents who participated in the PET program were better able to function to facilitate higher levels of empathy and the skills were maintained over time. The results showed empathy skills were available to parents of the experimental group whereas these skills did not seem to be available to parents in the control group. Therriem (1979) made the point that it is not known how often, if ever, parents in the experimental group actually employed empathy skills in their family and no measures were made of the parent training on their children. Future research is needed to determine if PET is effective in teaching parents skills of genuineness and problem solving. In his conclusions, Therriem suggested that perhaps the struggle for both parents and children could be reduced if training in empathy, warmth and genuineness were available. PET potentially showed value as a preventive measure to help parents become better facilitators of their children's emotional growth. However, there is no empirical research to support these suggestions.
Rinn and Markle (1977) reviewed 14 studies then available on PET, (only one of which was published). They concluded:

"Overall the research on PET has been limited in scope and inadequate in design. Of the studies reviewed none possessed the methodology rigorous." (Rinn and Markle, 1977, p.105).

Specifically Rinn and Markle found problems regarding random assignment of Ss to groups, a relative lack of objective measures, inappropriate statistical methods, absent or inappropriate control conditions and a lack of follow-up studies. Overall the effectiveness of PET as a prevention or intervention strategy was not supported (1977) in educating parents in child rearing practices.

Levant and Doyle (1983) evaluated the effectiveness of a parent training program for fathers of school age children (ages 6-12). Although the program was not specifically the PET program, it was a systematic communication skills program with a client centered orientation. Because fathers are thought to have more difficulty in the expressive role, communication skills were emphasized. The study was limited to married Caucasian fathers with at least one child between the ages of six and twelve years, using control/experimental group design. Both groups of fathers, their wives and one of the children were pre- and post-tested on dependent measures - the Sensitivity to Children Scale (STC), the Porter Acceptance Scale (PAS) and the Family Concept Test (FCT). The results showed an improvement in fathers' communication skills. The experimental group improved significantly (p=.05) more than control group on overall sensitivity (total STC score), and significantly
(P=.05) reduced their undesirable responses. No significant differences were found between the groups on the total score nor on the four subscales.

The Family Concept Test showed that the fathers had a change in their concept of the ideal family as the fathers learned a new way of thinking about family relationships. The result of this thinking created a reduction in the fathers' family satisfaction and the father-mother ideal family congruency. Levant and Doyle suggest as a whole the family concept finding represents an evaluation of a process which has yet to run its course (p.35). In conclusion, Levant and Doyle stated the program "shows promise" (p. 35). They recommended a follow-up assessment in three or six months following the course. They further suggested that research be done in this area as the results were not conclusive (p.35).

In summary, the research literature on communication skills training programs is unclear as to the effectiveness of the programs. For example, while Levant's and Doyle's study (1983) showed change occurs with fathers' sensitivity to children and understandings of family relationships, more research is suggested. Rinn and Markle (1977) who reviewed 14 studies of PET stated the effectiveness of the program was not supported. Further research on PET that has been conducted was designed to identify differences in the effectiveness of PET in comparison to behavior modification programs or Systematic Training for Effective Parenting (STEP) programs. This literature will be examined later in this review.
Adlerian Programs

Stressing the importance of the family group, the Adlerian parent education program provides another approach to the field of parent education. Based on the work of Alfred Adler, Dreikurs, and Soltz (1964), Dinkmeyer and McKay (1976) produced the parent training program STEP - Systematic Training for Effective Parenting. Misbehavior of children in this STEP program is described in terms of mistaken goals and natural and logical consequences which replace the concepts of reward and punishment. Much emphasis is placed on encouragement of the child to promote feelings of self-worth through communication of respect, love and support.

The STEP program has been widely used particularly in connection with school systems where teachers also receive training enabling them to use this approach in the classroom. Considering the wide use of the program, there are relatively few research studies published evaluating the effectiveness of the STEP program.

Studies have been done on the effects of the Adlerian principles prior to the development of the program with study groups and with counselling groups (Swenson, 1970; Eastlack, 1970; Platt, 1971; Steed, 1971; Berrett, 1973; Mahoney, 1975; Delaurier, 1975). These studies show mixed results as to the effectiveness of the Adlerian principles. Swenson's study (1970) showed a significant gain in teachers' rating of children's adaptation to school on those children whose parents participated in the study group. Eastlack (1970) compared
responses of a parent study group using Dreikurs and Stolz's *Children: The Challenge* (1964) and an experimental group who attended a family education center training. Results based on a parental practices questionnaire showed a significant change toward more democratic behavior among the people after attending the center's program. Platt's (1971) research showed the effects of Adlerian counselling and consultation on behavior change in children as perceived by parents and teachers. There was evidence of a positive change in the children's behavior as rated by their parents. The teachers rated all but 2 children as showing improvement.

Steed (1971) assessed the usefulness of Adlerian family counselling in modifying the families interactional process. Steed hypothesized the experimental families would show more positive attitudes toward themselves, each other and their children; and that children would show more positive attitudes towards themselves, their parents and their siblings. None of Steed's hypotheses were statistically supported. The process of Adlerian parent training, Steed suggested, is sometimes involved with periods of regression before positive changes occur.

Berrett (1973), using an experimental and control group design, studied the effects of an Adlerian parent study group on mother's attitudes, child rearing practices and perceptions of their children's behavior. Subjects of the study included mothers of both hearing impaired and on non-hearing impaired children. There was also a control group. The parent study group mothers showed a more liberal attitude
toward their children than did the control group mothers. The study group mothers also showed positive changes in child-rearing practices and reported a lower occurrence of negative behaviors from their children.

The effects of Adlerian parent training programs on self-esteem and child-rearing attitudes plus home and school behavior of the preschool child was studied by Nordal (1976). Parent training for the others in the experimental group was 5 weeks with one 2-hour session weekly. The findings of this study indicated Adlerian parent training did result in positive changes in child-rearing attitudes and improved child behavior at home. However, the learner's self concept, home and school behavior was not altered as measured by the instruments used.

Using a pre-test and post-test evaluation of 100 parents who attended an Adlerian parent study group, Fears (1976) reported that parents saw positive changes in their children's behaviors. Parents attributed the changes to the use of Adlerian child-rearing practices in the home.

McKay (1976) studied parent participation in a STEP (Systematic Training for Effective Parenting) group to determine if change occurred in the mother's ratings of the behavior of children with whom they were most concerned. Results indicated that the mothers' perception of her target child's behavior was significantly more positive although changes in verbal communications of the mothers was not significant. This
appears to be one of the few studies which showed significant changes in mother's perceptions of children's behavior resulting from participation in an Adlerian based parent study group.

To add more validity to the findings, this study could be tested with different populations that included fathers. Using unbiased observers to rate the children's behaviors and comparing their ratings to the parent's perceptions would be valuable in assessing results. Unbiased raters could also rate parents' behaviors.

Kieran and Berry (1975) evaluated the effectiveness of an Adlerian parent study group program in School District 71 in Courtenay, B.C. Children, The Challenge (Dreikurs and Soltz, 1964) was the basis for discussion of parenting techniques. The parents met for 2-hour weekly sessions for 10 weeks. Through a parent questionnaire, the traditional Family Ideology Scale (Shaw & Wright, 1967) and the Parental Experience Scale (Milton, 1969) the effects of the program on attitudes toward family relationships, prevention or correction of behavior and correction or prevention of learning difficulties were assessed. These instruments showed no significant change in any of these three dimensions. The author suggested that although the parent training groups may not alter family lifestyles, they may improve parents' perceptions of their difficulties. The study did not measure this dimension.
Summerlin's and Ward's study (1978) hypothesized that parents who participated in a STEP parent training group would show differences in attitudes from parents who had not participated in the group. The parents in the study were parents of kindergarten and grade one children in a small suburb of Houston, Texas.

Two instruments were used in this study: The Parent Attitude Survey (PAS), used to measure parents' attitudes and behaviors and the Primary Self Concept Inventory to measure a child's self concept.

The experimental group, twenty-six parents who participated in the STEP program, showed differences in attitudes, as measured by the Parent Attitude Survey (PAS) from the control group, twenty-four parents who were willing to participate in the STEP program but who had not yet attended the program. It was concluded that the STEP program accounted for the differences in parental attitudes as the parents had been randomly assigned to the two groups. The children of the experimental group parents showed positive differences in self-concept while the children of the control group parents remained unchanged. The results suggested that the treatment experienced by the experimental group parents were communicated to their children and resulted in higher self-concepts.

Pain (1984) investigated the effectiveness of an Adlerian based parent training for parents of kindergarten children using parents from two parallel school systems in St. Albert, Alberta; the Protestant Separate School System in which the course was offered and the Public
School System (predominantly Catholic). A letter was sent to the parents asking if they were interested in attending such a course. From the 68 parents who indicated an interest, a random sample of 45 were chosen, 21 as a control group for the fall course and 24 as a control for the winter.

The program was evaluated on 5 aspects; parents' attitude toward parenting using the Parent Attitude Scale (Hereford, 1963); parents' self report of their own behavior and perceptions of ideal parenting using The Parent's Report (Cohen and Dibble, 1973); an assessment of the child's self concept measured through Purdue Self-Concept Test for Pre-School Children (Cicerell, 1973); teachers' ratings of the child's behavior was evaluated with the Social Competence Scale and the Problem Check-List (both developed by Kohn, Parnes and Rossman, 1979).

Results showed significant positive change in the parents' attitudes, particularly in the dimensions of independence, trust and communication. A positive effect was shown in parenting self concepts as parents felt they were coming closer to their ideals in parenting. There was less evidence of the child's self concept changing. The author pointed out that in the four month time span such an expectation may be unrealistic. He suggested these children would be re-tested in a year for more conclusive results.
In summary, the effectiveness of Adlerian parent training programs has been evaluated by only a few studies which have been published. However, from those published studies there is evidence that the programs have changed parents' attitudes and knowledge (Berrett, 1975; Fears, 1976; Summerlin and Ward, 1981). Stolzoff (1980) further found that the attitude changes continued for two years with good knowledge retention by the parents. Although parents report lower levels of bothersome behavior (Berrett, 1975), changes in the behavior of children after the program were less frequently found (Croake & Burness, 1976).

The results of the studies cited in this review suggested that the Adlerian parent training programs are effective in facilitating positive changes for parents. It is important to note that the authors of the research studies suggested more research is needed for a more solid evaluation. Levant and Doyle (1983) suggested a measure of the parent-child relationship is needed plus a 3 to 6 month follow-up assessment after the training program is completed. Stevens (1978) suggested the relationship between critical aspects of parent training programs and outcomes may differ in rural populations as opposed to urban populations. Different strategies may be required to promote optimal change in parent-child behavior. In conclusion, considering the wide use of such Adlerian parent training programs in comparison to the published research studies, the evaluation of the effectiveness of this approach remains incomplete.
Developmental Programs

The theory of a developmental psychology is clearly defined by Hurlock (1959) as "the development of the human being from conception to death with emphasis on the changes that take place during different periods in the life span". In this approach the development of the child is a process of interaction between the individual and his environment. An important basic assumption is that the child is a functioning whole and the individual is unique. Each child because of his different physiology, environment, personality and experience develops into a unique being.

Effective development is viewed by Heisler "as a kind of cyclical process of differentiation followed by homeostatic equilibrium" (Blocher, 1974, p.62). A reasonable balance between these two basic tendencies is needed for a child to develop effectively. Without the security that insures reasonable homeostatic levels, a child's best energies go into maintaining homeostasis which is growth arresting. Conversely, without adequate stimulation in a child's life for the process of differentiation to occur, developmental growth is also arrested. The work of the parent is to help maintain a growth producing environment for the child at all stages of development (Blocher, 1966).

Donald Blocher (1974) describes two goals of a developmentalist: 1) to maximize the possible freedoms of an individual within the limitations supplied by himself and his environment and, 2) to maximize human effectiveness.
Studies in the area of adult education have stressed the developmental approach (Bryson, 1936; Thomas, 1961; Lowe, 1971; Huberman, 1974). Several adult educators (Mager, 1970; Houle, 1972; Blaney, 1974; Knowles, 1970; Knox, 1977) have developed a framework for planning adult education programs. Donald Blocher (1974) using theoretical statements and techniques from a number of separate developmental theories has established a "systematic eclectic model" which is perhaps the most universal developmental theory. His developmental counselling theory with its practical framework has been used as a basis for planning developmental parent training programs such as Whalen's parents of adolescence (1983).

The relationship between parents' knowledge about child development and their parenting skills was examined by Joseph Stevens, Jr. (1984). While Steven's study did not look at parent education programs, the study investigated the relationship between parents' knowledge about development and their skill in supporting children's development.

Two hundred and forty-three mothers of infants between 15 and 30 months of age were recruited for the study. By door-to-door canvassing in blocks where large number of low-income families reside the study participants were recruited. Black and white families were recruited from more than 45 low income neighborhoods located in three of the four quadrants of a metropolitan area. Parents whose infant was between 15 and 30 months of age, and who agreed to participate were included. Of these Southern urban women with at least one infant; 89% had incomes below the poverty level ($8,112 for a family of four).
Two measures of child development knowledge were used; one, a measure of knowledge about early normative development and the second, a measure of knowledge about the developmental processes. The Knowledge Environment Influences on Development Scale (KEID) assessed awareness of parent behavior related to children's cognitive language and effective development. The second child development knowledge measure used was the High Scope Knowledge of Early Infant Development (H/SED) Scale. The assessment of parenting skills used was the Home Observation for Measurement of the Environment (HOME). These instruments were administered to mothers during a visit in the home.

The results supported the assertion that what parents know about children's development positively related to their skill in designing a supportive learning environment and to their ability to interact in ways that stimulated a young child's development. When more specific dimensions of parenting skills were examined, similar relationships were evident. Parents who were more aware of the potency of their behavior and of the physical environment for development were those who were observed to behave in ways more supportive of mental development (p.242).

While there is much more work needed in instrument development to assure adequate sampling of the child development knowledge domain, both knowledge instruments employed have shown a positive correlation with one another and each is predictive of a well-validated measure of parenting skill - the HOME. The relationship between knowledge and parenting skill was a significant one (p.243).
The results of Steven's study provide a valid basis for the assertion that parent education programs based in developmental psychology can be effective for parents seeking further parenting skills and information. The study suggests that the Creative Parenting program, based in developmental psychology, is an approach to parent education that can be effective for parents participating in the program.

Developmentally based parenting programs help parents understand the stages through which their children progress during childhood, and the types of problems encountered in this growth process toward maturity. As parents gain understanding of the child's emotional development, a developmentally based parenting program focuses on parental approaches and attitudes that support and facilitate maximize positive growth in the child.

As the theory provides a practical framework through which a child's development can be understood and maximized, this developmental approach is potentially useful for education, counselling and parent training. However, in the literature education models or programs based in developmental theory are primarily in the area of adult education and career development. There is much written in the literature to suggest that a developmental parent education program potentially would have a significant effect in the field of parent education (Blocher, 1966; Boggs, C.J., 1983; Brandt, L.J., 1974; McGillicuddy et al, 1977; Park, R., 1977; Powell, D.R., 1983; Schofield, R., 1979; Stevens, J.H. Jr., 1984; Therriem, M.E., 1979; Washington, K.R., 1977).
Educators stress the importance of the role of the parent in the development of the child and have identified characteristics in the developing child that can be facilitated if parents understand the stages and sequences the child passes through in the process of growth and maturation (Andrew et al, 1975; House, 1972; Schaefer, 1971; Sherre, 1971).

Schaefer (1972) asked mixed groups of parents and professionals working with young children what would be their goal for children as they reach adulthood.

The answers were that:

1. The children become capable and competent people.
2. The children will value themselves and have high self-esteem.
3. The children will live better and more effective lives than they (parents and professionals) had lived.

