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ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF THE EFFECTS OF A GROUP EDUCATION PROGRAM, SYSTEMATIC TRAINING FOR EFFECTIVE PARENTING, UPON PARENTAL SELF CONCEPT AND ASSESSMENT OF CHILD BEHAVIOR

BAUER, MARCIA THOMPSON, Ed.D
THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY IN VIRGINIA, 1977

CHAIRMAN: DR. FRED L. ADAIR

Parent education is one strategy used to effect family change. This study explored the effectiveness of one such program, Systematic Training for Effective Parenting (STEP), developed by Dinkmeyer and McKay (1976) to provide child management training in communication skills and Adlerian-based discipline strategies. It evaluates changes in parental self-concept and parental perceptions of parent-child interaction, using didactic or process-oriented delivery systems. It also evaluates the efficacy of the STEP program versus a Dreikurs program.

Subjects for the experiment included 44 parents from one school system and 46 parents from a second, adjacent, school system (N=90). Intact groups with random assignment to treatment/control was used. All treated subjects (75) received a 14 hour, 9 week treatment course which included lecture, discussion, reading assignments and homework. The three treatment groups were assigned to STEP (didactic approach, N=31), STEP (process-oriented approach, N=33), and Dreikurs (N=11).

Testing for the effects of the STEP and Dreikurs' programs consisted of pre-posttest administration of the Eitts' Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (five subscales) and McKay's Adlerian Parental Assessment of Child Behavior Scale. Pretest scores on each were used as covariates.

Predicted outcomes and results included:
1. Treatment with STEP would cause a significant increase in parent-child interaction scores on the APSCBS. (Accepted, p < .05)
   1 (a). Parents in the process-oriented STEP group would show greater gains than parents in the didactic STEP group. (Rejected)
2. Treatment with the STEP program would cause a significant positive change in self-concept scores on subscales of the TSCS. (Rejected)
   2 (a). Parents in the process-oriented STEP group would show greater gains than parents in the didactic STEP group. (Rejected)
3. Treatment with the Dreikurs program would cause a significant increase in parent-child interaction scores on the APSCBS. (Accepted, p < .05)
4. Treatment with Dreikurs program would cause a significant positive change in self concept scores on subscales of the TSCS. (Accepted for subscales total score and behavior, p < .05; rejected for self concept, self satisfaction and family self)
5. Parents in the STEP groups would show greater gains than the Dreikurs group following treatment (rejected)
The five hypotheses were tested by analysis of covariance with pre-test scores used as covariate. All hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of confidence.

Results indicate that STEP is effective in changing parent's perceptions of their interactions with their children, but that it is not generally effective in changing parental self-concepts. It appears that STEP and Dreikurs programs are equally effective.
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Don't give up! We still have the walls to write on", I thought to myself
-- on the corner with the rain
pouring down,
and the cold pouring down.

The stamps, just bought,
stick tightly together because the rain
got them wet; on the corner I
don't even notice
the worms (in the bottom of the puddle)

But they don't notice my stamps either.

Paul Bauer
A Study of the Effects of a Group Education Program,
Systematic Training for Effective Parenting,
Upon Parental Self Concept and
Assessment of Child Behavior
Chapter 1
Introduction

Changes in the social structure of contemporary society have made the rearing of children an increasingly difficult task. Instead of the happy, well-behaved children who accept responsibility and welcome challenge, far too many parents see their children becoming bored, at odds with family, school and community, disrespectful, irresponsible, defiant and unhappy. The ability to raise a family seems grossly impaired and parents express frustration and dismay. An informal survey by an advice-columnist found that a large number of parents, if they could do it over again, would remain childless.

Past generations have looked to the models of their own childhoods and society as a whole shared common traditions of child-rearing. This approach is no longer generally viable. Lack of religious conviction, mobility, breakdown in the family unit, inflation, immaturity, materialism, a breakdown in moral values, global crises and insecurity are a few of the "causes" that are pointed to as responsible for our present predicament. "The underlying fact is that we don't know what to do with our children, because the traditional methods of childraising no longer work and we have not learned new methods which can take their place" (Dreikurs and Soltz, 1964, p. 9).

