

OVERVIEW

This **MONOGRAPH: PARENTING STYLES AND PROGRAM IMPACT** presents the data collected from 3080 parents who completed both Pre and Post Questionnaires as part of their participation in the ***Strengthening Multi-Ethnic Families and Communities: A Violence Prevention Parent Training Program***.

THE PROGRAM

The *Strengthening Multi-Ethnic Families and Communities Program* was piloted in 1991 and 1992 (as part of the Community Reclamation Program, Carson, CA). Four Authors contributed to the development of the curriculum (see Back Cover for biographical information on each author). Based upon feedback from facilitators and parents, the curriculum was restructured and presented as a National Model in late 1993.

This comprehensive parent training program is a strength-based curriculum for parents with children between 3 and 18 years of age, presents information within a “cultural framework,” and encourages parents to share their family/cultural values and roots (Cultural Component). Information is provided to assist parents in integrating strategies to enhance child self-esteem, self-discipline and social competence (Enhancing Relationships, Positive Discipline, and Rites of Passage Component Areas). Parents are also taught strategies to help themselves and their children learn to manage anger and conflict, and to develop problem-solving skills (Enhancing Relationships Component). The Community Involvement Component provides parents with an overview on different aspects of family and community violence, and utilizes two “community speaker” sessions to provide parents with information related to specific issues of violence, and to enhance parent access to and utilization of community resources. (See Appendix A for a more complete description of the program.)

Facilitators are required to participate in a Five-Day Facilitator Training Workshop where they learn program concepts and experience the program’s “facilitative” style. With this foundation, facilitators are encouraged to use the curriculum as a flexible framework in order to meet the needs of the specific parents participating in each class. Although the majority of facilitators implement the curriculum as outlined (12 sessions), some programs shortened the curriculum to 8-10 sessions, shortened the time from 3 hours to 2-1/2 or 2 hours, and added a variety of different types of information to augment curriculum content.

This MONOGRAPH presents the information collected from the Parent Pre/Post Questionnaires that were submitted by 143 different projects (some projects coordinated the implementation of as many as 75 different classes). A total of 416 facilitators implemented the 449 classes that are represented herein. (30 facilitators implemented ≥6 classes, with some as many as 12-13 classes). No attempt has been made to “correct the data set” for different styles of implementation.

Evaluation of the Facilitator Training Workshop, detailed descriptions on program implementation, and both facilitator and parent comments have been presented in a number of different project evaluation reports. (See Appendix B for a list of contributing agencies; Appendix C for a list of contributing facilitators; and Appendix D for a list of Evaluation Reports.)

PARENT PRE & POST QUESTIONNAIRE

Given that the curriculum was attempting to meet the needs of parents from a variety of different backgrounds, with different parenting values and styles, the Parent Pre & Post Questionnaires were developed with two purposes in mind. Although we wanted information and feedback that would document program effectiveness, we also were interested in acquiring information about different parenting styles that might guide us in improving the curriculum content and approach to parent training.

We did not develop items to evaluate whether or not parents learned specific skills presented in the curriculum. We believe it is the complete program, not specific topics and presentations, that will most effectively impact parent-child interactions, parent sense of competence, and parent ratings of child competence.

Since the Pre/Post Questionnaire was not developed to meet the rigorous requirements for "research", and it was never anticipated that other groups would be involved in evaluating the pre/post data, no Test-Retest Reliability or Validity Studies were conducted. The original Pre/Post Questionnaire was modified in 1999. Although no new items were added, about a third of the questions were removed to shorten the evaluation to 34 questions. (No Factor Analysis has been conducted on these items to determine relationships to different parenting constructs.) With the documentation of these results in this MONOGRAPH, we are now able to turn the complete data set over to others with more sophisticated statistical and research backgrounds. Our hope is that some of these analyses will be conducted, and peer review journal articles documenting program effectiveness will be published.

Parents are asked to complete Answer Sheets (so that reading is not required and consistency is maintained where the questions are translated). Parents use a five-point rating scale to respond to 34 items which assess parent style and program impact in the following areas: (See Appendix E for a copy of the questions.)

Parent-Child Interactions	(16 items)
Parent Competence	(10 items)
Child Competence	(8 items)

Three (3) of the Parent-Child Interaction items are considered to be "bi-directional" and were not analyzed for inclusion in this report. (A Bi-Directional Item is one where it is not possible to predict the direction of change from pre to post assessment. Depending on the parent's original score, some parents will "increase" frequency, while other parents will "decrease" frequency as a result of participating in the program.) It is anticipated that these three items will be analyzed at a later time and results presented in a future edition.