Schaefer then states, "If these are the common goals - the path toward them begins at birth. There is no arbitrary day when responsibility shifts from home to school." (p.21).

Sherre (1971) also in the field of early childhood education, describes four types of early childhood education programs: custodial, academic, cognitive and developmental (p.35). Further he defines a
developmental program as a program that "endeavors to stimulate maximum personalized human development" (p.36). In emphasizing the value of a developmental program he continues:

"Assuming developmental programs become widespread - largely replace custodial or day care types, we can anticipate at least 10 developmental and behavior changes in children's education." (p.36)

In Griggs (1981) evaluation of parenting materials, he questions the lack of understanding given to parents around their child's development as he states:

"How do we really view the child? What is the goal of the child rearing process? All too often treatment and education efforts focus on training the parent to follow this or that behavior pattern without ever making explicit the concepts and goals on which advice or treatment methods rests." (p.554)

Robertson (1984) also identifies this problem in the currently common and popular approaches as she suggests:

"Criticisms might also be directed toward programs other than PET as they too do not incorporate findings from the child and family development literature. For example, some issues as discipline do not continue across age levels; however, the manner in which they are dealt with could differ from one developmental level to another." (p.102)

The literature suggests the importance of the developmental approach not only in education of children, but also for parent education programs. In families where infants developed less optimally, researchers have found the less effective parenting observed not only due to a lack of parenting skill but also to a lack of knowledge about
development (Stevens, J.H., Jr.). Grantham-McGregor & Desai (1975) and Gordon & Guinaugh (1974) found that parent education programs produced changes in children's development and in parents' awareness of their children's development.

Thus, an important factor of learning to become an effective parent would appear to be a knowledge base about basic underlying important developmental processes as well as descriptive information about the course of development (Stevens, 1984).

"Creative Parenting" is a program that has been developed to respond to this need of educating parents in developmental processes. Its content and concepts are based in developmental psychology, taking a different focus than that of the currently popular programs such as PET and STEP.

However, the effectiveness of the Creative Parenting program remains unknown from an empirical research basis. (The only evaluation has been subjective course evaluation forms parents have completed at the conclusion of each training program.)

**Comparative Studies of Parent Training Programs**

To determine the differential effects of two systemic parent-training programs which are theoretically and comparatively different, studies have been conducted. Parent Effectiveness Training (PET) appears to be the program most consistently compared to other programs in these studies.
Nobel (1976) studied PET and Adlerian Parent groups for differential effects using child rearing attitudes as the criterion variable. Using the Parental Attitude Research Instrument the pretest-posttest results showed no significant difference between the two experimental treatment groups. Neither group of parents changed significantly in their awareness of their children's emotional needs, or in their encouragement of parent-child communication.

Schofield (1979) researched the effects on children on two of the most dominant approaches in the parent training education field, Parent Effectiveness Training and Behavior Modification. Twenty-eight parents were randomly assigned to two experimental groups. Fourteen parents who indicated an interest in participating but unable to do so at the time formed the voluntary control group. Children's groups, formed for testing purposes, were established based on parent group assignments. The Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI) was administered to the children in their schools on three occasions: (1) as a pretest, prior to the start of the parent education programs; (2) as a posttest nine weeks later, following the completion of both programs; and (3) as a follow-up test four months after the posttest.

The PET parent group met in 8 weekly 2 hour sessions. The behavior modification group met in 6 weekly sessions using a curriculum outline developed by Welles and Radin covering methods and tools common to most behavior modification programs for parents. Despite the unequal time allotment, both models stated that their objectives could be met in the time allotted.
Results showed the children of parents in both experimental
groups showed positive gains in self-esteem that were not significantly
different at the .05 level. However, when the two experimental groups
were compared with the voluntary control group, a statistically
significant difference was found between the posttest scores of children
in the PET group and children in the control group. No significant
differences were shown in a similar comparison of behavior modification
group scores with control group scores. A follow-up testing of the
children 4 months after the parent education programs were completed
showed slight differences in mean SEI scores. The mean follow-up score
of children in the PET group showed an increase of three points over the
posttest mean. The children in the behavior modification group showed a
decrease of three points in such a comparison, and the children in the
control group increased their mean scores less than two points.

Using PET and behavior modification approaches this study
compared the effects produced in the children's self-esteem as a result
of their parents attending school-based education groups with a
population that was predominantly white, middle to upper-middle
socio-economic class. From the results, Schofield (1979) concluded that
parental involvement in a PET education group could be considered a
superior means of raising their children's self-esteem as compared to
behavior modification parent education groups. In considering the
positive results of this study, the specific socio-economic group of
middle to middle-upper class must be considered. If the study was
replicated across socio-economic groups would the PET parent education
groups be shown to be more effective than behavior modification parent
education groups?
Finally, this study did not show specifically what parents learned and used from the PET program in their approaches to their children which resulted in the children's higher level of self-esteem. Conversely it was not possible to establish where the behavior modification program failed to help parents in their approaches to raise children's self-esteem. No instruments were used in this study to measure these important variables. This author suggested that such a measure was needed to accurately establish and clarify the relationship of the PET parent education group and a higher level of self-esteem in the children whose parents took the program. The converse would be true also for the behavior modification group.

Again comparing PET and a behavior modification child management program, Anchor and Thomason (1977) evaluated the effectiveness of the two models in helping parents become a more skillful parent. By advertising the courses as simply courses on "how to be a more skillful parent", not PET or behavior modification, there was a response of 41 parents who were randomly assigned to one of four classes. There were 3 classes of 10 parents and one class of 11 parents. To assess the effectiveness of the programs the following instruments were used: (1) the Communication Questionnaire (Brown & Dye, 1973) to measure the style of communication; (2) the Child-Home Behavior Checklist to assess the kind and extent of problem behaviors; (3) the Adjective Checklist, a list of 300 adjectives commonly used to describe personality characteristics; (4) the Rathus Assertive Scale to measure assertiveness; and (5) the Modified Verbal Behavior Checklist, a means to specify and identify the possible problems of an individual's verbal behavior.
Results showed no significant differences at the .05 level between the two kinds of training groups. The groups were not significantly different from each other before the intervention. Follow-up data collected 5 to 6 months after the conclusion of the programs further confirmed that sustained desirable change in the parent was not facilitated by either program. Anchor and Thomason (1977) suggest the lack of change could be the result of the ceiling effect - that is parents didn't change because they already knew and practiced the principles and techniques the courses taught.

Again as in Schofield's study (1979), parents who participated in this study were highly educated and middle to upper-middle socio-economic status. These parents also held high occupational status. Borger's findings (1974) are supported here in that when a parent-training program was offered without special incentives for the participants, the volunteers tend to be of higher education levels. Gabel, Graybill, Wood DeMott and Johnston (1975) report similar results to Borger and suggest an explanation. The parents of such socio-economic status with high education level and high level occupations realize the need for parent training more than parents of lower socio-economic and educational levels. The educated parents already know most parenting concepts therefore may simply enjoy the intellectual stimulus and social intent of the class.

With Anchor and Thomason (1977) study as with Schofield's (1979) study it is difficult to assess what the programs, (PET and behavior modification) specifically failed to contribute effectively to parents' learning. The possibility exists that the parents in the
Anchor and Thomason study already know and utilize the parenting concepts taught in these two programs, PET and behavior modification as suggested by Gabel et al (1975). The possibility also exists that the parents with this high level of education rejected the concepts presented and chose not to change. Anchor and Thomason reported some parents expressed verbal resistance to participating in one of the behavior modification classes. They felt the course did not fulfill their needs. Apparently they had expected a class more similar to the PET program in philosophy of parenting.

The investigator of this creative Parenting program evaluation suggested it was also important to recognize the results of the Creative Parenting program evaluation study related to a specific socio-economic status and high education level of the general population. If the study was replicated with sample that was representative of the general population, would the results be different and how would they be different?

Pinsker and Geoffory (1981) studied the effects of PET and a behavior modification workshop based on their hypothesis that "in alleviation of parent-child difficulties, the different focal points of training may lead to different effects along a number of dimensions relevant to parent-child interaction" (p.62).

Forty parents whose children attended one of three Chesterfield County, Va. elementary schools responded to an announcement of parent groups for "training in child management skills". Three groups were formed. All subjects were married and residing with their respective
spouses. Subjects were assigned to one of three groups on the basis of the geographical area of the elementary school their children attended. Group 1 (n=13) followed a behavior modification format, Group 2 (n=13) used the format of PET and Group 3 (n=14) acted as a control group.

Outcome was assessed using six primary measures, namely: 1) Problem Checklist (Eatontown Children’s Psychiatric Center, 1972), 2) The Family Environment Scale (Moos, 1975), 3) The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (Fitts, 1965), 4) Behavior Modification Cognitive Scale (adapted by Pinsker from the Behavior Modification format, Becker, 1976), 5) Parent Effectiveness Training Cognitive Scale (adapted by Pinsker from the Parent Effective Training Format, Gordon, 1970) and 6) home observations. There were three parent report measures, two cognitive scales and home observation data. Using a pretest-posttest design, the parent report measures and cognitive scale scores were collected. Observation data was gathered for each family member pre, post and three times during intervention. Differential results were obtained for the behavior modification and PET group depending upon the criterion measure used.

Over the period of intervention, the Behavior Modification group demonstrated a significant decrease in problem behaviors in their target children according to scores on the Problem Checklist measure. While individual scores on the Problem Checklist measure for the PET group and control group indicated non-significant changes, trends were noted in both the PET group and the control group toward a decrease in perceptions of problem behaviors following the interventions. The Family Environment Scale showed significantly more family cohesion and
concurrently less family conflict with the PET group than with the Behavior Modification group. There were no significant differences noted with self-concept variables. Behavior observations during the intervention (three times during the group program) showed the PET group elevated the level of positive parental responses, while the behavior modification group showed significant decreases in the numbers of negative child behaviors. Both groups significantly increased their respective knowledge of the techniques involved.

Pinsker and Geoffory (1981) propose these results reflect upon those principles and philosophies that the two workshops espouse. The Behavior Modification focuses on behavior changes which the results of the Behavior Modification group showed. The Parent Effectiveness Training program focuses upon positive communication patterns which was also shown in the PET group pre-post test results. However, a direct behavior change after effective communication patterns have been established or the generalization of positive communication patterns to decreased negative behaviors may not be as strong as originally conceived.

In conclusion, Pinsker and Geoffory (1981) state the study does not convey effectiveness of one technique over the other. Both have important concepts to offer child management procedures. It is their conclusion that parent training is useful in attaining a number of different goals. The method selected for parent training should be based on the goals to be met. One type of parent workshop does not
comprehensively remediate all difficulties in parenting. However, the approach used such as Behavior Modification for behavior change, often produces positive spinoffs in other areas not necessarily covered in the program.

To determine the effectiveness of small group approaches in improving family communications along with resultant attitude and behavior changes in parents plus observed changes in their children, Larson (1972) studied three different group approaches; Achievement Motivation Program (AMP), PET and Discussion Encounter Group (DEG). A two year pilot program preceding the research indicated all three programs had some characteristics for bringing about desired change.

A meeting was held at Westwood Junior High School in St. Louis Park, Minnesota in the fall of 1969. The essential characteristics of the above three methods were described to parents. Parents were assigned to groups for which they volunteered to the degree that was possible. When participants are involved in an experience of their own choosing which they believe will be useful, each method receives maximum potential of being helpful and the variables underlying the expectations of the group members were possibly met. Groups were conducted in fall, winter and spring series. Each series had 3 experimental group programs. Participants were assigned to the groups based on their choice of the method being used. Each group met for a total of 24 hours over a period of eight weeks, one three-hour session per week. Groups meeting later on in the year served as control groups for the experimental groups meeting earlier in the year.
Instruments used to assess parental behavior and attributes were: (1) a self-concept inventory for parents adapted from the Sears Self-Concept Inventory for Children; (2) the Parent Concern Survey to measure goal attainment; (3) a checklist of problems; (4) the Hereford Parent Attitude Scale; (5) Self Report Logs; (6) a Parent Concern Survey and (7) a final evaluation by parent participants.

The Self-Concept Inventory showed that AMP (Achievement Motivation Program) and PET groups were better able to identify themselves as persons possessing characteristics such as a sense of humor, capacity for fun and ability to enjoy life. The Parent Concerns Survey showed a substantial reduction in the area of concern - problems with children, problems of parents' regarding self and problems of parents' regarding the family - for both AMP and PET groups. Overall the PET groups showed the largest change in the Parent Concerns Survey.

The Hereford Parent Attitude Scale showed that both the PET and AMP groups indicated overall improvement while the DEG (Discussion Encounter Group) did not. The AMP group showed the largest gains in feelings by parents of better understanding of their children's behavior. The PET group results revealed more confidence was gained by parents in their parental roles, more insight into their children's behavior and more trust in their relationship with their children.
In summary this study showed that on most criteria, PET appears superior to other methods of group work. The AMP group is particularly effective for growth of parents' own self-concept. The study was done over a span of three months and the author recommended follow-up studies to determine long-range attitude and behavior changes resulting from each group approach.

A follow-up evaluation of parent training approaches was conducted by Stolzoff (1980) using three different approaches: (1) Parent Effectiveness Training (PET), (2) the Adlerian program, (3) Behavior modification. The three experimental groups in the study were composed of mothers who had completed the training of the method between six months and 2 years prior to evaluation. The control groups were formed from mothers who had not taken the training but agreed to participate in the study. The control group mothers had children enrolled in the same pre-school as the experimental group mothers. Stolzoff measured outcome variables of: democratic attitude by Attitudes Toward Freedom of Children Scale; Acceptance of the Child by McDaniel, Piers, Young; Children's Self Concept Scale, and mother's knowledge of theoretical concepts by the Parent Training Inventory. These variables were measured for each method.

The results showed the ASG (Adlerian Study Group) and the PET mothers to be significantly more democratic in their attitudes and acceptance of their children that the behavior modification and control groups. ASG moms showed more parental acceptance than PET group mothers.
in unconditional acceptance of the child. Differences in raising of the child's self-concept was not found by the results of the study in any of the groups. Overall the study showed ASG to be more effective. The behavior modification as presented and measured was shown to be not as effective as PET or ASG in changing parent democratic attitude or acceptance of children.

In reviewing these comparative studies, overall results remain inconclusive as to the effectiveness of parent training programs. While Nobel (1976), Anchor & Thomason (1977) found no significant effects of either of the programs they compared, Pinsker & Geoffory (1981) concluded both PET and behavior modification had value to child management procedures, depending on the goals of the instructor and parents involved. Schofield (1979) found children of PET group parents to show greater self-esteem than behavior modification parents. Stolzoff (1980) study showed ASG to be more effective as a training approach than PET and behavior modification in changing parental democratic attitudes and in parental acceptance of the child.

It is important to acknowledge in examining these comparative studies that although the studies were evaluating the same parent training programs, PET, Adlerian study group and behavior modification, the researchers studied different criterion to measure outcomes of the programs. Nobel (1976) compared the studies using child rearing attitudes as a criterion; Schofield (1979) in comparing the same programs as Nobel researched the effects on the children. As each study used different instruments to measure different effects and also
different populations it is not possible to accurately assess the overall effectiveness of the programs comparatively or each program individually based on the findings from these studies. In conclusion this author suggested while these studies do not all show conflicting results, collectively they do not demonstrate the significant effectiveness of any of the programs studied.

Summary

In summary, research on parent training programs has shown that these programs have some strengths and some weaknesses. Behavioral approaches are generally well researched, and show positive behavior change using such methods, but it is difficult to demonstrate that the behavioral methods generalize to other than the targeted behaviors or situations. Communication programs, particularly PET, which is well organized and has been given to large numbers of parents, shows an incredible lack of documented program evaluations (Rinn, Markle, 1977). Adlerian programs have been more widely researched and evaluations indicate the programs effect positive changes in parental attitudes and parents' perception of their children (Pain, 1984).