For most of our history, the child-raising practice has been one of a dominant-submissive pattern of parent and child, with its control by reward and punishment. As democratic beliefs and principles have permeated all societal structures, equality is being brought to basic interpersonal relationships. The impact of democracy has been largely responsible for transforming our cultural and social atmosphere and making the traditional pattern of child-rearing obsolete. A democratic atmosphere contains both order and freedom, and can be distinguished from the order without freedom of autocracy and the freedom without order of anarchy. Dreikurs and Grey (1970) note that Adler "formulated ... the first social law -- the law of equality, the ironclad logic of social living which demands recognition of every human being as an equal (p. 6).
To truly help our children and to provide meaningful and effective parenting, we must turn from the obsolete autocratic practices toward new methods based on freedom and responsibility.

The position in this study is that the democratic process is most effective in promoting individual growth. Consonant with this belief is that Adlerian philosophy and practice will assist parents in learning more effective parenting skills within the democratic framework. Further, that a specific Adlerian-based program, Dinkmeyer and McKay's (1976) Systematic Training for Effective Parenting (STEP) provides such a background for parents of school-age children. The parent will experience a sense of understanding which will be reflected in his subjective evaluation of positive interaction and elevation of his own self esteem.

The STEP program is a multi-media program which has been designed to enhance understanding and application of the conceptual aspects of the program, while providing for individual learning styles through viewing visual materials, listening to cassettes, reading, discussing and practicing. Included in the program are a leader's manual, study book for parents, and other audio and video components designed to make the program more meaningful and attractive. STEP combines communication skill training and Adlerian-based practices in a nine session program, which may be led by professional or lay leaders.

**Purpose of the Study**

Field test data and early studies (McKay, 1976) indicate positive reactions to the STEP program as a method of providing parents with a broad framework suggested by Dinkmeyer (1965):

Development should be viewed as a product of hereditary, environmental, and self forces. The continual interaction between heredity and environment, combined with the child's primary reaction pattern and his capacity to choose, are the key factors in understanding development. To function effectively with children, it is necessary to have (1) a broad framework, which helps to set guidelines and interpret both behavior and misbehavior, and (2) a knowledge of the child's specific pattern. (p.13)
This study attempted to provide additional validational data for the STEP program. The effectiveness of the STEP program in helping parents improve their relationship with their children was assessed. Further, two alternative methods of presentation, didactic and process-oriented, were examined. Finally, the STEP program was evaluated for effectiveness when compared with another Adlerian-based parent study program.

Statement of the Problem

Basically, the answer to the following questions were sought: How did the use of the STEP program affect the interpersonal interaction between parent and child, as subjectively perceived? What relationship did one's self concept have to changes in such interpersonal interactions? What variables contributed toward its effectiveness? Was it more effective than a comparable program?

Hypotheses

In the preface to Virginia Satir's recent book (1977) it states: The way we relate to other people and how we can live with other human beings are some of the things we learn as children within the family .... Given that the family is crucial in shaping human behavior, it follows that for all human relations to improve, families must change their ways of functioning so that they will not nurture harmful modes of interaction and perpetuate ineffective or damaging models of behavior from one generation to the next. (pp. 11-12)

The STEP program, based on Adlerian psychology, was hypothesized as an effective intervention and educational program for changing the ways parents function with their children. By learning new communication skills and discipline by logical consequences, the whole pattern of family interaction would be constructively changed.

Further, it was hypothesized that of the two approaches to the STEP program, process-oriented and didactic, the parents who participated in the process-oriented group would show greater gains in assessing interactions between themselves and their children.

Combs, Avila and Purkey (1972) believe that one's self concept
determines behavior.

The importance of the self concept in the economy of the individual goes far beyond providing his basis of reality. Once established, the self concept thereafter provides a screen through which everything else is seen, heard, evaluated and understood. In every aspect of human existence the self concept exerts its influence upon what people do and how they behave. (pp. 43-44)

These authors agreed that the self concept is learned in the same way all perceptions are acquired—through experience.

It was hypothesized that the STEP program provides learning experiences whereby the parent will experience success in interactions with his children. Perceiving success, he comes to regard himself in this way, and his self esteem is elevated. Further, it was hypothesized that of the two approaches to the STEP program, didactic and process-oriented, parents participating in the process-oriented group would make greater gains.

It was also hypothesized that changes in a positive direction would occur at the completion of the other Adlerian-based study group using *Children: The Challenge* (Dreikurs and Soltz, 1964) for both the parental self concept and the parental perception of interaction.