- (1) Give Children Rewards
- (2) Ignore Child While Misbehaving
- (3) Tell Others of Child's Bad Behavior

DATA SET

Only data collected between 1994 and 2001 has been included in this report. Within the last two years several large-scale projects have implemented the *Strengthening Multi-Ethnic Families and Communities Program* with a number of additional groups that are not represented herein; including Cambodian families, Chinese families, a variety of American Indian groups, refugee families in the US and in the UK, African-Caribbean groups, as well as other African and East Indian/Asian groups in the UK. The data collected from these groups will also be analyzed and made available in future reports.

Given the enormous job of collecting, inputting and analyzing the data submitted since 1994, the decision was made to include only the data where a Registration Form and both a Pre and Post Questionnaire were submitted. (Unfortunately, some data was miscoded and 95 people included in the data set did not complete a Registration Form.)

It is not possible with this data set to look at the differences between people who completed the program and those that dropped. Also, without a sophisticated understanding of how to correct for missing data, data was included for each item where both the pre and post questions had been answered. (FOR EXAMPLE: Whereas 230 people may have answered the pre question for a particular item, and 210 people answered the post question for the same item, the data set includes only those 200 people that answered both questions.)

DATA ANALYSES

Because our interest in analyzing and documenting evaluation results has not only been to provide evidence of program impact, but also to find ways to “explain” the data to those without a statistical background, we have analyzed the data in a variety of ways.

Paired (2-Tailed) T-Tests (95% confidence level) are calculated for each item based on the Total Data Set. This information is presented in Table A for the TOTAL GROUP and for each COMPARISON GROUP.

Correction Rates are calculated based on the number of participants that report “negative change” from pre to post assessment. We believe looking at this number can provide direction for improving evaluation tools, as well as provide insight into how and why parents respond to specific questions in different ways from pre to post assessment. We believe there are several factors which may influence parents to report “negative change” from pre to post assessment.

- (a) It appears that some participants do not understand the rating scale, and/or they cannot switch between the positive/negative directions presented in the different sections; i.e. parents were asked to rate parent-child interactions from “Always-Never”, and then asked to rate parent and child competence from “Poor-Good”. (Future evaluation tools will take this into account.)
- (b) It is believed that some participants want to represent themselves in a “best possible light” on the pre questionnaire, and then after developing more “trust” are willing to be more “truthful” on the post questionnaire.
- (c) It has been documented that when participants rate themselves at the “highest possible rating”, there is a tendency to revert back toward the “mean”.
- (d) Based on feedback from facilitators and parents, we have learned that some participants interpret some of the post questionnaire items differently from the pre questionnaire items, given that they have learned specific skills and strategies presented in the curriculum.
- (e) Based on feedback from facilitators and parents, we have learned that some participants that do not have their children with them (court referral, for example), or whose children are very young (≤ 3 years of age), may be less accurate in their ratings pre to post because they are rating “what they think they will do” as compared to “what they actually do”.
- (f) When parents “decrease” their use of some methods they may also “increase” the use of others. A “negative change” on a particular item may, in actuality, be part of a broader “positive change” in parent-child interactions, etc.

- (g) Some parents/children that may be experiencing one or more risk factors (problems with children, court referral, etc.) may also be experiencing a number of other associated social, emotional and environmental difficulties. Although these parents may be accurately reporting a “negative change”, they may be considered a more “treatment” population. Since the curriculum is considered to be a “prevention/intervention” model, it may not be enough by itself to offset the other factors cited above.
- (h) Lastly, something about the curriculum (or its implementation) may be responsible for parents reporting “negative change”. This seems “unlikely”, given that the program promotes positive parent-child interactions.

Improvement Rates provide information on the number of parents who “could” show improvement, who “do” show improvement. Those reporting “negative change” (Correction Rate) are eliminated from the sample, as well as those parents already reporting the “best possible rating”.

FOR EXAMPLE: 3053 parents rated the item “Kiss/Hug Your Children”. 339 parents (11%) reported negative change from pre to post assessment. (Correction Rate). 1855 parents reported on the pre questionnaire that they “Always Kiss/Hug Their Children” (Highest Rating). The Improvement Rate is based on the 859 participants that could show improvement. Of this 859, 486 reported an increase on this item from pre to post assessment; Improvement Rate = 57%.