In the literature parent training programs based primarily on developmental theory did not appear with the exception of the "Success" program and Whalen's parent of adolescence study group (1983). There were not empirical research evaluations of either of these programs.
Studies on the effectiveness of parent training programs evaluated through empirical research methods have demonstrated a variety of results. Studies evaluating the same program (i.e., P.E.T.) have not shown consistent results as to the effectiveness of the program (Rinn & Markle, 1977; Levant & Doyle, 1983; McKay, 1967; Kieran & Berry, 1975; Pain, 1984; Nordal, 1976; Anchor & Thomason, 1977; Schofield, 1979). Research methods in parent education have been dominated by an interest in the outcomes of the program, thus a majority of the studies have focused on the dyadic relationship of parent-child looking for the immediate impact on communication, the child's perception of the parent, the child's self-concept, and the child's motivation or child's behavior. Measures of parent attributes have been measured in relationship to their influence on the child. Much parent-child research has approached the parent as a "black box reactor" not as an information-processing organism (Parke, 1977). As a result parental attitudes, beliefs, knowledge, cognitions and perceptions in regard to parent-child interaction have largely been ignored.

**Substantive Hypotheses**

The primary aim of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of a parent education program entitled "Creative Parenting". The specific goals of the study were to determine if the program influences (i) parental acceptance of their children, (ii) approaches parents use in child rearing and (iii) parents perceptions of family adaptability and cohesion. Specifically, this study was designed to investigate the following hypotheses:
1. Parents who participate in the Creative Parenting program will show significant differences in the acceptance of their children from those who have not participated in the program as measured by the Porter Parental Acceptance Scale, (Porter, B.B. 1954).

2. Parents who participate in the Creative Parenting program will show a more favourable change in their approaches to their child-rearing than those who do not participate in the program as measured by the Report of Parent Behavior Inventory, (Schluderman & Schluderman, 1979).

3. Parents' perceptions of family adaptability and family cohesion will show more balanced cohesion and greater adaptability following their participation in the Creative Parenting program than those parents who have not yet participated in the program as measured by the Family Adaptability and Cohesion Scales, Olson, H.D., Bell, R. Portner, J., 1979.

These hypotheses can best be understood within the theory of developmental psychology underlying the Creative Parenting program. This organismic theory of development views development as taking place in an ordered sequence of qualitatively distinct stages and characterized by an increase in complexity with the individual taking an active, not reactive role (Salkind, 1981). Organismic theorists such as Rousseau, Gesell, Werner and Piaget share a fundamental orientation of psychological development unfolding from inner growth and spontaneous learning (Crain, 1980). Within this understanding, the organismic model of development can be viewed as a preventive theory as well as a remedial theory.
Piaget's (1964) theory of cognitive development suggests that an individual incorporates new ideas into his/her existing framework of knowledge (assimilation) and then adjusts existing schemes to fit the newly acquired knowledge (accommodation). This process is always complementary and functions throughout life as a person retains continuity in cognitive structure through only slight modification. Assimilation and accommodation must be in balance through the life span. As external events such as new learnings upset the equilibrium, an individual is able to successfully gain new knowledge and make accommodations to his/her existing framework. The development or growth of the individual advances to a new and higher level of organization.

As parents in the Creative Parenting program develop to a new and higher level of organization through new learnings about parenting roles, the perceptions of the parents would change toward their children. As they gained understanding and knowledge, they would also gain self-confidence as parents. With more self confidence the parents could make changes in their approaches to their children such as becoming more accepting, more flexible, understanding and supportive (Pain, 1984; Stevens, J., 1984).
CHAPTER III - METHODOLOGY

This chapter is concerned with the procedures involved in testing the hypotheses for this study. Sampling procedures, description of instruments, the research design, research and treatment procedures, methods of measurement and the analysis of data are discussed.

Population & Samples

The population of parents who have previously enrolled in the Creative Parenting programs were identified by specific demographic variables. Most were married, living with their spouse and had at least one child. The education level of the parents was mainly at a post secondary level with some holding graduate level degrees. There were a large number of parents in professional occupations. Many of the mothers, who were currently homemakers, had trained for and worked at a professional occupation. Although the course was advertised throughout a geographic area, the parents living in the middle to upper middle class neighborhoods enrolled in the program. The average age of these parents was the early thirties with their children mainly under 5 years of age. Children in elementary school in these families were usually the oldest child in the family and very few parents with adolescents enrolled in the Creative Parenting program. The population was predominantly Caucasian. This population of parents was described as having middle to upper-middle socio-economic status. Hence, the population of parents to whom the results of this study are generalized is described as being from a middle to upper-middle socio-economic population with an education level of high school or above.
The sample for the present study consisted of parents who had voluntarily enrolled in the parent education program, Creative Parenting. They also agreed to participate in the study and came from the population described previously.

Descriptive statistics on demographic data will be presented in Chapter IV and the demographic data will be discussed in Chapter V.

**Procedures for Obtaining Sample**

Brochures and notices announcing the Creative parenting programs were distributed to community centers, family drop-in centers and day care centers in the Point Grey, Dunbar, Kerrisdale, Shaughnessy and Vancouver South areas. The Vancouver Sun newspaper also carried an article in early January, prior to registration for the program. This article discussed the program's approach and concepts.

Registration for the program was through mailing in the registration form which was attached to the bottom of the notices, or, by directly phoning the office of Dr. Gordon Neufeld, the program instructor. The option was offered of enrolling in the program beginning the week of January 20, 1986 or signing up for the program given in April.

Due to the large enrollment, two spring programs were given. The location for the January program and one spring program was the West Point Grey Community Center. The second spring program was given in the
church hall of St. John's Church on Granville and Nanton. The spring programs commenced the same week of April 15, 1986. One program was given on Monday night at West Point Grey Community Center and the second program was held Tuesday night at St. John's Church hall.

All registrants for the program were contacted by phone to ask if they would be willing to participate in this research study. They were told the information they would provide would assist in improving the existing program and any programs offered in the future.

**Sample**

The sample consisted of one control group with two experimental groups in the January to March program. One experimental group received no pre-test to conform to the research design (to be presented later in this chapter). The control group was comprised of parents who voluntarily registered for the program and were unable to participate in the January program. They were willing to be a part of the research beginning in January and were pretested with the 2 experimental groups. The remaining parents who were willing to participate in the research study in the spring formed a replication of the experimental group that was pretested and took the program in January. The parents who participated in this study:

1) had voluntarily enrolled in the Creative Parenting program and agreed to participate in the study
2) had at least one child and had expressed a desire for learning more about their role as a parent and the parent-child relationship, and
were from a middle to upper-middle socio-economic population with an education of high school completion or above.

**Treatment**

Participating in the Creative Parenting program involved weekly attendance at ten, two hour sessions. The parents who participated in this study were expected to attend a minimum of eight of the ten sessions. The treatment procedures involved specific topics for each session. The program is organized into sections as follows:

- **Part One** Parenting in Perspective - Session One  
  - introduction and program overview
- **Part Two** Building a Foundation of Trust - Session Two  
  - factors in the development of trust
- **Part Three** A Child's Sense of Self - Sessions Three and Four  
  - stage of autonomy  
  - stage of initiative
- **Part Four** A Child's Self-Beliefs - Sessions Five and Six  
  - self-beliefs  
  - self-confidence
- **Part Five** Heart Hygiene - Sessions Seven and Eight  
  - respect for the child  
  - effective ways of caring
- **Part Six** Approaches to Discipline - Sessions Nine and Ten  
  - purpose of discipline  
  - styles of discipline - models
A more detailed outline of the format can be found in Appendix A. The sessions were conducted in a lecture style format with opportunities for participants to ask questions. The room furniture was arranged in classroom fashion with tables in rows, each table seating approximately five people. An overhead projector was used to illustrate concepts.

At each session, parents were supplied with paper for note taking and handouts that corresponded to the topic for that session.

**Description of Instruments**

A number of instruments were considered and investigated for use in measuring the effectiveness of the Creative Parenting program. The program was drawn from developmental psychology and designed to enhance the parents' self-concept and influence the parents' approaches toward their children. To measure the effectiveness of the program, instruments were selected that were perceived to be compatible with the purposes and goals of the program.

The program was designed to influence the parents' perceptions of their parenting activities. Therefore, instruments were selected to measure these perceptions. The instruments selected for this study were the Porter Parental Acceptance Scale; (Porter, B.B. 1954); The Report of Parent Behavior Inventory; (Schluderman & Schluderman, 1979) and the Family Adaptability and Cohesion Scales; (Olson, H.D., Bell, R., Portner, J., 1979).
Porter Parental Acceptance Scale

The Porter Parental Acceptance Scale designed by Blaine R. Porter assesses parents' acceptance of their child (Appendix B). It is a forty item, four point, multiple choice scale which locates a parent on a continuum ranging from low to high acceptance according to the degree of acceptance the parent has for the child. The total acceptance score is the sum of the numbers marked by the subject. The possible range is 40 to 200. The higher the total score the more accepting the parent is of his child. Cronbach's alpha (Cronbach, 1951) for internal consistency ranged from .81 to .89. The Pearson r-test of stability over time yielded a coefficient of .83 (Porter, 1954).

A corrected reliability correlation coefficient of .865 was obtained using a sample of forty-three men and fifty-seven women (Porter, 1954). The total test reliability was estimated at .80 by Hawkes (1956) in a later study with a sample more representative of .256. A high agreement among five experienced clinicians resulted from ranking the responses from 1 to 5, 1 representing low acceptance and 5 representing high acceptance. In every case at least three of five judges agreed (Porter, 1954). The scale is quasi-interval therefore parametric statistics are appropriate.

Report of Parent Behavior Inventory (RPBI)

Schaefer and Bell (1958) developed the earliest version of the RPBI known as the Parental Attitude Research Instrument. The original instrument (called Q1) consisted of 23 scales with 5 items per scale.
The instrument was a Likert-type attitude questionnaire where answers were scored in the following way: strongly agree (A) -4, agree (a) -3, disagree (d) -2, strongly disagree (D) -1. The system was called the U (unreversed) scoring system (Appendix C and D).

In 1961 Zuckerman and co-workers offered an alternative form of the Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI), called Q2. Twenty out of Schaefer's 23 Q1 scales were selected and the meaning of all their items was reversed. The system of scoring was as follows: strongly agree (A) -1, agree (a) -2, disagree (d) -3, strongly disagree (D) -4. This system of scoring was called the R (reversed) system. A perfectly consistent subject would obtain the same scores on corresponding Q1 and Q2 items because agreement with a given Q1 item implied disagreement with the corresponding Q2 item.

In a series of methodological studies Schluderman and Schluderman (1979,1974,1977) examined the methodological properties of the instrument and developed another version of the Parental Research Instrument (called Q4) which minimized the methodological problems. The instrument had 23 scales of 5 or 8 items per scale involving 3 major factors: acceptance vs. rejection; psychological control vs. psychological autonomy; firm control vs. lax control. In this study, basic scales taken from Q1 were scored according to the U system while basic scales taken from Q2 were scored according to the R system. The scorer must identify the basic scale items which should be scored according to the U or R systems. In 1979, Schluderman and Schluderman modified the scoring system to simplify the scoring system in the
following way: (a) all items of the 23 basic scales are scored according to the R system; (b) on all basic scales, the scale name, and high scores are related to disagreement with item content. This scale is quasi-interval therefore parametric statistics are appropriate. The instrument was called the Report of Parent Behavior Inventory (RPBI).

A normative study of the instrument was conducted in 1977 with a sample of 425 college students who completed the instrument (then known as the Parent Attitude Research Instrument (PARI) and the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. A week later the same subjects completed the PARI (Q4) again with the Edwards Social Desirability Scale this time. By comparing item and scale scores on the first and second testings, the test-retest reliability was calculated. The reliability coefficients ranged from .52 for scale 6 to .81 for scales 18 and 19.

**Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scales (FACES)**

This scale designed by Olson, Bell & Portner is a 111 item, four point, Likert-type scale of self report to systematically assess family cohesion and adaptability. There are nine subscales for family cohesion with six items for each subscale, making a total of 54 cohesion items. There are seven subscales for family adaptability with 42 adaptability items (Appendix E). A modified version of the Edmonds Social Desirability Scale with 15 items was included to total 111 items.

In order to assess the clinical validity of the items, 35 marriage and family counsellors were asked to rate each item of a Likert scale ranging from low cohesion or low adaptability to high cohesion or
high adaptability. A second population was used to assess the empirical validity of the items. This group consisted of 410 young adults, students in family relationship courses. The clinical validity was demonstrated by a high level of agreement in that the item fell at either a high, moderate or low level of each subscale.

The empirical or construct validity was demonstrated by the fact that the items had a high factor loading on different factors which were related to the three levels of the dimensions - high, moderate and low.

Additional data analysis was done by Joyce Portner and Richard Bell (1979) on 201 families correlating social desirability, adaptability and cohesion. The internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) reliability coefficient of the total scores for adaptability and cohesion were .75 and .83, respectively. The split-half reliability for each of the subscales was low. It is recommended that total scores be used for adaptability and cohesion rather than the individual subscale scores.

**Research Design**

The research design selected to guide the study and analyze the data was the Solomon 4-group design, (Borg, W. and Gall, M., 1983). The Solomon 4-group design is a special case of a factorial design. It has three purposes: (1) to assess the treatment effect; (2) to assess the effect of a pretest; and (3) to assess the interaction between pretest and treatment (Borg, W. & Gall, M., 1983).
The Solomon 4-group design can be diagramed as follows:

\[ \begin{align*} 
R O_1 & \quad X \quad O_2 & \text{(Experimental - group one)} \\
R O_1 & \quad O_2 & \text{(Control - group one)} \\
R & \quad X \quad O_2 & \text{(Experimental - group two)} \\
R & \quad O_2 & \text{(Control - group two)} 
\end{align*} \]

- \( O_1 \) - Dependent variable measures before treatment
- \( O_2 \) - Dependent variable measures after treatment
- \( X \) - Independent variable (treatment)

One experimental group and one control group are treated exactly as in the classical experiment and the other experimental group is given only the experimental variable and the posttest. The second control group receives no pretest and no experimental variable - only the posttest.

All groups were composed of parents who registered for the Creative Parenting program and agreed voluntarily to participate in the research study. Experimental group one and experimental group two were established through random assignment of those participants taking the January through March section. Parents who registered to take the April section and agreed to participate in the investigation were randomly assigned to control group one and control group two.
It was also realized that if control group two was posttested following the April treatment, it would be possible to create two experimental groups to replicate experimental group one. The data base would be expanded.

Due to the large registration for the April sections, the program was held on two consecutive evenings, Monday and Tuesday, commencing the same week in April. It was also decided to establish two experimental groups. Experimental group three were parents attending the Monday night program who had agreed to participate in the study (as a control group) and were willing to be posttested. Experimental group four were parents attending the Tuesday night program who had agreed to participate in the study (also a control group) and were willing to be posttested.

The modified research design, then, used to analyze the data for this study using the Solomon 4-group design plus the replication of experimental group one was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group No.</th>
<th>Jan.</th>
<th>Apr.</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>Sample n for Pretest</th>
<th>Sample n for Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0₁</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0₂</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0₂</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0₁</td>
<td></td>
<td>0₂</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0₁*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0₂</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0₁*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0₂</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* used as posttest scores like group 0
Procedures

Parents registered for the Creative Parenting program received a letter informing them of this research study and asking if they wished to participate (Appendix F). As the letter stated, each registrant then received a follow-up telephone call (investigator) to answer any further questions concerning the study and to determine the parents who wished to participate (Appendix G). When this procedure was completed, the experimental and control groups were established through random assignment of those who agreed to participate in the study (Appendix H).