Although both the Dreikurs program and the STEP program are Adlerian-based, designed for parents of children who have not yet reached their teens, and can be taught by lay leaders, it was hypothesized that parents who participated in the STEP program would show greater gains than parents who participated in the Dreikurs and Soltz' program. The multi-media presentation and the addition of communication skills training was seen as more effective.

For research purposed, the following hypotheses were formulated:

**Hypothesis 1**

There will be a significant difference in parental assessment of parent-child interaction between the groups (process-oriented and didactic) participating in the STEP training and the group not participating, at the completion of the nine-week program, as measured.
by the Adlerian Parental Assessment of Child Behavior Scale (APACBS).

(a) The parents in the process-oriented group will show greater gains than parents in the didactic group.

Hypothesis 2

There will be a significant difference in self concept between the groups participating in the STEP training and the group not participating, at the completion of the nine-week program, as measured by the following scales of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS): (a) total score, (b) identity or self-concept, (c) self-satisfaction, (d) behavior, and (e) family self.

(a) The parents in the process-oriented group will show greater gains than parents in the didactic group.

Hypothesis 3

There will be a significant difference in parental assessment of parent-child interaction between the Dreikurs group and the group receiving no training, at the completion of the nine-week training period, as measured by the APACBS.

Hypothesis 4

There will be a significant difference in self concept between the Dreikurs group and the group not participating, at the completion of the nine-week program, as measured by the following scales of the TSCS: (a) total score, (b) identity or self concept, (c) self-satisfaction, (d) behavior, and (e) family self.

Hypothesis 5

Gain scores for the parental assessment of parent-child interaction will be greater for the STEP groups than for the Dreikurs' group, as measured by the APACBS.

For statistical purposes, the hypotheses will be tested in null form.

Theoretical Rationale

Set within the framework of group dynamics, the theoretical base for this study lies in the philosophy and practice first enunciated by Alfred Adler (1927, 1969). Starting with a basic assumption of "unity of the individual", man is perceived as a social being who exercises
freedom of choice and whose every action is purposive. Adler (1969) states:

We cannot think, feel, will or act without the perception of some goal .... As soon as the goal of a psychic movement has been recognized, then we are to assume that all the movement of its constituent parts will coincide with both the goal and the life plan. (p. 3)

The life plan, or style of life, refers to the characteristic way of reacting which a child develops based on his subjective evaluation of self and society.

Self Concept

Behavior may be conceptualized in terms of the self concept. Byrne (1974) defines the self concept as "the total collection of attitudes, judgements, and values which an individual holds with respect to his behavior, his ability, his body, his worth as a person - in short, how he perceives and evaluates himself" (p. 271). McCandless (1976) notes that one's feelings about himself (whether he regards himself as positively or negatively reinforcing, or takes his own reinforcement seriously; i.e., is a person of internal or external locus of control) have resulted from the family and culture within which he has lived" (p. 193).

Combs et al. (1972) believe that the single most important factor which affects behavior is the self concept. "What people do at every moment of their lives is a product of how they see themselves and the situations they are in" (p. 39). Self-esteem is a positive self concept. These authors see the threat to psychological freedom as reducing the likelihood of effective and satisfying behaviors.

Hansen, Stevic and Warner (1972) discuss Carl Rogers' view of the self:

The self develops out of the organism's interaction with the environment. As it develops, it tends to integrate as well as distort some of the values of other people. The self integrates those values consistent with the self and distorts other values in order to maintain consistency.
Through this process the self is striving to maintain the consistency of behavior of the organism and its own consistency. Experiences that are not consistent with the self are perceived as a threat to the self. Central to the idea is that the self is always in process; it grows and changes as a result of its continuing interaction with the phenomenal field. (p. 78)

Barclay (1971) notes that "Rogers believes that the psychologically mature person can communicate and can test his hypotheses on all three levels, that is, in terms of his own self-concept, in terms of interpersonal relationships, and in terms of objective data" (p. 340). This would indicate subjective self-evaluation, and subjective and objective feedback.

Other authors comment on the self concept and its social aspects. Margaret Mead (1955) sees the self as a social structure which is derived from a social experience, in which the individual experiences himself from the introjected views of his social group. David Ausubel (1957) indicates his belief that ego [self] development comes from the continual interaction of social experience and the already existent personality structure which has been mediated by perceptual responses.