Improvement Patterns give insight into how the group mean (average) scores are influenced from pre to post assessment. Those reporting “negative change” (Correction Rate) are eliminated from this sample. Frequencies (percentage scores) are calculated for low ratings (Ratings 1 & 2) and high ratings (Ratings 4 & 5).

FOR EXAMPLE: To better understand what is happening when we see that the mean (average) rating for “Attend Cultural Events” increases from 2.82 to 3.21, we can look at the Improvement Patterns. The number of parents reporting “Usually/Always” (Ratings 1 & 2) increased from 22% (pre) to 45% (post). The number of parents reporting that they “Rarely/Never” (Ratings 4 & 5) decreased from 44% (pre) to 23% (post). This pattern of change is different from that seen for another item such as “Have Fun Together As A Family”. Although the mean (average) score increased from 3.93 to 4.18, the number of parents reporting that they “Usually/Always” (Ratings 1 & 2) increased from 66% (pre) to 86% (post), while the number of parents reporting that they “Rarely/Never” (Ratings 4 & 5) decreased from 9% (pre) to 2% (post).

Adjusted Means. With limited knowledge of how to correct the data for “extreme” outlining scores, we have chosen a more “common sense” approach to adjusting the data so that a few extreme scores do not obscure the impact of the program on the remaining participants. Extreme Negative Change Scores (≥ 2 points in the unpredicted direction) were eliminated for these analyses. (See discussion on Correction Rate.) In most cases, no more than 2-4% of the scores were eliminated, although in some cases the number of Extreme Negative Change Scores is as high as 9% (Talk About Sexual Responsibility).

Adjusted Pre and Post Mean Scores are presented on Table (B) for the TOTAL GROUP and for all COMPARISON GROUPS. The percent of scores eliminated from the Total Data Sample is also documented on Table (B). All graphic representations of mean differences (pre to post) are based on Adjusted Means.

ANOVA, Repeated Measures Analyses were conducted when comparing different groups to determine whether or not particular factors (sex, marital status, ethnic background, level of education, number of risk factors, and child age) influence parent pre ratings (main effect) or influence program impact (interaction effects). Adjusted Means are used for these calculations.

STUCTURE OF MONOGRAPH

The first section of the MONOGRAPH presents the results for all 3080 parents in the Section TOTAL GROUP. To look more specifically at different factors that may influence *Parent Style* and *Program Impact*, the TOTAL GROUP was subdivided into COMPARISON GROUPS and the results presented as additional sections to the report. Each section is meant to answer the specific questions: “*What role does this factor play in parent pre questionnaire ratings?*”, and “*Does the program impact parents differently based on this factor?*”

Although there are many factors that could be used to develop COMPARISON GROUPS, this MONOGRAPH looks at the following six factors: PARENT SEX, MARITAL STATUS, ETHNIC BACKGROUND, LEVEL OF EDUCATION, NUMBER OF RISK FACTORS and CHILD AGE. A separate section presents the results of all analyses for each factor, and the results for all analyses for each COMPARISON GROUP are presented on Tables (A) and (B). In addition, graphic comparisons of all analyses are presented for each of the 31 items.

It is clear that many of these factors are correlated with each other in different ways. Now that the basic information has been documented in this MONOGRAPH, we hope that more sophisticated “multiple regression” analyses, etc. will sort out the relative importance of each of these factors.

There are several additional factors that we were not able to analyze for this report. They include the following: Parent Age, Income, Previous Parent Classes, and English As First Language. We hope to add this information to a future edition.

THE RESULTS

This MONOGRAPH sets out to document the results from all analyses for all items. We are letting the data “speak for itself” as we have not “interpreted” the results. Our interpretation of the results will be presented in a future document.

Our hope is that by providing the results of these different analyses we will (a) show that the program has positively impacted parents, and (b) stimulate further thinking about evaluation with different groups, as well as the importance of different factors in the parent training process. We also hope that this document will encourage others to do more sophisticated analyses on the data.

We believe the results presented herein clearly support the following statement:

The Strengthening Multi-Ethnic Families and Communities: A Violence Prevention Parent Training Program significantly impacts parent ratings and enhances Parent-Child Interactions, Parent Competence and Child Competence. These significant findings hold regardless of PARENT SEX, MARITAL STATUS, ETHNIC BACKGROUND, LEVEL OF EDUCATION, NUMBER OF RISK FACTORS, or CHILD AGE.