Pretest

Each member of experimental group one was asked to complete three pretest questionnaires: the Porter Acceptance Scale, the Schluderman Report of Parent Behavior Inventory, and the Olson Family Adaptability and Cohesion Scale. If both mother and father in one family were participating in the research study, they were requested to answer these questionnaires independently. The demographic data were obtained by the use of the Porter Acceptance Scale, the first page of which was designed to collect such data (Appendix I).

The questionnaires and general instructions for completing them were distributed by the investigator at the first session of the
Creative Parenting program. The questionnaires were to be completed within a week and to be returned to the investigator at the beginning of session two of the program. Participants who did not bring the questionnaires back were to make arrangements with the investigator to return the questionnaires to her within the next day or two.

For those in control group one who took the pretest in January with no treatment to follow, the questionnaires were hand delivered to them and also hand collected within the same time frame as for experimental group one.

Posttest

At session nine of the Creative Parenting program, all participants were posttested using the research questionnaires. The participants were asked to return the completed questionnaires to the next and final session of the program. Distribution and collection followed the same procedure as used for the pretest questionnaires. For experimental groups 3 and 4 this same posttest procedure was followed. Participants who requested feedback of test results were contacted by the investigator upon completion of the study to discuss the individuals' own questionnaire results.
Analysis of Data

The Porter Acceptance Scale, the Report of Parents Behavior Inventory and the Family Adaptability and Cohesion Scale were all scored manually. Participants marked their answers on the questionnaires and these answers were manually transferred to answer sheets. Means and standard deviations were determined for the experimental groups and the control groups for each dependent variable.

Using the pretest scores of the dependent variables, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test for significant differences between the groups having taken the pretests. If no statistically significant differences were shown between means, all groups could be considered equivalent. Using posttest scores of the dependent variables the same process was followed. If any significant difference ($p=.05$) was shown among the means of the groups, the difference was attributed to treatment.

To investigate the pretest effect, the Solomon 4-group design was selected. If the pre-tests provided a practice effect, the result would be higher posttest scores of groups who received both treatment and pretest from the groups who received treatment and no pretests. If the
pretest sensitized the experimental groups to study specific content there would be greater difference on the posttests between the experimental groups and the control groups. To identify which groups were significantly different from one another the Duncan multiple group comparisons test was utilized.

The first section of Chapter IV reports the results of the data analyses, and the second part contains the tests of hypotheses. All significance tests in this study were performed at .05 level. This standard level of statistical significance was selected as it appeared to be the most satisfactory. It was the most commonly used level of statistical significance and there would be no unusual consequences if a Type I error occurred.
CHAPTER IV - DATA PRESENTATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

This chapter reports the results of the data analyses. The descriptive statistics are presented followed by a presentation of the inferential statistical tests of hypotheses.

**Descriptive Statistics**

Statistical analysis of demographic data was seen as significant to understanding the results of dependent variable data analysis. Table 4.1 reports a summary of the demographic data collected.

**Table 4.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Total Frequencies</th>
<th>Total Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-45 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Married</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Living with Spouse</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of Marriage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schooling Completed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post Graduate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fathers' Occupations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Service</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsman</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mothers' Occupations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Service</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Total Frequencies</td>
<td>Total Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A review of Table 4.1 shows the sample consisted of 70 parents, 55 female and 15 male. The age range was 25 to 49 years with 57 of the parents in the range 30 to 39 years. In this sample 58 of the parents were married and living with their spouse. The length of marriages ranged from 4 years to 20 years with 81.5% reporting being married between 4 to 14 years. In these families, 85% had no more than two children. The education level of the sample showed 82% had post secondary education with 31% of this group having trained at the graduate level. Occupations ranged from professionals to crafts people. In total, mothers and fathers who took the program and participated in the research study, there were 24 professionals. Twenty-six mothers defined themselves as "homemakers".

Research Groups for Data Analyses

Five groups were used in this study. Voluntary registration for the treatment (the Creative Parenting program), and voluntary participation in the study restricted random selection of participants. When registration was completed, the volunteer study subjects randomly assigned to groups and therefore treated as equivalent on the pretests. Table 4.2 identifies each group of the study and identifies the group number for each group.
Table 4.2

Identification of Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Number</th>
<th>Testing Times</th>
<th>Sample Size (n) Pretest</th>
<th>Sample Size (n) Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$0_1 \times 0_2$</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$\times 0_2$</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0_1 \times 0_2$</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$0_1 \times 0_2$</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$0_1 \times 0_2$</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the data analysis groups 0, 1, 2 are designated as the initial groups. Groups 3 and 4 are designated as replications of experimental group one.

Results of the Analysis of the Data

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted on pretest scores on each dependent variable of the groups pretested. Table 4.3 shows the results.

A review of Table 4.3 reveals that all groups with the exception of control group 2 wrote the pretests. The results, recorded on Table 4.3, showed that there were no statistically significant differences among the means of the pretest scores for the groups pretested. All groups could therefore be considered equivalent. These groups are not considered as equal as the means are different, but the difference is non-significant so they are said to be equivalent. The F-ratio showed the difference in means to be non-significant at a .05 level and therefore differences in the means could be attributed to chance.
Table 4.3

Mean, Standard Deviations (S.D.), F-Ratio, Probabilities
Across All Groups (Pretests)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>147.15</td>
<td>18.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>145.36</td>
<td>15.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>151.61</td>
<td>15.17</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>143.93</td>
<td>15.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olson (Cohesion)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>248.23</td>
<td>23.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>255.93</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>252.61</td>
<td>16.82</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>241.36</td>
<td>16.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olson (adaptability)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>178.00</td>
<td>15.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>180.79</td>
<td>13.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>177.17</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>170.93</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schluderman (authority)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.99</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.54</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.52</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.68</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schluderman (family disharmony)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.17</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.73</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.92</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the conclusion of the treatment (the Creative Parenting program), a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test at the .05 level of statistical significance was conducted on posttest scores of all groups for each dependent variable. Table 4.4 showed the results.
# Table 4.4

Means, Standard Deviations (S.D.), F-Ratio, and Probabilities Across All Groups (Posttests)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Porter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>146.54</td>
<td>17.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>160.79</td>
<td>16.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>155.36</td>
<td>16.06</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>162.73</td>
<td>15.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>165.89</td>
<td>10.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olson (Cohesion)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>256.08</td>
<td>21.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>254.21</td>
<td>19.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>246.00</td>
<td>16.78</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>245.73</td>
<td>15.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>242.67</td>
<td>19.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olson (adaptability)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>173.85</td>
<td>11.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>182.43</td>
<td>12.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>179.82</td>
<td>13.25</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>179.09</td>
<td>12.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>166.44</td>
<td>15.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schluderman (authority)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.79</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.37</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.15</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.79</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schluderman (family disharmony)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.53</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.62</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.12</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.35</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.97</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A review of Table 4.4 shows no significant differences at the .05 level on three dependent variables: the Family Cohesion Scale (Olson, H.D., Bell, R., Portner, J., 1979), the Family Adaptability Scale (Olson, H.D., Bell, R., Portner, J., 1979) and Family Disharmony on Report of Parent Behavior Inventory (Schluderman). On the Porter Parental Acceptance Scale (Porter, D.R., 1954) a probability of 0.05 is shown on the posttest means of the group scores. Family authority variable on the Report of Parent Behavior Inventory showed a 0.02 probability. Both represent statistical differences among means.

The Duncan multiple group comparisons procedure showed groups 1, 3, and 4, the experimental groups, to be significantly different from group 0, the control group, on the Porter Parental Acceptance Scale posttests.

With the authority subtest on the Report of Parent Behavior Inventory with posttest means, the Duncan multiple group comparisons procedure showed group 3 and 4 different from one another. Group 0 was shown to be different than group 3 and 2.

Group 2, an experimental group with no pretest, showed no significant mean difference from group 0, the control group. A possibility of pretest effect was suspected. To determine the existence or not of a pretest effect, the groups were categorized to test for pretest effect and treatment effect. In this analysis of the data,
group 3 and group 4 pretest scores were used as posttest scores (as if they had received no treatment like group 0, the control group. Recategorization of the groups is shown in Table 4.5

Table 4.5
Research Groups Reorganization to Test for Pretest and Treatment Effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>No Treatment</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Pretest</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6
Research Groups Organized for Data Analysis Using Solomon 4-Group Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Number</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Post/Pre</th>
<th>Sample n</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Sample n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0₁</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0₂</td>
<td></td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0₂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0₁</td>
<td></td>
<td>0₂</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0₁*</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0₂</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0₁*</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0₂</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* used as posttest scores like group 0)

Two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used with the reorganized data (Table 4.6) using the posttest scores of all the dependent variables. The means, F-ratio and probabilities are shown in Table 4.7.
### Table 4.7

**Means, F-Ratios, Probabilities for Groups with Treatment (T) vs. No Treatment (NT), and Pretest (P) vs. No Pretest (NP)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Porter Acceptance</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>158.50</td>
<td>6.116</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>147.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>150.07</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>153.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olson (Cohesion)</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>250.60</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>0.715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>250.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>247.26</td>
<td>3.077</td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>255.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olson (Adaptability)</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>181.28</td>
<td>1.931</td>
<td>0.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>175.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>175.81</td>
<td>1.300</td>
<td>0.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>180.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schluderman (Authority)</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11.27</td>
<td>5.683</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11.48</td>
<td>1.341</td>
<td>0.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schluderman (Disharmony)</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13.95</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td>0.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A review of Table 4.7 shows no significant difference at the .05 level for all groups. This result shows there was no pretest effect and any significant difference (.05) in groups be attributed to pretest effect. Table 4.7 shows a significant mean difference (.02) on the Porter Parental Acceptance Scale for groups receiving treatment and groups with no treatment. On Schluderman's Report on Parental Behavior Inventory, (authority) Table 4.7 shows a significant difference (0.02) between the treatment group and the non-treatment group. On the dependent variables of Family Disharmony, (Schluderman), cohesion and adaptability (Olson Faces) there was no significant mean difference between the group receiving treatment and the group with no treatment.

Tests of Hypotheses

The hypotheses were tested using analysis of variance (ANOVA) with pretest and posttest scores to determine significant mean differences at the 0.05 level of statistical significance among the groups. The results of these tests have been cited in Tables 4.3 and 4.4. The remainder of this chapter consists of a statement of each statistical hypothesis along with a summary of the results of each inferential test.

Hypothesis 1

There will be no statistically significant ($\alpha = .05$) difference in the mean rating of acceptance of children between parents participating in the Creative Parenting program and those not participating in the program as measured by the Parental Acceptance Scale, (Porter, 1954).
The results of the analysis of variance indicated that the null hypothesis should be rejected (Table 4.8).

Table 4.8
Means, Standard Deviations (S.D.), F-Ratios and Probabilities for all Groups (Porter Acceptance Scale)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>147.15</td>
<td>18.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>146.54</td>
<td>17.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>145.36</td>
<td>15.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>160.79</td>
<td>16.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>155.36</td>
<td>16.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>162.73</td>
<td>18.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>151.61</td>
<td>15.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>162.73</td>
<td>18.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>143.93</td>
<td>15.41</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>165.89</td>
<td>10.85</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A review of Table 4.8 showed no significant difference (p=0.55) in the means of the pretest scores among groups. With no significant difference and random assignment of subjects to groups, all groups can be considered equivalent.

There was a significant difference (p=0.05) in the means of the posttest scores among groups. Using the Duncan multiple group comparisons, the differences were shown to exist between groups 1, 3, and 4, the experimental groups, and group 0, the control group. Experimental group 2 showed no significant difference from the control group 0. This suggested the differences shown between groups 1, 3, 4, and group 0 could be attributed to treatment effect and possibly the pretest. Using the Solomon four-group research design, a two-way analysis of variance was used to test for the possible influence of the pretest. The data was reorganized by groups
receiving treatment and groups with no treatment and tested for significant ($\alpha = .05$) difference. The mean, F-ratio and probability of the groups are presented in Table 4.9 for the dependent variable-acceptance.

**Table 4.9**

**Means, F-Ratio, Probability for No Treatment, Treatment, No Pretest, Pretest (Parental Acceptance)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Treatment</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>147.46</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>158.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Pretest</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>150.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>153.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In reviewing Table 4.9, results show no significant difference (0.78) between groups pretested and groups with no pretest. The results also show a significant difference ($p=0.02$) for groups receiving treatment and groups with no treatment. The differences can be considered due to treatment. A higher mean score represents increased acceptance which is a positive change. The null hypothesis can be rejected. The pretest-posttest means are more graphically illustrated in Figure 1. Based on the ANOVA statistic as shown in Table 4.8, there is a statistically significant difference between the means for the experimental groups and the control group on the posttest.
Figure 1: Pretest and Posttest Mean Changes on Parental Acceptance Scale

Note: Increasing scores indicate change toward higher acceptance of child.
Hypothesis 2

There will be no statistically significant ($\alpha = .05$) difference in the mean rating of parental perception of family cohesion between subjects participating in the Creative Parenting program and those not participating in the program as measured by the Family Cohesion Evaluation Scale (FACES), Olson, Bell & Portner.

The results of the analysis of variance indicated that the null hypothesis should be retained (Table 4.10).

Table 4.10

Means, Standard Deviations (S.D.), F-ratios and Probabilities for all Groups (Family Cohesion Evaluation Scale): (FACES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 13</td>
<td>248.23</td>
<td>23.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>256.08</td>
<td>21.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 14</td>
<td>255.93</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>254.21</td>
<td>19.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 11</td>
<td>255.93</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>246.00</td>
<td>16.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 18</td>
<td>253.61</td>
<td>16.82</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>245.73</td>
<td>15.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 14</td>
<td>241.36</td>
<td>16.53</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>242.67</td>
<td>19.69</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A review of Table 4.10 showed no statistically significant difference ($p=0.14$) in the means of the pretest scores among the groups which suggested all groups were essentially equivalent. There was no significant difference ($p=0.36$) in the means of the posttest scores among groups, which suggested all groups remained essentially equivalent at the .05 level following treatment. The treatment was considered to have had no effect and the null hypothesis was retained.
Hypothesis 3

There will be no statistically significant ($\alpha = .05$) difference in the mean rating of parental perceptions of family adaptability between subjects participating in the Creative Parenting program and those not participating in the program as measured by the Family Adaptability Evaluation Scale, FACES, (Olson, Bell & Portner).

The results of the analysis of variance indicated that the null hypothesis should be retained (Table 4.11).

Table 4.11

Means, Standard Deviations (S.D.), F-ratios and Probabilities for all Groups (Family Adaptability Evaluation Scale): (FACES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>178.00</td>
<td>15.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>180.79</td>
<td>13.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>179.82</td>
<td>13.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>177.17</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>170.93</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A review of Table 4.11 shows no significant difference (p=0.29) in the means of the pretest scores among the groups, which suggested all groups were essentially equivalent. There was no significant difference in the means of the posttest scores among groups, which suggested all groups remained equivalent following treatment. The treatment can be considered to have no effect. The null hypothesis should be retained.
Hypothesis 4

There will be no statistically significant ($\alpha = .05$) difference in the mean rating of parental perceptions toward use of authority in child-rearing behaviors between subjects participating in the program and those not participating in the program as measured by the Report of Parent Behavior Inventory (RPBI).

The results of the analysis of variance indicated that the null hypothesis should be rejected (Table 4.12).

**Table 4.12**

Means, Standard Deviations (S.D.), F-ratios and Probabilities for all Groups Authority Family Report of Parental Behavior Inventory: (RPBI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.99</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.54</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.52</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.68</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.79</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.37</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.15</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.79</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the analysis of variance indicates that the null hypothesis should be rejected. There was no significant difference ($\alpha = .05$) shown in the means of the pretest scores among groups and therefore all groups can be considered essentially equivalent. There was a significant difference ($p=.02$) in posttest score means among groups. The Duncan multiple group comparisons procedure showed group 3 and 4 different from one another. Group 0 was shown to be different than group 3 and 2. This further supported rejection of the null hypothesis and suggested that the treatment made a significant ($\alpha = .05$) difference.
Using a two-way analysis of variance, these groups were tested for differences between pretested and no pretest groups and treatment and no treatment groups (Table 4.13).