According to Adlerian theory, "man is understood only in terms of his phenomenological field, the world and self as experienced by the individual at the instant of action" (Dinkmeyer, 1965, p. 28).

The self concept of the parent is seen as being important to the interpersonal interactions between parent and child. Any behavioral or cognitive changes which result from a parent education program are likely to be accompanied by changes in parental self concept.

The Group as an Agent of Change

Groups have been defined according to one or more of the following characteristics: (1) perception and cognition of group members, (2) motivation and need satisfaction, (3) group goals, (4) group organization, (5) interdependency of group members, and (6) interaction (Shaw, 1971).

Jennings (1950) defines groups on the basis of type. There are
primary or secondary groups, socio- or psyche- groups, organized or unorganized, in- or out- groups, and voluntary or involuntary groups. Socio-process groups have as their goal the planning of a future event, the finding of some solution to a current problem, or the evaluation of some past undertaking. Psyche-process groups, sometimes termed group psycho-therapy or group counseling, have as their goal clarification and understanding of personal attitudes and values of self and others (Kemp, 1964). The STEP program has some properties found in each group, but is more closely related to socio-process.

The group as an agent of change will depend upon the process, that is, the interaction of group members and the assimilation and understanding of useful material for each individual. The core interactions are seen by Egan (1971) as self-disclosure, the expression of feeling, listening, support, confrontation, responding to confrontation, flight (and confronting flight) and freedom. Process is influenced by the method of presentation, the materials and the discussion, which are interdependent in providing a framework within which the group functions.

Included in the method of presentation is the type of delivery system (didactic or process-oriented) and the style and characteristics of leadership. Didactic delivery is structured by the leader, who functions in an information-giving capacity. The process-oriented delivery uses the leader as a facilitator, aiming at the interaction of group members with much of the material originating from within the group.

Schein (1969) discusses the role of the leader as a "process consultant", who presents a set of activities which "help the client to perceive, understand, and act upon process events which occur in the client's environment". These events are usually the various human actions which occur as part of our normal flow of activities. Schein sees the client's own actions and their impact on others as particularly relevant.

Gibb (1971) points out that while some theorists hypothesize that the key to permanent behavior change lies in basic changes in the motivational structure, these changes are generally inferred, rather
than measured directly. The literature refers to such hoped for motivational outcomes as "self actualization, awareness of our motives, clear communication of one's motives to others, self determination, commitment, greater energy level, inner-directedness, and becoming" (p. 324).

Levine and Butler (1952) also believe that it is necessary that the importance of motivation as well as the acquisition of knowledge in social change be evaluated. While greater involvement is believed to be related, just how it is related to motivation and to action is far from clear. It has been suggested that perhaps in group decision, the members are more likely to make up their minds. Once this decision is made, it has the effect of freezing this motivational constellation for action. It is the position in this study that ego involvement is enhanced through the use of role-playing tapes which are included in the STEP materials, and through group-originated material.

Adlerian Theory and Practice

Adlerian theory presents a socio-teleological model that sees man as purposive and goal-directed. His behavior is viewed subjectively in terms to its social relevancy. The psychological processes are understood in terms of a self-consistent organization, a life-style, which is an evaluation of self and society. Adlerians believe that personality rests on a wholistic foundation, with the individual interacting with his social environment. The basic motivation of his psychological movement is goal-related.

Commenting that "the child is an excellent observer but a poor interpreter", Dreikurs (1972) states, "We should realize that a misbehaving child is only a discouraged child trying to find his place; he is acting on the faulty logic that his misbehavior will give him the social acceptance which he deserves" (p. 32). Dreikurs identifies the four goals of children's misbehavior as: (1) attention-getting, (2) power, (3) revenge, and (4) display of inadequacy. The goal may be recognized by the feelings the parent gets as the results of the misbehavior or from the response of the child to correction.

In pursuing one of these goals of misbehavior, the child may be
either active or passive and may be either constructive or destructive. Dreikurs (1957) believes that "only if the child feels accepted will he use constructive methods; antagonism is always expressed in destructive acts. On the other hand, whether the child responds actively or passively depends on his self-confidence and courage" (p. 29).