Table 4.13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Treatment</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11.65</td>
<td>5.683</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Pretest</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11.48</td>
<td>1.341</td>
<td>0.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In reviewing Table 4.13, results show no significant difference (0.251) between groups pretested and groups not pretested. Therefore it can be concluded that there was no pretest effect. Results showed a significant difference (p=0.02) between groups receiving treatment and groups receiving no treatment. Hence, no significant pretest effect, the difference can be attributed due to the treatment. The null hypothesis was rejected.

The differences in pretest-posttest means are more graphically illustrated in Figure 2. Based on the analysis of variance statistics as shown in Table 4.14 there is a statistically significant (\( \alpha = 0.05 \)) difference between the means of the experimental groups 1,2,3,4 and the control group 0 on the posttest.
Figure 2: Pretest & Posttest Mean Changes on Authority
(Parental Behavior Inventory)

Note: Lower scores indicate change toward authority.
Hypothesis 5

There will be no statistically significant (α = .05) difference in the mean rating of parental perceptions of family disharmony between subjects participating in the program and those not participating in the program as measured by the Report of Parent Behavior Inventory (RPBI).

Table 4.14

Means, Standard Deviations (S.D.), F-Ratios and Probabilities for all Groups Family Disharmony Report of Parent Behavior Inventory (RPBI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.17</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.53</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.73</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.62</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.92</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.35</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.97</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A review of Table 4.14 shows no significant difference (p=0.72) in the means of the pretest scores among the groups, which suggested all groups were equivalent. There was no significant difference (p=0.83) in the means of the posttest scores among groups, which suggests all groups remained equivalent following treatment. There was no significant difference between the means of groups 1, 2, 3, and 4, experimental groups, and group 0, the control group. The treatment can be considered to have no effect. The null hypothesis was retained.

Summary

Experimental and control group parents reported their acceptance of the child by means of the Porter Acceptance Scale (Porter, B.R., 1954). Both groups reported family disharmony and authority by
the Report of Parent Behavior Inventory (Schudson & Schudson, RPBI). Both groups reported cohesion and adaptability of the family by Family Cohesion and Family Adaptability Scales (FACES), Olson, Bell and Portner.

Parental acceptance of the child and the authority variables both reported statistically significant gains at a .05 level between the experimental groups and the control group on the posttest. All other measures showed no statistically significant change between the experimental groups and the control group on the posttest.

The discussion of results, summary, limitations, and suggestions for further research are presented in Chapter V.
CHAPTER V - DISCUSSION, SUMMARY AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Discussion

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of the Creative Parenting program bringing about changes in parenting attitudes and approaches.

When considering the problem, this investigator chose to measure changes in:

(1) parental acceptance of children as perceived by the parent participants,

(2) the family climate of adaptability and cohesion as perceived by the participants,

(3) parental use of authority and parental flexibility as perceived by the participants.

Interpretation of Findings

Hypothesis 1:

The data summarized in Table 4.8 and Table 4.9 does not support the research hypothesis that states:

There will be no statistically significant ($\alpha = .05$) difference in the mean rating of acceptance of children between parents participating in the Creative Parenting program and those not participating in the program as measured by the Parental Acceptance Scale, (Porter, 1954).
Since the results of the data showed a significant difference (p = .051) in the means of the posttest scores among groups, which suggested all groups were not equivalent following treatment and there were significant mean differences (p = 0.02) for groups receiving treatment from groups receiving no treatment, the null hypothesis was rejected.

No studies, using a rigorous research design, appear in the literature that investigated a parent education program with the same theoretical base as the Creative Parenting program. Therefore it is not possible to compare directly studies that support or reject the findings of this study. There were studies whose findings suggest that parent education programs (specifically PET) helped parents become better facilitators of their children's emotional growth (Therriem, 1979; Summerlin & Ward, 1978; Pain, 1984). The results of these studies showed significant positive change in parents' attitudes following the parent education program, particularly in the dimensions of independence, trust and communication. When parents' attitudes change positively in these dimensions, the assertion could be made that parents would also become more accepting of their children. Stearn's (1971) study did not support this assertion. The results of Stearn's study showed that there appeared to be no relationship between democratic attitudes of parents and the parents' perceived acceptance of the children.
Levant and Doyle (1983) used the Porter Acceptance Scale (1954), as was used in this study, to measure change in acceptance of children following the treatment program, a Systematic Communication Skills parent education program with fathers of school age children. Levant's and Doyle's findings did not support the findings of this study. Results showed no significant ($\alpha = .05$) difference between groups following the treatment program. Levant & Doyle's study found that the parent education program they investigated did not effectively change the participants' perceptions of their acceptance of their children. This study investigating the Creative Parenting program using the Porter Acceptance Scale (1954) found the program was effective in changing the participants perceptions of their acceptance of their children. The different results of the two studies suggests that the Creative Parenting program has an impact on parental acceptance dimensions. This may be due to the nature of the two programs. The Systematic Communication Skill program is a skill building program and thus may not be sensitive to bringing about the change in attitudes toward children. The two studies were independent of one another and conducted with different population samples. Therefore it was not possible to assert that the Creative Parenting program was more effective than the systematic communication skills program.

In the Adlerian based parent education program studies, differences in parental attitudes toward their children and role as a parent were investigated to evaluate the effectiveness of the STEP parent education program. Findings from studies by Steed (1971),
Bennett (1973), Nordal (1976), Kieran and Berry (1975) reported no statistical evidence of change in parental attitudes concerning the parent-child relationship after participating in an Adlerian parent program. Again this may be due to the fact that the STEP program is basically skill training.

In the studies comparing two programs Anchor and Thomason (1977) investigated the effectiveness of PET and behavior modification programs to see if either program helped parents to become a "more skillful parent". The results showed that neither group of parents changed significantly following treatment. These results are of interest to this study as the sample population for Anchor and Thomason study was similar to the sample and target population of this study. That is, the parents were from middle to upper-middle socio-economic level, well educated, and Caucasian. The Anchor and Thomason (1977) study results showed neither program, PET or behavior modification was effective in creating change.

Anchor & Thomason (1977) suggested the lack of change shown in their study could be the result of the ceiling effect - that is parents didn't change because they already knew and practiced the principles and techniques the courses taught. When the similar sample population of their study and this study are considered (middle to middle-upper socio-economic level), the results of the Porter Acceptance Scale in this study do not support their suggestion. The range of scores for the Porter Acceptance Scale is 40 to 200. The higher the total acceptance
score, the more accepting the parent is (Porter, 1954). The total mean score for groups pretested was 147.32 which would indicate a high level of acceptance before treatment. Following the treatment the total mean score for the groups was 157.72 which was significantly different ($p = 0.05$). Based on these findings the assertion can be supported that a "ceiling effect" did not occur and the effectiveness of the Creative Parenting program in raising parents' acceptance of the children was demonstrated with a sample of parents who, prior to the Creative Parenting program had a high level of acceptance of their children.

The results of a two-way analysis of variance showed a significant mean difference ($p = 0.02$) on the Porter Parental Acceptance Scale for groups receiving treatment and groups with no treatment. The Creative Parenting program can be seen as effective in raising parents' acceptance of their children. This finding was not supported by the findings of other studies (Steed, 1971; Stearn, 1971, Kieran and Berry, 1975; Anchor & Thomason, 1977; Levant & Doyle, 1983).

Hypothesis 2:

The data summarized in Table 4.10 supports the research hypothesis that states:

There will be no statistically significant ($X = .05$) difference in the mean rating of parental perception of family cohesion between subjects participating in the Creative Parenting program as measured by the Family Cohesion Evaluation Scale, (Olson, Bell & Portner).
Since the results of data showed no significant difference ($p = 0.36$) in the means of the posttest scores among groups, which suggested all groups remained equivalent following treatment, the null hypothesis was retained.

Hypothesis 3:

The data summarized in Table 4.11 supports the research hypothesis that states:

There will be no statistically significant ($\alpha = .05$) difference in the mean rating of parental perceptions of family adaptability between subjects participating in the Creative Parenting program and those not participating in the program as measured by the Family Adaptability Evaluation Scale, (Olson, Bell & Portner).

Since the analysis of the data showed no significant difference ($p = 0.07$) in the means of posttest scores among groups, which suggested all groups remained equivalent following treatment, the null hypothesis was retained.

Family cohesion and family adaptability were both measured by the Family Adaptability and Cohesion Scale and are family interactional measures. The two dimensions are also related to one another (Olson, Bell & Portner, 1979). As both measures showed no significant ($\alpha = 0.05$) difference, and they are related, the results will be discussed together.
These findings with the family environment measures of cohesion and adaptability are in accord with the findings of Steed (1971) and Kieran & Berry (1975). The studies of Steed and Kieran and Berry are based in Adlerian theory and showed no change in family interactional processes and attitudes toward family relationships after participating in a parent education group. Family interactional processes and attitudes toward family relationships can be seen as intervening variables influencing family cohesion and family adaptability. Therefore if family interactional processes and attitudes toward family relationships remain unchanged for participants following parent education programs, the assertion can be made that family cohesion and family adaptability would also remain unchanged.

Steed (1971) suggested that sometimes the parenting education process involves a period of regression before positive changes occur. Pretest mean scores compared to the posttest mean scores for adaptability and cohesion did not show regression (Tables 4.10 & 4.11); Steed's suggestion was not found to be so in this study. Levant and Doyle (1983) suggested as a whole the family concept represents a process which has yet to run its course. Any changes in the family concept effected by a parent education program would therefore not be shown in an evaluation done at the conclusion of the program. Since the evaluation of program effectiveness was conducted at the conclusion of the Creative Parenting program, a possibility exists that Levant's and Doyle's suggestion applies to this study. A follow-up study at a later date would be required to investigate this possibility.
Pinsker & Geoffory (1981) investigated the effectiveness of the PET program on the family environment by use of the Family Environment Scale (MOOS, 1975). The results of their study showed more cohesion and less conflict in the families of those parents who participated in the PET program compared to the families of parents who participated in a behavior modification parent education program. The difference was attributed to more positive communication with the families following the program. The results of this study indicated that participation in the Creative Parenting program did not significantly (p = 0.36 cohesion; p = 0.07 adaptability) change the participants' perceptions of family cohesion and family adaptability. Pinsker & Geoffory's study does not support the findings of this study.

The PET program is based on communication skills training and the Creative Parenting is rooted in developmental psychology, therefore the philosophies and goals of the programs are different. Taking this into consideration, it is difficult to assert that there is any relationship in the findings of Pinsker & Geoffory (1981) study and this study though both investigations looked at the effectiveness of the parent education program on family cohesion.

Hypothesis 4:

The data summarized in Table 4.12 and Table 4.13 does not support the research hypothesis that states:

There will be no statistically significant difference in the mean rating of parental perceptions toward use of authority in child-rearing behaviors between subjects participating in the program and those not participating in the program as measured by the Report of Parent Behavior Inventory (RPBI).
Since the results of the data showed a significant change \( (p = 0.02) \) in the means of the posttest scores among groups which suggested all groups were not equivalent following treatment and there was a significant mean difference \( (p = 0.02) \) for groups receiving treatment from groups receiving no treatment, the null hypothesis was rejected.

With no studies in the literature that investigate the effectiveness of a parent education program model similar in theoretical orientation and format to the Creative Parenting program, it was not possible to directly compare the findings of other studies to the findings in this study. Authority as measured in the Report of Parent Behavior Inventory refers to the authoritarian behavior of the parent. Authoritarian behavior is defined as discouraging verbalization, breaking the will, martyrdom, strictness, exclusion of outside influences, parental control, approval of activity, and intrusiveness (Schluderman & Schluderman, 1979).

Democratic behaviors of trust, open communication and independence can be understood as opposite to authoritarian behavior defined by Schluderman & Schluderman (1979). If democratic attitudes and behaviors are positively changed (increased) then authoritarian behaviors would be reduced. Using this framework, it was possible to compare results of studies investigating the effectiveness of parent education programs on democratic attitudes and behaviors with this study which investigated parental attitudes and behaviors towards use of authority.
The findings of this study were in accord with those of Stearn (1971), Platt (1971), Berrett (1973), Stolzoff (1980) and Pain (1984). These studies showed that parental democratic attitudes toward their children using scientific research instruments were positively changed (improved) following the parents' participation in a parent education program. The findings of this study showed that following participation in the Creative Parenting program, parents perceived a reduction in use of their authority. The posttest scores for parents following treatment showed a lower mean of the scores (11.27) than the mean of the posttest scores (11.65) for those parents who did not receive treatment (the Creative Parenting program). The difference in these scores was statistically significant (p = 0.02). To say the findings of this study on the dimension of use of parental authority were supported in the literature would not be entirely accurate. The assertion that reduced use of authority would produce more democratic attitudes and behaviors was not discussed in the literature. However, the possibility of this assertion cannot be ignored.

Findings of this study on the dimension of use of parental authority were indirectly supported in Stevens' study (1984). Stevens investigated the relationship between parents knowledge about child development and their ability to design a quality home learning environment. Findings showed parents' awareness of interactional strategies which promote language development (as well as an awareness
of the value of parental teaching and the potency of play materials) was positively related to their parenting skills. It could be asserted that parents' awareness of interactional strategies which promote language development would reduce the use of parental authority as authoritarianism was defined in part as discouraging verbalization (Schluderman & Schluderman, 1979).

This assertion could not be strongly supported. However, the findings of Stevens (1984) that the parents' knowledge of child development was positively related to their parenting skills provided support for this finding on reduced use of authority after being enrolled in the Creative Parenting program.

Hypothesis 5:

The data summarized in Table 4.14 supports the research hypothesis that states:

There will be no statistically significant ($\chi = .05$) difference in the mean rating of parental perceptions of family disharmony between subjects participating in the program and those not participating in the program as measured by the Report of Parent Behavior Inventory (RPBI).

Since the analysis of the data showed no significant difference ($p = .83$) in the means of the posttest scores among groups, which suggested all groups remained equivalent following treatment, the null hypothesis was retained.
The intention was to measure the effects of the Creative Parenting program on participants perceptions of family disharmony. The interpretation of the results requires an understanding of the scoring system adapted by the Report of Parent Behavior Inventory (RPBI). On both dimensions of the RPBI, authoritarianism and family disharmony, the range of scores was from 5 to 20 points. A score of 20 was understood to represent a perception of maximum disharmony within the family and a score of 5 represented virtually no perceived family disharmony. A middle score range around 12.5 was considered the desirable balance and an optimum of functioning in the family (Schluderman & Schluderman). In this study the mean of the pretest scores for all groups was 13.67 which was slightly above the optimal score of 12.5: the mean of posttest scores for all groups was 13.71 again just above the optimum score of balance. Groups who received treatment had a mean of posttest scores of 13.78 and those who received no treatment showed a mean of 13.84. The assertion could be made that there was no statistically significant (p = .83) difference following treatment as the participants perceived the family disharmony as nearly the same following the treatment. These parents saw their families as balanced before taking the course. This assertion was supported by Anchor and Thomason (1977) as they also found in their study parents of higher education levels, middle to upper middle socio-economic levels with high occupational status that the parent training programs they investigated (PET and behavior modification) failed to facilitate significant changes in parents. They
suggest that these parents may realize the need for parent education more than parents of lower levels of education. These educated parents may enjoy the intellectual stimulation and social interaction involved in parent education classes (p.140).

If these are seen as valid assertions, the possibility also exists that the parents' perceptions of family disharmony before the course was confirmed by the training program as a balanced level of disharmony and therefore the parents would not desire or perceive change following the program.

In understanding the level of family disharmony another variable needs to be considered. The children of these parents were very young for the most part, and consequently, the level of discord would potentially be much lower than might be expected with adolescent children.

**Limitations of the Study**

A major limitation of this study was the lack of control over possible effects of demographic variables and the representativeness of the sample. There were a number of demographic variables which could have affected this study including: socio-economic status, education level of participants, geographic area from which the sample came, marital status, family size and age of the children of the participants.
The sample was restricted to a population of Caucasian parents from middle to upper middle socio-economic status with high levels of education and occupation. A significant number of participants were married with a family of no more than three children and lived in a middle to middle-upper residential area of Vancouver. A majority of the children in these families were pre-school age or younger.

With sample selection a violation in randomization is a possibility as the participants were parents who had voluntarily selected to take the Creative Parenting program and participate in the research study. The assignment of some participants to groups was restricted by the time in which they would begin the treatment in January or in April. Also most of the participants' volunteers were mothers, it was not possible to assess the impact of the program on fathers accurately. Thus generalizability of the research findings was reduced.

Another limitation of this study was that perhaps the instruments chosen were not sensitive enough to measure all the changes due to the treatment. The Porter Acceptance Scale (Porter, 1954) and the Report of Parental Behavior Instrument (Schluderman & Schluderman, 1979) did measure and showed significant changes in acceptance of the child and parental use of authority and therefore could be seen to have measured the concepts of the program. However, the Family Adaptability
and Cohesion Scales (FACES), Olson et al 1979, showed no changes in adaptability and cohesion in the family interactional variables. Are these concepts the Creative Parenting program addresses? Feedback from the participants suggested that the instrument did not fit with the course content. The possibility exists that other variables could have been measured which might have shown significant changes as the result of the treatment.

Another limitation was the participants' responses to the instruments. Feedback from the participants indicated that the instruments took too much time to fill out and many found the questionnaire difficult to complete because they perceived the questions as applying to families with children of school age and adolescents. For these two reasons some participants withdrew from the study and did not complete the posttest questionnaires. Many who had the same difficulties with the instruments did not withdraw and did complete the posttest questionnaires. It is possible their feelings about the questionnaires did influence their answers and the final score did not accurately reflect what effect the program had for them.

Implications and Future Research Suggestions

With a theoretical basis in the psychology of human development the Creative Parenting program provides participants with an understanding of children's development psychologically and nurturing
and supporting parenting behaviors. As children develop normatively and affectively, they have specific developmental needs. As parents learn that their role changes with the development of their children, they can develop an approach which enables them to become more effective in their parent-child relationship and with the responsibilities of the parenting role.

The results of this study supported the effectiveness of the Creative Parenting program since positive changes were reported in the participants' approaches to their children. Steven's (1984) study on child developmental knowledge and parenting skills showed that parents who were more aware of the potency of their behavior and of the physical environment for development were those who were observed to behave in ways more supportive of mental development. From Leler's (1982) review of parent education research with school-age children based on Adlerian principles, evidence is presented to suggest that when parent education focuses on knowledge acquisition alone and if care was taken to target potent parenting behaviors, some improvement in parenting behavior did occur. While Stevens (1984) and Leler (1982) findings lend support to the findings of this study, their reviews did not investigate a parent education program with developmental knowledge as the program's approach to parent education. Thus the following questions seem relevant: What changes can be demonstrated in parents' perceptions of their approach to their children following participation in the Creative Parenting program? Are these changes significant? How are they significant?
This research study is the only study to the best of this investigator's knowledge that has attempted to measure the effects of the Creative Parenting program or of any parent education program using a didactic format with a developmental psychology based model. This study involved a comparison of the effects of the Creative Parenting parent education program on participants to an equivalent control group and used a pre-post assessment to determine differences in the groups. No significant differences in family adaptability, family cohesion and family disharmony were reported. The significant differences that were reported statistically showed that the participants had raised their level of acceptance of their children and lowered their use of authority. These results seem to indicate that perhaps Creative Parenting is effective in terms of helping parents develop a parenting approach supportive of their child's development needs.

It should be noted that the investigator had received positive feedback from participants of the Creative Parenting program and from parents in the community who had taken the program previous to this research study. Parents reported that through the program they had gained important insights about their own personal development and were able to better understand themselves as a parent. Some suggested they would plan to take the program again and next time focus on their child.

It appeared from this feedback that as a result of this first experience with the program, many participants had undergone changes due
to self-evaluation which led to a concentrated self-improvement and an enhancement of the parent-child relationship. This view is supported by Pain (1984), Larson (1972), and Stolzoff (1980). The results of these studies revealed that a significant positive change in parents' attitudes resulted in positive effects in the parenting self concepts as parents.

The lecture style presentation of the program and the formal classroom environment of the Creative Parenting program should be of interest to program developers. Other well-known parent education programs such as STEP and PET use a more informal style with group discussion, roleplaying, demonstrations and modeling of skills. Group process and interactions are seen to be significant to the success of the programs. However, an assessment of which parenting approach is more effective has not been researched at this time (Robertson, 1984). Looking at the demographic variables of this sample gives some perspective to better understanding the reasons for the effectiveness of this study. The participants not only had high level occupations and above average socio-economic status, they also had a high level of formal education. The Creative Parenting program's lecture format and formal environmental would be consistent for these participants in the way they have been educated and their learning expectations. This assertion is supported by Stevens (1978) who states:

With regression accounted for, the characteristics of those who maximally benefit may reflect an optimal match between the program content, the delivery strategy, and the client characteristics (p.62).
The investigator reminds the reader of the demographics of the samples and sample selection when considering the results. It is recommended that the program be tested with a more representative sample or tested with different populations such as lower income, and educational levels. A study that could involve more fathers would be more balanced. Also it would be interesting to explore the effects of the program on parents of adolescents.

The effects of the Creative Parenting program on the children in the family needs to be investigated. In addition to measuring the children's behavior, the parents' behavior could be observed and rated. Parents' results were obtained through self-report instruments and how parents' attitude changes influence their behaviors with their children was not established in this study. An unbiased observer's ratings of parental behavior and family environment could be investigated.

In assessing the effectiveness of the Creative Parenting program, a follow-up study six months to a year following participation in the program would contribute to an understanding of the program effects. Changes in children's behavior are not likely to occur immediately following their parents' participation in any parent education program. Even when parental attitudes are changed, the positive effects upon their children may not be evident until later. This assertion was supported by Levant and Doyle (1983), Therriem (1979), and Pain (1984).
A follow-up study within a year needs to be conducted following the conclusion of treatment. It is hoped that such a follow-up can be carried out in the future.

Another modification of the study would be a replication of the study using a different instructor other than Dr. Gordon Neufeld. Dr. Neufeld developed the program and would be seen as an expert with the program. The question that is raised is; Would the Creative Parenting program be as effective and as well received if given by another qualified instructor? Would the results of a research study of the program with another instructor be different?

Robertson (1984) contends that parent education is grounded in two basic assumptions: (a) parent educators know what should be taught and that (b) they know what parent education is or should be. By researching current programs, the methods and subjects toward which parent education is focused, the field becomes more clearly defined. Through researching of parent education programs using a scientific research approach, a more comprehensive conception of parent education may emerge. Robertson asserts that:

"There is a need to develop a comprehensive theoretical model of parent education indicating (a) what effective parenting entails, (b) what should be taught to whom, and (c) what methods are most effective under what circumstances. Such a theoretical model would also specify what parental competencies are important at what ages and under what circumstances." (p.104)
In conclusion, this study has shown that the Creative Parenting program was effective in positively changing parental attitudes in two dimensions: (1) acceptance of their children, and (2) parental use of authority. While this study has demonstrated that the program is effective with a very specific population, the possibilities for expansion and adaption of the program are untapped. In terms of a "comprehensive theoretical model of parent education" this study suggests that the Creative Parenting program has a contribution to make.
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APPENDIX B

PORTER ACCEPTANCE SCALE
PORTER PARENTAL ACCEPTANCE SCALE

We are trying to learn more about parent-child relationships. To do this we need the cooperation and assistance of many parents. You can help us a great deal by filling out the attached questionnaire as frankly and as carefully as possible. Sincere and frank answers are requested so that valid data can be secured.

You will note that the questionnaire does not call for any mark of identification. Thus your answers as well as the many others will be absolutely anonymous. Furthermore, all of the responses will be treated confidentially and will be used only for purposes of scientific research.

Please answer all questions. If you cannot give the exact answer to a question, answer the best you can.

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Sex: Male___ Female___  2. Year of Birth___  3. Year of Marriage___

4. Living with spouse at present time. Yes___ No___

5. Married more than once. Yes___ No___

6. If married more than once, was previous marriage ended because of:
   ___death ___divorce ___other (Please state)____________________

7. Draw a circle around the number of years of schooling you have completed.

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
   Grade School  High School College Post Graduate

8. Religious Affiliation:
   ___Protestant ___Jewish ___None
   ___Catholic ___Other __________________

9. Was your childhood and adolescence, 10. Present family income (annual)
   for the most part, spent in:

   ___open country or village under 1000 ___ under $4,000
   ___a town of 1,000 to 5,000 ___ 4,000 to 7,000
   ___a city of 5,000 to 10,000 ___ 7,000 to 10,000
   ___a city of 10,000 to 50,000 ___ 10,000 to 13,000
   ___a city of 50,000 to 100,000 ___ 13,000 to 16,000
   ___a city of 100,000 to 250,000 ___ 16,000 to 25,000
   ___a city of 250,000 or over ___ 25,000 or over
11. Husband's occupation (Be specific such as Dairy Farmer, Drug Store Clerk, College Professor, Automobile Mechanic, etc.)

12. Wife's occupation

13. Ages of children (to nearest birthday)
   Ages of boys ___; ___; ___; ___;
   Ages of girls ___; ___; ___; ___;

While responding to the following questions, please think of only one child. If you have a child in the age range of six to ten years, choose that one. If you have more than one child in that age range, choose the one nearest to ten. If your children are all younger than six years, choose the one nearest six. Place a circle around the age (in question 13 above) of the one which you will be thinking of while answering the questions about your child. BE SURE AND REFER ONLY TO THIS CHILD WHILE ANSWERING THE QUESTIONS.

14. Is this child your: (circle one) Own Child Stepchild Adopted Child

INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR CHILD

Many parents say that their feeling of affection toward or for their child varies with his behavior and with circumstances. Will you please read each item carefully and place a check in the column which most nearly describes the degree of feeling of affection which you have for your child in that situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Feeling of Affection</th>
<th>A Much more</th>
<th>A little more</th>
<th>A little less</th>
<th>A much less</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Check One Column For Each Item Below</td>
<td>than usual</td>
<td>than usual</td>
<td>than usual</td>
<td>than usual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. When he is obedient

2. When he is with me

3. When he misbehaves in front of special guests

4. When he expresses unsolicited affection. "You're the nicest mommy (daddy) in the whole world."
5. When he is away from me

6. When he shows off in public

7. When he behaves according to my highest expectations

8. When he expresses angry and hateful things to me

9. When he does things I have hoped that he would not do

10. When we are doing things together

Listed below are several statements describing things which children do and say. Following each statement are five responses which suggest ways of feeling or courses of action.

Read each statement carefully and then place a circle around the letter in front of the one response which most nearly describes the feeling you usually have or the course of action you most generally take when your child says or does these things.

It is possible that you may find a few statements which describe a type of behavior which you have not yet experienced with your child. In such cases, mark the response which most nearly describes how you think you would feel or what you think you would do.

Be sure that you answer every statement and mark only one response for each statement.

11. When my child is shouting and dancing with excitement at a time when I want peace and quiet, it:

   a. Makes me feel annoyed
   b. Makes me want to know more about what excites him
   c. Makes me feel like punishing him
   d. Makes me feel that I will be glad when he is past this stage
   e. Makes me feel like telling him to stop

12. When my child misbehaves while others in the group he is with are behaving well, I:

   a. See to it that he behaves as the others
   b. Tell him it is important to behave well when he is in a group
   c. Let him alone if he isn't disturbing the others too much
   d. Ask him to tell me what he would like to do
   e. Help him find some activity that he can enjoy and at the same time not disturb the group
13. When my child is unable to do something which I think is important for him, it:

   a. Makes we want to help him find success in the things he can do
   b. Makes me feel disappointed in him
   c. Makes me wish he could do it
   d. Makes me realize that he can't do everything
   e. Makes me want to know more about the things he can do

14. When my child seems to be more fond of someone else (teacher, friend, relative) than me, it:

   a. Makes me realize that he is growing up
   b. Pleases me to see his interest widening to other people
   c. Makes me feel resentful
   d. Makes me feel that he doesn't appreciate what I have done for him
   e. Makes me wish he liked me more

15. When my child is faced with two or more choices and has to choose only one, I:

   a. Tell him which choice to make and why
   b. Think it through with him
   c. Point out the advantages and disadvantages of each, but let him decide for himself
   d. Tell him that I am sure he can make a wise choice and help him foresee the consequences
   e. Make the decision for him

16. When my child makes decisions without consulting me, I:

   a. Punish him for not consulting me
   b. Encourage him to make his own decisions if he can foresee the consequences
   c. Allow him to make many of his own decisions
   d. Suggest that we talk it over before he makes his decision
   e. Tell him he must consult me first before making a decision

17. When my child kicks, hits or knocks his things about, it:

   a. Makes me feel like telling him to stop
   b. Makes me feel like punishing him
   c. Pleases me that he feels free to express himself
   d. Makes me feel that I will be glad when he is past this stage
   e. Makes me feel annoyed
18. When my child is not interested in some of the usual activities of his age group, it:
   a. Makes me realize that each child is different
   b. Makes me wish he were interested in the same activities
   c. Makes me feel disappointed in him
   d. Makes me want to help him find ways to make the most of his interests
   e. Makes me want to know more about the activities in which he is interested

19. When my child acts silly and giggly, I:
   a. Tell him I know how he feels
   b. Pay no attention to him
   c. Tell him he shouldn't act that way
   d. Make him quit
   e. Tell him it is all right to feel that way, but help him find other ways of expressing himself

20. When my child prefers to do things with his friends rather than with his family, I:
   a. Encourage him to do things with his friends
   b. Accept this as part of growing up
   c. Plan special activities so that he will want to be with his family
   d. Try to minimize his association with his friends
   e. Make him stay with his family

21. When my child disagrees with me about something which I think is important, it:
   a. Makes me feel like punishing him
   b. Pleases me that he feels free to express himself
   c. Makes me feel like persuading him that I am right
   d. Makes me realize he has ideas of his own
   e. Makes me feel annoyed

22. When my child misbehaves while others in the group he is with are behaving well, it:
   a. Makes me realize that he does not always behave as others in his group
   b. Makes me feel embarrassed
   c. Makes me want to help him find the best ways to express his feelings
   d. Makes me wish he would behave like the others
   e. Makes me want to know more about his feelings
23. When my child is shouting and dancing with excitement at a time when I want peace and quiet, I:
   a. Give him something quiet to do
   b. Tell him that I wish he would stop
   c. Make him be quiet
   d. Let him tell me about what excites him
   e. Send him somewhere else

24. When my child seems to be more fond of someone else (teacher, friend, relative) than me, I:
   a. Try to minimize his association with that person
   b. Let him have such associations when I think he is ready for them
   c. Do some special things for him to remind him of how nice I am
   d. Point out the weaknesses and faults of that other person
   e. Encourage him to create and maintain such associations

25. When my child says angry and hateful things about me to my face, it:
   a. Makes me feel annoyed
   b. Makes me feel that I will be glad when he is past this stage
   c. Pleases me that he feels free to express himself
   d. Makes me feel like punishing him
   e. Makes me feel like telling him not to talk that way to me