Adlerians are interested in the family constellation of the client, which is his psychological position in his family. It is the subjective perception of the individual, rather than the numerical position, that is important. The family atmosphere is explored regarding the social climate within which the child interacts. The family council, with its decision-making and conflict-resolving responsibilities, is important to Adlerian practice.

Systematic Training for Effective Parenting (STEP), developed by Dinkmeyer and McKay (1976) presents an Adlerian-based program which helps parents develop democratic child-training procedures and an understanding of themselves and their children. The Adlerian principles and practices which are an integral part of the STEP program, according to McKay (1976) include:

1. Understanding the nature of democratic relationships based on mutual respect and social equality.
2. Understanding the purposive nature of behavior and emotions.
3. Understanding the four goals of misbehavior and their positive counterparts.
4. Understanding how an individual's life style is formed, and the major emphasis on the family constellation and methods of training.
5. Understanding parental beliefs and behaviors which foster misbehavior, and alternate beliefs and behaviors which promote responsible goals and behavior in children.
6. Learning the process of encouragement. Learning how to focus on assets and strengths, and understanding the differences between praise and encouragement.
7. Understanding natural and logical consequences. Learning how to give children choices and allow them to assume responsibility for the consequences of their behavior.

8. Learning about the family meeting. Learning how to involve children in planning and problem solving by fostering democratic discussions.

9. Developing parent self confidence. Learning how to respond to criticism of their child-training beliefs and procedures, and learning to focus on their own strengths as parents. (pp. 8-9)

The Adlerian emphasis is augmented by communication skills training which focuses upon (1) communication from child to parent to child (feedback) which is termed "reflective listening" in STEP, (2) communication from parent to child about the parent's feelings and needs, termed "I-messages", and (3) problem-solving procedures.

The framework for Adlerian practice and for the STEP program, according to Dinkmeyer (1965):

proceeds on the assumption that every human being is of value and has a right to optimum development as a person of usefulness to society. It recognizes that every human being is different from all others and possesses a unique set of goals, percepts, liabilities, and assets. Each individual seeks significance in his own manner. Our job is to assist each child, without force or pressure, to grow in relationship to his uniqueness through a process which takes into account his uniqueness and makes him an acceptable and contributing member of society. (p. 15)

**Definition of Terms**

For the purposes of this study, terms used are defined below:

**Systematic Training for Effective Parenting (STEP)**

A nine-session parent study group program developed by Dinkmeyer and McKay (1976). The topics and format are determined and developed according to the leader's manual.
Target Child

A child above the age of two and below 18 whom the parent identified as the one with whom (s)he would be concerned in this study, and with whom (s)he wished to improve a relationship.

Adlerian Parental Assessment of Child Behavior Scale (APACBS)

A 32-item rating scale developed by McKay (1976) which assessed the parent's perceptions of his Target Child's behavior. The seven point interval, Likert-type scale asked the parent to rate each behavior on a continuum. Both positive and negative behaviors were represented.

Adlerian-based Parent Group

A nine-session discussion group which used Children, the Challenge (Dreikurs and Soltz, 1964) and which employed process-oriented facilitation. Additional outside readings were required.

Self Concept

A construct which included the individual's thinking, feeling, and expressions of personality; also designated in this study as life style.

Group

An aggregation of individuals who met regularly which functioned in such a way as to meet group and individual goals, and which contributed to the viable personal-social growth of the members.

Leadership

A socially oriented process which included three interacting components -- a leader, those who were led, and a shared situation.

Plan of Presentation

Information relevant to this study will be presented in five parts designated as chapters. Chapter one introduces the problem, reviews the theoretical background, states the hypotheses, and defines important terms. In chapter two through five, related literature, research methodology, results and analysis of research data, and conclusions and recommendations are presented.
Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

This chapter consists of a review of relevant literature pertaining to: (1) Parent Group Education, including the effectiveness of group education, the role of the counselor, and the method of presentation, (2) Adlerian-based studies in parent education and the STEP program, (3) Self concept studies, and (4) the measurement instruments.