26. When my child shows a deep interest in something I don't think is important, it:
   a. Makes me realize he has interests of his own
   b. Makes me want to help him find ways to make the most of his interest
   c. Makes me feel disappointed in him
   d. Makes me want to know more about his interests
   e. Makes me wish he were more interested in the things I think are important for him

27. When my child is unable to do some things as well as other in his group, I:
   a. Tell him he must try to do as well as the others
   b. Encourage him to keep trying
   c. Tell him that no one can do everything well
   d. Call his attention to the things he does well
   e. Help him make the most of the activities which he can do

28. When my child wants to do something which I am sure will lead to disappointment for him, I:
   a. Occasionally let him carry such an activity to its conclusion
   b. Don't let him do it
   c. Advise him not to do it
   d. Help him with it in order to ease the disappointment
   e. Point out what is likely to happen
29. When my child acts silly and giggly, it:
   a. Makes me feel that I will be glad when he is past this stage
   b. Pleases me that he feels free to express himself
   c. Makes me feel like punishing him
   d. Makes me feel like telling him to stop
   e. Makes me feel annoyed

30. When my child is faced with two or more choices and has to choose only one, it:
   a. Makes me feel that I should tell him which choice to make and why
   b. Makes me feel that I should point out the advantages and disadvantages
   c. Makes me hope that I have prepared him to choose wisely
   d. Makes me want to encourage him to make his own choice
   e. Makes me want to make the decision for him

31. When my child is unable to do something which I think is important for him, I:
   a. Tell him he must do better
   b. Help him make the most of the things which he can do
   c. Ask him to tell more more about the things which he can do
   d. Tell him that no one can do everything
   e. Encourage him to keep trying

32. When my child disagrees with me about something which I think is important, I:
   a. Tell him he shouldn't disagree with me
   b. Make him quit
   c. Listen to his side of the problem and change my mind if I am wrong
   d. Tell him maybe we can do it his way another time
   e. Explain that I am doing what is best for him

33. When my child is unable to do some things as well as others in his group, it:
   a. Makes me realize that he can't be best in everything
   b. Makes me wish he could do as well
   c. Makes me feel embarrassed
   d. Makes me want to help him find success in the things he can do
   e. Makes me want to know more about the things he can do well

34. When my child makes decisions without consulting me, it:
   a. Makes me hope that I have prepared him adequately to make his decisions
   b. Makes me wish he would consult me
   c. Makes me feel disturbed
   d. Makes me want to restrict his freedom
   e. Pleases me to see that as he grows he needs me less
35. When my child says angry and hateful things about me to my face, I:
   a. Tell him it's all right to feel that way, but help him find other ways of expressing himself
   b. Tell him I know how he feels
   c. Pay no attention to him
   d. Tell him he shouldn't say such things to me
   e. Make him quit

36. When my child kicks, hits and knocks his things about, I:
   a. Make him quit
   b. Tell him it is all right to feel that way, but help him find other ways of expressing himself
   c. Tell him he shouldn't do such things
   d. Tell him I know how he feels
   e. Pay no attention to him

37. When my child prefers to do things with his friends rather than with his family, it:
   a. Makes me wish he would spend more time with us
   b. Makes me feel resentful
   c. Pleases me to see his interests widening to other people
   d. Makes me feel he doesn't appreciate us
   e. Makes me realize that he is growing up

38. When my child wants to do something which I am sure will lead to disappointment for him, it:
   a. Makes me hope that I have prepared him to meet disappointment
   b. Makes me wish he didn't have to meet unpleasant experiences
   c. Makes me want to keep him from doing it
   d. Makes me realize that occasionally such an experience will be good for him
   e. Makes me want to postpone these experiences

39. When my child is not interested in some of the usual activities of his age group, I:
   a. Try to help him realize that it is important to be interested in the same things as others in his group
   b. Call his attention to the activities in which he is interested
   c. Tell him it is all right if he isn't interested in the same things
   d. See to it that he does the same things as others in his group
   e. Help him find ways of making the most of his interests

40. When my child shows a deep interest in something I don't think is important, I:
   a. Let him go ahead with his interest
   b. Ask him to tell me more about this interest
   c. Help him find ways to make the most of this interest
   d. Do everything I can to discourage his interest in it
   e. Try to interest him in more worthwhile things
APPENDIX C

REPORT OF PARENT BEHAVIOR INVENTORY (RPBI)

QUESTIONNAIRE TO WOMEN
Mother's PARI (Q4)
(Schludermann)

A QUESTIONNAIRE TO WOMEN (4)

Read each of the statements below and then rate them as follows:

A strongly agree   a mildly agree   d mildly disagree   D strongly disagree

Indicate your opinion by drawing a circle around the "A" if you strongly agree, around the "a" if you mildly agree, around the "d" if you mildly disagree, and around the "D" if you strongly disagree.

There are no right or wrong answers, so answer according to your own opinion. It is very important to the study that all questions be answered. Many of the statements will seem alike but all are necessary to show slight differences of opinion.

1. Children should be allowed to disagree with their parents if they feel their own ideas are better.

2. A good mother lets her child learn the hard way about life.

3. A good mother should develop interests outside the home.

4. The home is the only thing that matters to a good mother.

5. Parents shouldn't feel they have to sacrifice for their children.

6. Mothers worry too much about bathing babies.

7. There is no reason for arguments in a happy marriage.

8. Strict training will make a child resent his parents later on.

9. There is no reason why a day with the children should be upsetting.

10. Children have every right to question their mother's views.

Agree Disagree

A a d D

A a d D

A a d D

A a d D

A a d D

A a d D

A a d D

A a d D

A a d D

A a d D
11. Loyalty on the part of children to their parents is something that the parents should earn. A a d D
12. Children should be taught to fight so they can take care of themselves. A a d D
13. Taking care of a home doesn't have to coop a woman up. A a d D
14. Parents should adjust to the children some, rather than always expecting the children to adjust to the parents. A a d D
15. A child needs time to just sit around and do nothing if he feels like it. A a d D
16. Children should be encouraged to talk about their problems. A a d D
17. Fathers generally are kind and helpful. A a d D
18. Children should be taught about sex as soon as possible. A a d D
19. It is not the mother's place to make the rules for the home. A a d D
20. A child's thoughts and ideas are his own business. A a d D
21. Children would be happier and better behaved if parents would show an interest in their affairs. A a d D
22. Very few children are toilet trained by 15 months of age. A a d D
23. A young mother doesn't need any help when going through her first experience. A a d D
24. Children should be encouraged to tell their parents about it whenever they feel family rules are unreasonable. A a d D
25. A child has to learn that he has to be disappointed sometimes. A a d D
26. A good mother has an active social life. A a d D
27. You can't make a child behave by cracking down on him. A a d D
28. There is no reason why a mother can't be happy and make her child happy too. A a d D
29. Most young mothers don't worry much about handling or holding the baby.  
30. A good wife never has to argue with her husband.  
31. Strict discipline makes children grow up to be mean or rebellious.  
32. Most mothers never get to the point where they can't stand their children.  
33. If a parent is wrong he should admit it to his child.  
34. A child should be taught that there are many other people he will love and respect as much or more than his own parents.  
35. A child should be taught to fight his own battles.  
36. Most mothers are content to be with children all the time.  
37. Parents must earn the respect of their children by the way they act.  
38. There is plenty of time for children to strive for success after they are older.  
39. A child should always be encouraged to talk about his troubles.  
40. Husbands have a perfect right to their own interests.  
41. There is nothing wrong with bathing boys and girls in the same bathtub.  
42. The family is better off when the husband settles most of the family problems.  
43. Children are entitled to keep their own secrets.  
44. Laughing at children's jokes and telling children jokes makes things go more smoothly.  
45. A child should take all the time he wants before he walks.  
46. Women should handle most of child raising without much help from others.  
47. A child has a right to his own point of view and ought to be allowed to express it.
48. Children should be encouraged to undertake tough jobs if they want to.

49. A mother can keep a nice home and still have plenty of time left over to visit with neighbours and friends.

50. There is no need for children to look on parents as their bosses.

51. Most children are grateful to their parents.

52. Little accidents are bound to happen when caring for young children.

53. If a couple really loves each other there are very few arguments in their married life.

54. If children are given too many rules they will grow up to be unhappy adults.

55. Most mothers can spend all day with their children and remain calm and even-tempered.

56. A child should be encouraged to look for answers to his questions from other people even if the answers contradict his parents.

57. Most children soon learn that their parents were mistaken in many of their ideas.

58. It's quite natural for children to hit one another.

59. Most young mothers don't mind spending most of their time at home.

60. Children are too often asked to do all the compromising and adjustment and what is not fair.

61. Children should have lots of time to loaf and play.

62. A mother should be concerned with any problem of a child no matter how trivial.

63. In most cases the mother rather than the father is responsible for trouble in the home.

64. Sex play is a normal thing in children.

65. A mother should take a back seat to her husband as far as the planning is concerned.
66. A good parent doesn't try to pry into the child's thoughts.
67. Parents who are interested in hearing about their children's parties, dates and fun, help them grow up right.
68. A child needs to be emotionally close to its parents for a long time.
69. A woman should be on her own after having a baby.
70. A child's ideas should be seriously considered in making family decisions.
71. Children have to face difficult situations on their own.
72. Mothers should get out of the home fairly often.
73. If a child acts mean he needs understanding rather than punishment.
74. Children don't "owe" their mothers anything.
75. Most mothers are confident when handling their babies.
76. Almost any problem can be settled by quietly talking it over.
77. Raising children is an easy job.
78. Most children are disciplined too much.
79. When a child thinks his parent is wrong he should say so.
80. A parent should not expect to be more highly esteemed than other worthy adults in their children's eyes.
81. Children should be taught ways of defending themselves in a fight.
82. If you can run your home right, you have plenty of time to do the things you like to do.
83. As much as is reasonable a parent should try to treat a child as an equal.
84. It isn't good for children to be constantly running from one activity to another.
85. A mother should always be concerned about upset feelings in a child.

86. Most husbands show a good understanding for a mother's problems.

87. Sex is no great problem for children if the parent doesn't make it one.

88. It's up to the father to take charge of the family.

89. Being a mother doesn't give women the right to know everything in their children's lives.

90. If parents would have fun with their children, the children would be more apt to take their advice.

91. Toilet training should be put off until a child indicates that he is ready.

92. A woman should be up and around a short time after giving birth.

93. When a child is in trouble he ought to know he won't be punished for talking about it with his parents.

94. Children should be encouraged to undertake all kinds of jobs no matter how hard.

95. It is important for a mother to have a social life outside of the family.

96. Children have a right to rebel and to be stubborn sometimes.

97. Having children doesn't mean you can't have as much fun as you usually do.

98. Mothers shouldn't worry much about calamities that might happen to their children.

99. Husbands and wives who have different views can still get along without arguments.

100. Strict training makes children unhappy.

101. A mother should keep control of her temper even when children are demanding.

102. A good mother should keep control of her temper even when children are around.
103. Loyalty to parents is an over-emphasized virtue.

104. Most parents prefer a "scrappy" child to be a quiet one.

105. Most young mothers are pretty content with home life.

106. There is no reason parents should have their own way all the time anymore than that children should have their own way all the time.

107. A child should have time to just dawdle or daydream.

108. Anything a child wants to tell a parent is important enough to listen to.

109. Most men try to take their wives out as often as they can.

110. Children are normally curious about sex.

111. Most wives think it best that the husband take the lead in family affairs.

112. Every child should have an inner life which is only his business.

113. When you do things together, children feel close to you and can talk easier.

114. The longer a child is bottle or brest fed the more secure he will feel.

115. Any woman should be able to take care of a baby by herself.

116. Some children are just so bad they must be taught to fear adults for their own good.

117. More parents should teach their children to have unquestioning loyalty to them.

118. Children will get on any woman's nerves if she has to be with them all day.

119. It is frequently necessary to drive the mischief out of a child before he will behave.

120. The child should be taught to revere his parents above all other grown-ups.
121. Mothers very often feel that they can't stand their children a moment longer.

122. A wise parent will teach a child early just who is boss.

123. A child soon learns that there is no greater wisdom than that of his parents.

124. It's a rare mother who can be sweet and even-tempered with her children all day.

125. Children need some of the natural meanness taken out of them.

126. Parents deserve the highest regard and esteem of their children.

127. Raising children is a nerve-wracking job.

128. It is sometimes necessary for the parents to break the child's will.

129. Loyalty to parents comes before anything else.

130. It's natural for a mother to "blow her top" when children are selfish and demanding.
APPENDIX D

REPORT OF PARENT BEHAVIOR INVENTORY (RPBI)

QUESTIONNAIRE TO MEN
A QUESTIONNAIRE TO MEN (4)

Reach each of the statements below and then rate them as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>mildly Agree</th>
<th>mildly Disagree</th>
<th>strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>mildly agree</td>
<td>mildly disagree</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicate your opinion by drawing a circle around the "A" if you strongly agree, around the "a" if you mildly agree, around the "d" if you mildly disagree, and around the "D" if you strongly disagree.

There are no right or wrong answers, so answer according to your own opinion. It is very important to the study that all questions be answered. Many of the statements will seem alike but all are necessary to show slight differences of opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Children should be allowed to gripe about rules which their parents make.</td>
<td>A a d D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A good father lets his child learn the hard way about life.</td>
<td>A a d D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A child should never be taught to fear adults.</td>
<td>A a d D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It is no use trying to make a child behave by slapping the child immediately for getting into mischief.</td>
<td>A a d D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Deceiving a child is very often necessary for his own good.</td>
<td>A a d D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. There is no reason for arguments in a happy marriage.</td>
<td>A a d D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Children who are troublemakers have most likely been spanked too much.</td>
<td>A a d D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Loyalty on the part of children to their parents is something the parents should earn.</td>
<td>A a d D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The things the wife and children ask of a man after his hard day's work are enough to make anyone lose his temper at times.</td>
<td>A a d D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Strict training will make a child resent his parents later on.</td>
<td>A a d D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. A child who is not afraid to show his emotions will do well in life.

12. Children should be taught not to be content with what they have, but to strive for better things.

13. Children must often be taught to do certain things by just being left on their own.

14. A child should learn that he has to be disappointed sometimes.

15. You can’t make a child behave by cracking down on him.

16. If small children refuse to obey, parents should not whip them for it.

17. A good wife never has to argue with her husband.

18. Physical punishment makes a child fear adults and this is the worst thing that can happen to a child.

19. Strict discipline makes children grow up to be mean or rebellious.

20. There is nothing wrong with bathing boys and girls in the same bathtub.

21. A father has no right to demand that the whole family must do what he knows is best.

22. Few wives realize that husbands are part of the family too, and need some looking after.

23. It is not a mistake, when a man worries a woman who always wants to wear pants in the family.

24. Children should not be spanked immediately, when they are cross and nagging because that makes them obstinate and they get into the habit of acting like that.

25. If a couple really loves each other, there are very few arguments in their married life.

26. Spanking a child makes it impossible for him to love and respect his parents.

27. Having to be with the family all the time gives a man the feeling that his wings have been clipped.
28. It's quite natural for children to hit one another.

29. Most children soon learn that their parents were mistaken in many of their ideas.

30. There is nothing wrong when outsiders upset the confidence a child has in his parent's way of doing things.

31. It's no wonder that men reach their boiling point, when as soon as they come in the door at home, they run right into family problems.

32. Sex play is a normal thing in children.

33. There should not be a boss in the family, and the father should not boss the family around.

34. One thing that marriage means is that a wife belongs to the husband and not to her parents or other people she knows.