Parent Group Education

The first question we should ask is, "Why work with parents at all?" First, because of the overwhelming numbers of children and their problems. Brown and Brown (1975) believe that counselors must develop resources, alternative methods, and new approaches for dealing with them. Second, there is the need to focus on prevention rather than remediation (Glidewell, 1971; O'Dell, 1974; Tavomin, 1974). Third, without change in the home environment, school intervention will not have a lasting effect (O'Dell, 1974). Finally, interventions with parents can have a greater effect than interventions with children (Tavormina, 1974; Dinkmeyer, 1973).

The second question that should be asked is, "What mode should be used to work with the parents?" Consultation, counseling, and education are three processes available to the counselor. Differentiating between consultation and counseling, Brown and Brown (1975) state their position that "consultation is a process engaged in by a counselor and parent for the benefit of the child, as distinguished from working directly with the child" (p. 95). Nelson (1967), Dustin and Burden (1972), Christiansen (1972) and others concur. The third approach, parent education, can be distinguished on the basis of both process and content. An agenda or format, and a more traditional approach stressing information is used.

The enormous influence which the parents and other family members exert upon the child has been documented by researchers for many years (Freud, 1929; Adler, 1927; Baruch, 1949; Ginott, 1965; Patterson and Guillion, 1968; and Dinkmeyer and Carlson, 1973).

The U.S. Commissioner of Education, T.H. Bell (1975), cites the 14
1965 Coleman report, which found that home background is the most important element in a child's classroom progress. Bell states, "The odds are overwhelming that children denied effective parenting will be unable to compare with their peers, in school or in adult life. Children who receive effective parenting will be unquestionably able to do so" (p. 272).

The problems that children bring to school cannot be ignored, and the behavior of the child affects the school environment, notes Carroll (1976). Therefore, she believes that working with parents has become an important emphasis for the school counselor. McWhirter and Kahn (1974) agree that parent education groups offer a unique modality for increasing the school counselor's effectiveness. They recommend communication skill groups to train parents in active listening and conflict resolution, stating that "Parental ability to communicate with children, their knowledge of how to assess problem situations, and their use of a method of problem solving not only enhances the parent-child relationship, but also teaches the child to identify his feelings, explore alternatives, and take responsibility for his actions" (p. 116).

In a lengthy review of the literature detailing various methods of using parents as change agents for their children and emphasizing a behavior modification approach, Johnson and Katz (1973) concluded that the success of therapeutic intervention by parents is dependent upon the ability of a backup therapist to produce reliable changes in the behavior of parents toward their children. They also noted that parents constitute an inexpensive, continuous treatment source.

Benson, Berger, and Mease (1973) believe "Parents will respond in very supportive ways to the whole school enterprise after experiencing a training program ... In their eyes this breaks the pattern of coming to school only for PTA or crisis intervention (p. 226).

Corsini and Painter (1975) believe that by joining a parent group, (1) the parent can get ideas from others, (2) make new friends, (3) get satisfaction from using helping skills with others, (4) help other parents understand their children and deal with their problems, and (5) act as an example to one's own children of your concern for others.
Investigating the possibility of group discussion with parents of first and seventh grade children, Shaw (1969) found that parents of minority children responded when invited face to face. Parents of first grade children felt more positive and noticed more behavior change in their children than did parents of seventh grade children. Shaw felt that "large-scale parent group counseling, as a regular part of the guidance program, is feasible if the motivation to carry it out is present" (p. 53).

The Effectiveness of Parent Group Education

Parent discussion groups, usually relatively unstructured, were the modality of choice of many researchers (Price, 1971; Shaw, 1969; Dinkmeyer, 1969; Carlson, 1969). Irving Shapiro (1956) points out that as early as the twenties, discussion groups were in vogue. "Discussion is rapidly becoming the most widely accepted technique of parent education", he quotes from a 1932 publication. Shapiro believes that it is the best method. In a study of 25 parents involved in discussion groups which met for 12 meetings, evaluation was done at the conclusion of the meetings and again 10 months later using a revised instrument based on the Children's Ethnic Attitudes, II.: Relationship to Parental Beliefs Concerning Child Training (Harris, Gough and Martin, 1950). The experimental group showed a significant modification in child-rearing attitudes. There was some indication that the group members received benefits in the areas of social, marital and ethnic group relations as well as in child-rearing.