35. Children should be trained to be independent by forcing them to do their own work.

36. A child's ideas should be seriously considered in making family decisions.

37. Children have to face difficult situations on their own.

38. If a child acts mean he needs understanding rather than punishment.

39. The wise parent will not whip a child to teach him to change his ways.

40. Children should be taught ways of defending themselves in a fight.

41. A parent should not expect to be more highly esteemed than other worthy adults in their child's eyes.

42. Children have a right to question their father's views.

43. There are times when any husband or father gets to the point where he feels he can't stand his family a moment longer.

44. Most children are disciplined too much.
45. The old fashioned family, where the father is in charge, is a very bad thing.
46. Most husbands would do better, if they quit trying to look smarter than their wives.
47. Parents who teach children to express freely (uncontrollably) how they feel help them to get along better in life.
48. Parents who allow their children to grow up with an idea that other people will often help them just encourage them to become failures.
49. Children should be encouraged to undertake all kinds of jobs no matter how hard.
50. It is no use whipping children who are always breaking their parents' rules.
51. Often you have to fool children to get them to do what they should without a big fuss.
52. Husbands and wives who have different views can still get along without arguments.
53. Settling down to family life is hard for a man because it means giving up so many other things.
54. Loyalty to parents is an over-emphasized virtue.
55. A man needs to 'blow his top' once in a while around the home just to clear the air a bit.
56. Strict training makes children unhappy.
57. Children are normally curious about sex.
58. The mother should be the final authority in the family.
59. Wives should be encouraged to have more say in running the family affairs.
60. The best attitude for a child to learn is not to take things as they are, but to work to improve his situation.
61. Children should at all times be told to fight their own battles.
62. Children should be encouraged to express their opinions about everything which involves them.

63. Children are most lovable when they become self-reliant.

64. You cannot train children by breaking them the way you break in horses.

65. Trying to be completely honest with a young child is just doing things the hard way.

66. Only a cruel parent would use physical punishment on a child.

67. Men don't know how much they enjoy being free to do as they please, until they begin raising a family.

68. Children should be allowed to hit back, when someone hits them.

69. Children should not be taught to love their parents always above everyone else.

70. When a child thinks his parent is wrong he should say so.

71. A man has a right to be angry and irritated when the family doesn't give him a chance to relax at home.

72. It is very harmful to warn children about sex. There is no harm if they sometimes indulge in sex play.

73. Wives too often use the children as an excuse for ignoring the father.

74. A parent does much harm to a child when he teaches him to keep from showing it, when he is 'boiling' inside.

75. A child should not be taught that about all one can expect to do is to make the best of what one has.

76. The child who grows up with the idea that he will have to do almost everything for himself gets much further in life.

77. Family life would be happier, if parents made children feel that they were free to say what they think about anything.
78. You have to fool children into doing many things because they wouldn't understand why they should be done anyway.

79. Before marriage, most men don't realize how much of burden the responsibility of a family can be.

80. A good child learns to fight for its own rights.

81. One should not attempt to safeguard a child's trust in his parents by preventing the child from meeting people with different ideas.

82. The ideal home is one in which it is clear to all that the mother is head of the household.

83. Too many wives are so busy with friends, relatives or the children that they forget all about the man they married.

84. The trouble with husbands nowadays is that they don't have any respect for a wife's right to have her say so.

85. A child who always looks calm and cool no matter how upset he feels inside does not get along well.

86. Children should be taught not to be satisfied with life as it is and to make every effort to improve their condition.

87. Children should be allowed to disagree with their parents if they feel their own ideas are better.

88. Children who have fear of adults will get into trouble.

89. When you can get kids doing what you want by being a little clever, there's no use wasting a lot of time explaining.

90. In marriage a person must yield his rights in order to avoid a fight.

91. Children never feel the same about a parent who spanks them.

92. Most young fathers are bothered more by the feeling of being tied to the home than anything else.
93. Children who are 'tomboys' or 'regular guys' are preferable to those who are gentlemanly or ladylike.

94. Children should learn to think for themselves by comparing the ideas learned outside the home with their parents' ideas.

95. A parent should sometimes let children get away with things they aren't supposed to do.

96. Many well behaved children are curious about sex.

97. It's a rare wife who pays as much attention to her husband after the marriage.

98. A wife's mother too often gives her the idea that she must respect what her husband says.

99. Parents should teach a child to express his feelings as soon as he can understand.

100. The main thing in growing up is to learn not to take things as they are, but to improve your situation in life.

101. Some children are just so bad that they must be taught to fear adults for their own good.

102. More parents should teach their children to have unquestioning loyalty to them.

103. After a hard day's work a father should listen patiently to all the questions a wife and children ask.

104. It is frequently necessary to drive the mischief out of a child before he will behave.

105. A child soon learns that there is no greater wisdom than that of his parents.

106. There is no excuse for men to reach their boiling point when they run into family problems on their return home from work.

107. Children need some of the natural meanness taken out of them.

108. Parents deserve the highest esteem and regard of their children.
109. A father or husband should never get irritated about family problems, no matter how tired he is or how silly the problems are. 

110. Many children, like horses, must be broken in in order to be trained. 

111. Loyalty to parents comes before anything else. 

112. When at home a father must never get angry and 'blow his top'. 

113. To keep from getting into trouble, a child should have a healthy fear of adults. 

114. A child should always love his parents above everyone else. 

115. No man has a right to be angry and irritated when the family doesn't give him the chance to relax at home.
APPENDIX E

FAMILY ADAPTABILITY AND COHESION EVALUATION SCALES (FACES)
Thank you for taking the time to fill out the following questions. Your input will give us an indication of how well the program is working.

INSTRUCTIONS

Answer the following by placing 4 = true all the time
3 = true most of the time
2 = true some of the time
1 = true none of the time

beside each statement as it pertains to you.

Please enclose the completed form in the envelope provided and give it to your son or daughter to give to the counsellor at school who will pass it on to the authors of the program.

FACES

4 = true all the time 2 = true some of the time
3 = true most of the time 1 = true none of the time

___ 1. Family members are concerned with each other's welfare.
___ 2. Family members feel free to say what's on their mind.
___ 3. We don't have spur of the moment guests at mealtime.
___ 4. It is hard to know who the leader is in our family.
___ 5. It's difficult for family members to take time away from the family.
___ 6. Family members are afraid to tell the truth because of how harsh the punishment will be.
___ 7. Most personal friends are not family friends.
___ 8. Family members talk a lot but nothing ever gets done.
___ 9. Family members feel guilty if they want to spend some time alone.
___ 10. There are times when other family members do things that make me unhappy.
11. In our family we know where all family members are at all times.
12. Family members have some say in what is required of them.
13. The parents in our family stick together.
14. I have some needs that are not being met by family members.
15. Family members make the rules together.
16. It seems like there is never any place to be alone in our house.
17. It is difficult to keep track of what other family members are doing.
18. Family members do not check with each other when making decisions.
19. My family completely understand and sympathizes with my every mood.
20. Family ties are more important to us than any friendship could possibly be.
21. When our family has an argument, family members just keep to themselves.
22. Family members often answer questions that were addressed to another person.
23. The parents check with the children before making important decisions in our family.
24. Family members like to spend some of their free time with each other.
25. Punishment is usually pretty fair in our family.
26. Family members are encouraged to have friends of their own as well as family friends.
27. Family members discuss problems and usually feel good about the solutions.
28. Family members share almost all interests and hobbies with each other.
29. Our family is not a perfect success.
30. Family members are extremely independent.
31. No one in our family seems to be able to keep track of what their duties are.
32. Family members feel it's "everyone for themselves".
33. Every new thing I've learned about my family has pleased me.
34. Our family has a rule for almost every possible situation.
35. We respect each other's privacy.
36. Once our family has planned to do something, it's difficult to change it.
37. In our family we are on our own when there is a problem to solve.
38. I have never regretted being with my family, not even for a moment.
39. Family members do not turn to each other when they need help.
40. It is hard to know what other family members are thinking.
41. Family members make visitors feel at home.
42. Parents make all of the important decisions in our family.
43. Even when everyone is home, family members spend their time separately.
44. Parents and children in our family discuss together the method of punishment.
45. Family members have little need for friends because the family is so close.
46. We feel good about our ability to solve problems.
47. Although family members have individual interests, they still participate in family activities.
48. My family has all the qualities I've always wanted in a family.
49. Family members are totally on their own in developing their ideas.
50. Once a task is assigned to a family member, there is no chance of changing it.
51. Family members seldom take sides against other members.
52. There are times when I do not feel a great deal of love and affection for my family.
53. When rules are broken, family members are treated fairly.
54. Family members don't enter each other's areas or activities.
55. Family members encourage each other's efforts to find new ways of doing things.
56. Family members discuss important decisions with each other, but usually make their own choices.
57. If I could be a part of any family in the world, I could not have a better match.
58. Home is one of the loneliest places to be.
59. In our family, it's important for everyone to express their opinion.
60. Family members find it easier to discuss things with persons outside the family.
61. There is no leadership in our family.
62. We try to plan some things during the week so we can all be together.
63. Family members are not punished or reprimanded when they do something wrong.
64. In our family we know each other's close friends.
65. Our family does not discuss its problems.
66. Our family doesn't do things together.
67. If my family has any faults, I am not aware of them.
68. Family members enjoy doing things alone as well as together.
69. In our family, everyone shares responsibilities.
70. Parents agree on how to handle the children.
71. I don't think anyone could possibly be happier than my family and I when we are together.
72. It is unclear what will happen when rules are broken in our family.
73. When a bedroom door is shut, family members will knock before entering.
74. If one way doesn't work in our family, we try another.
75. Family members are expected to have the approval of others before making decisions.
76. Family members are totally involved in each other's lives.
77. Family members speak their minds without considering how it will affect others.
78. Family members feel comfortable inviting their friends along on family activities.
79. Each family member has at least some say in major family decisions.
80. Family members feel pressured to spend most free time together.
81. Members of our family can get away with almost anything.
82. Family members share the same friends.
83. When trying to solve problems, family members jump from one attempted solution to another without giving any of them time to work.
84. We have difficulty thinking of things to do as a family.
85. Family members understand each other completely.
86. It seems as if we agree on everything.
87. It seems as if males and females never do the same chores in our family.
88. Family members know who will agree and who will disagree with them on most family matters.
89. My family could be happier than it is.
90. There is strict punishment for breaking rules in our family.
91. Family members seem to avoid contact with each other when at home.
92. For no apparent reason, family members seem to change their minds.
93. We decide together on family matters and separately on personal matters.
94. Our family has a balance of closeness and separateness.
95. Family members rarely say what they want.
96. It seems there are always people around home who are not members of the family.
97. Certain family members order everyone else around.
98. It seems as if family members can never find time to be together.
99. Family members are severely punished for anything they do wrong.
100. We know very little about the friends of other family members.
101. Family members feel they have no say in solving problems.
102. Members of our family share many interests.
103. Our family is as well adjusted as any family in this world can be.
104. Family members are encouraged to do their own thing.
105. Family members never know how others are going to act.
106. Certain individuals seem to cause most of our family problems.
107. I don't think any family could live together with greater harmony than my family.
108. It is hard to know what the rules are in our family because they always change.
109. Family members find it hard to get away from each other.
110. Family members feel that the family will never change.
111. Family members feel they have to go along with what the family decides to do.
APPENDIX F

LETTERS REQUESTING PARTICIPATION IN THE RESEARCH STUDY
APPENDIX G

PROCEDURE FOR RECRUITMENT OF VOLUNTEERS
PROCEDURE FOR RECRUITMENT OF VOLUNTEERS
FLOW CHART AND SCHEDULE

I. RECRUITMENT OF VOLUNTEERS

A. Two letters will introduce the research study and request participation of those enrolled in the courses:

1. Gordon Neufeld will write a covering letter.

2. A letter from the Department of Counselling Psychology from the Researcher, John Friesen, will describe the purpose of the study, introduce the research assistant, Gael Paddack, outline the time commitment and describe the questionnaires.

B. January 17 - These letters will be mailed to the parents enrolled from the spring program who will form the control group.

C. January 20 - These letters will be distributed to each participant at the first session of the Creative Parenting program.

II. ESTABLISHING THOSE WHO WILL PARTICIPATE IN THE STUDY

A. January 22 (Wednesday) - Follow-up phone calls will be made to each person receiving the letters to establish those who are willing to participate in the study.

B. Outline of Telephone Interview

1. Introduce myself as the research assistant and ask if they have read the letter and have any questions about the study.

2. Discuss with the parent any concerns they express and if necessary clarify what we are asking them to do as a participant.

3. Ask the parent if he/she is willing to participate in the study.

4. Explain that the package of questionnaires will be delivered personally and arrange a delivery time.

5. Explain that there will be a follow-up phone call to give the parent a chance to ask any questions about the instruments or clarify anything that might be confusing.
6. Explain the need to have the questionnaires completed by the following session (for those in the first group) and by a set date (for those in the spring group).

7. Explain that their participation will also be necessary at the conclusion of the program by again completing the questionnaires.

8. Following the completion of the study offer the participants the opportunity to meet with me to look at their own answers to the questionnaires if they desire.

9. Answer any further questions and re-confirm drop-off time and completion time.

10. Thank parents for their cooperation.
APPENDIX H

CONSENT FORM
I agree to participate in a study evaluating the effectiveness of the "Creative Parenting" program. I understand that participation in the evaluation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time or refuse to answer any question.

I understand I will be required to answer questionnaires which will take me approximately 3 hours totally. I do this with the understanding that the information will be kept confidential, used for program evaluation purposes only, and destroyed at the end of its usefulness.

Signed: ____________________________
APPENDIX I

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA FORM
PORTER PARENTAL ACCEPTANCE SCALE

We are trying to learn more about parent-child relationships. To do this we need the cooperation and assistance of many parents. You can help us a great deal by filling out the attached questionnaire as frankly and as carefully as possible. Sincere and frank answers are requested so that valid data can be secured.

You will note that the questionnaire does not call for any mark of identification. Thus your answers as well as the many others will be absolutely anonymous. Furthermore, all of the responses will be treated confidentially and will be used only for purposes of scientific research.

Please answer all questions. If you cannot give the exact answer to a question, answer the best you can.

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Sex: Male___ Female___  2. Year of Birth___  3. Year of Marriage___
4. Living with spouse at present time. Yes___ No___
5. Married more than once. Yes___ No___
6. If married more than once, was previous marriage ended because of: ___death ___divorce ___other (Please state)__________________________
7. Draw a circle around the number of years of schooling you have completed.

   Grade School  High School  College  Post Graduate
   12345678  1234  1234  1234

8. Religious Affiliation:
   ___Protestant  ___Jewish  ___None
   ___Catholic  ___Other ____________________
9. Was your childhood and adolescence,  10. Present family income (annual) for the most part, spent in:
   ___open country or village under 1000 ___under $4,000
   ___a town of 1,000 to 5,000 ___4,000 tp 7,000
   ___a city of 5,000 to 10,000 ___7,000 to 10,000
   ___a city of 10,00 to 50,000 ___10,000 to 13,000
   ___a city of 50,000 to 100,000 ___13,000 to 16,000
   ___a city of 100,000 to 250,000 ___16,000 to 25,000
   ___a city of 250,000 or over ___25,000 or over
11. Husband's occupation (Be specific such as Dairy Farmer, Drug Store Clerk, College Professor, Automobile Mechanic, etc.)

12. Wife's occupation

13. Ages of children (to nearest birthday)
   Ages of boys __; __; __; __;
   Ages of girls __; __; __; __;

While responding to the following questions, please think of only one child. If you have a child in the age range of six to ten years, choose that one. If you have more than one child in that age range, choose the one nearest to ten. If your children are all younger than six years, choose the one nearest six. Place a circle around the age (in question 13 above) of the one which you will be thinking of while answering the questions about your child. BE SURE AND REFER ONLY TO THIS CHILD WHILE ANSWERING THE QUESTIONS.

14. Is this child your: (circle one) Own Child  Stepchild  Adopted Child