In a study from Sydney, Australia (Cullen, 1959), lay leaders were trained to lead discussion groups of 1-15 sessions utilizing group self-structure and leadership. 81 mothers participated and reported benefits as follows: (1) general knowledge about children, (2) new skills in child management, (3) understanding of their own attitudes, feelings and behavior as parents, (4) new knowledge of their own children's behavior, motives and needs, (5) a reinforcement of their existing beliefs or practices, and (6) hints about better household management.

Swenson (1970) studied changing parental attitudes toward child-
rearing practices following a three month parent-child study group. While he found no significant group differences, he made the point that there was significant difference in a number of individual cases. He saw involvement in the parent study groups as appearing to be necessary for certain parents as a preliminary to seeking and accepting special helping services for their child's particular learning-behavior situation.

McCullen (1975) used interviews by experienced researchers at the end of 10-15 week parent courses and again two months later. At the end of the course, 30% of the mothers made gains in self-awareness. Other gains were personality related: more confident, relaxed, tolerant or less impatient and anxious (p. 602) After two months, 35% felt that earlier gains had been maintained; 28% noted additional gains, and 9% felt that there had been a loss over original gains.

Christensen (1972) believes that there are several advantages to the large group modality, including its consistency with the educational model. It is estimated that approximately 80-90% of any given parent group can make direct use of the information received. Christensen comments on the strategy:

If one views the monumental task of reeducating an entire generation of parents and teachers as being a legitimate part of the counselor role, we must encourage numbers of parents to become involved in a dialogue with teachers and counselors and to learn viable child-rearing, adult-child relationship techniques which will produce the kind of adults which can best survive in a democratic society. (p. 129)

The Role of the Counselor

Dinkmeyer and McKay (1974) believe that the counselor should be a facilitator, keeping the group moving and focused. They enumerate six skills which should be used by the group leader to maximize success: (1) Structuring. Identifying the purposes and procedures of the sessions. (2) Universalizing. Showing that concerns are common. Through common concerns, members of the group provide encouragement and empathy.
(3) Linking. Pointing out similarities and differences in comments offered by members. (4) Feedback. A process which helps an individual understand how he affects others by his beliefs, feelings and behaviors. (5) Redirecting. A method of maximizing group involvement whereby the leader declines to comment on a question or statement, but refers it to the group for discussion. (6) Questioning. Both open and closed questions are used. The closed questions elicit specific information; open questions call for an opinion. (7) Providing Encouragement. Pointing out effort and improvement as well as success. (8) Brainstorming. Group effort to help solve problems will provide alternative solutions from which to choose. (9) Obtaining Commitments. Parents are helped to see how principles can be applied to their specific situations and then commitments are obtained about how much a parent is willing to do and under what circumstances. (10) Summarizing. The counselor and/or the group must summarize at various points in the session to clarify understanding and examine progress (pp. 109-113).

In examining the relationship between size of the group and the behavior of "superior" leaders, Hemphill (1950) also examined both leader and group factors. He concluded that it is probable that leader behavior will be found to include social factors and characteristics of the group within which the leader functions. Using "30" as the delineating point between large and small groups, 70 items relating to leader behavior were examined. There were significant differences on 30 of the 70 items, divided into two categories: the first indicating greater pressure or demands for strength, stability, reliability and predictability in behavior of leaders of large groups. The items of significant difference in the second category indicated less consideration by the leader toward individual members of large groups. The study suggests that, with the large group, the role of the leader finds demands greater and more numerous; and that with a large group, tolerance for leader-centered direction of group activities becomes greater.

Using Hemphill's questionnaire, translated, with 132 German students, tendencies "pointed to a stronger leader role and structure
in larger groups....Factor analysis extracted factors similar to 'locomotion' and 'cohesion' functions of leaders...", according to Lück (1971, p. 537).

In discussing the characteristics and determinants of leadership, Warters (1960) states:

Leadership is a complex social phenomenon that is best defined in terms of the interaction of a number of inconstant variables. Among these variables are the personality traits of the individual, the particular situation with its task and resources, the group's structure, the effectiveness of the total performance of the group as a group (termed 'syntality'), the goals, the responsibility patterns of the members, the members' perceptions and expectations of the leaders, and the expectation of the group from the outside. (p. 27)

The role of the counselor is seen by Kelly (1976) not as teacher, counselor, lecturer, or expert in human behavior, but as a facilitator of discussion. With an Adlerian framework and a commitment to parent education, the counselor in this study operated nine groups. With the development of leadership skills in parents during the first series of groups, selected parents were asked to co-lead during the second series, and assume leadership during the third series. 195 parents and 4 parent study group leaders were trained in the Adlerian method. This study did not employ systematic assessment, but anecdotal reports indicated that parents felt that behavior change did occur.

**Method of Presentation**

Levine (1952) investigated the lecture vs. group discussion in changing behavior. Three supervisory groups were used: treatment - lecture, treatment - discussion, and control. The lecture group was given a problem and told how to solve it; the discussion group was given the problem only and developed their own solution. In the post-test, there was a significant difference in rating by both experimental groups over the control, and a significant difference between the lecture and discussion groups. Clearly, the discussion group had made
the highest amount of behavior change. The author concluded that group
decision was more effective than the formal lecture in overcoming
resistance to change in behavior.

The effectiveness of group discussion as a method of parent edu­
cation for single and married parents was investigated by Hale (1976). Using the Parent-Attitude Survey, she analyzed pre- and posttest changes
on the Attitudes Toward Children score (combined) and the subscore
"acceptance". She found, using one and two way analyses of variance,
a .05 level gain for the experimental group on both measures. The
author concluded that "the group discussion method of parenting education
was effective in improving parental attitudes toward children, the
parents' self concepts were unchanged, and that single parents benefited
less than married. The population, however, was quite small (7 married
and 11 single in the experimental group and 11 married, 10 single in
the control) and the results must be subject to the restrictions of
that fact.

Adlerian Parent Study Groups

Adlerian psychology concerns itself especially with the psychology
of children, studying the personality and its dynamic struggle for de­
velopment and expression. Grubbe (1968) sees Adlerian psychology as
dealing with the purposes, rather than the causes, of behavior. The
counselor, knowing the purpose, can make effective recommendations that
will help to change the child's interpretation of the behavioral situation
even when he cannot change physical limitations or circumstances. These
principles can be taught to teachers and parents as well so that they
will also be able to better deal with children. Grubbe believes "[Parents]
are open to suggestions and recommendations. When these parents develop
an insight into the purpose of their own and their children's behavior,
it is not uncommon for marked changes to occur rather quickly" (p. 25).

Fears (1976) discusses Adlerian parent study groups within a
school setting, based on humanistic theory and conceptualized as aware
of goals and directions, capable of change and actualization. Adlerian­
based programs,Fears believes, involve four basic theoretical concepts:
social interest, the creative self, life style, and striving for super-
iority. Fears' parent study group met a total of eight hours and were given specific Adlerian topics each week, including: understanding children, birth order, mistaken approaches to child rearing, discouragement, natural and logical consequences, the four goals of misbehavior, and the family meeting. A pretest-posttest measure similar to the APACBS was designed by the author to measure changes in the parent's perception of the child's behavior. 23 of the 40 items showed significant change following the intervention. Subjective verbal feedback strengthened the author's belief in the positive value of the program.

Noble (1976) contrasted the Parent Effectiveness Training program with an Adlerian Parent Group to evaluate change in child-rearing attitudes. Scores on three factors, as measured by the Parental Attitude Research Instrument, using subscales for Controlling techniques, Awareness of the Emotional Needs of Children, and Parent-Child Communications, were the criterion variable. The two treatment groups of 12 members each (the control had nine) met for 12 hours over a six week period. Using one-way analysis of variance and multiple comparison tests, there was no significant difference between treatment groups found. However, expressed attitude toward the use of controlling techniques as measured by the PARI for parents in both treatment groups changed significantly (p = .01). The results appear to indicate that the two programs may have many basic principles in common. However, with a small population and a 25% dropout rate, the results should be regarded as very tentative.

Mahoney (1974) reported on the effects of Adlerian groups regarding the child raising practices of authoritarian parents. 62 parents were randomly assigned to four groups, three treatment and one control, to test the effectiveness of alternative delivery systems of an Adlerian program. The treatment groups used (1) home reading only, (2) study group, and (3) counseling group. The subscales of the Maryland Parent Attitude Survey, Disciplinarian and Protection, and the Goal Recognition and Correction Measure, were administered. The author concluded that (1) levels of disciplinarian attitude showed no change, (2) there was no decrease in parental overprotectiveness, but (3) there was a significant increase in recognition of children's goals and in correcting mistaken
goals. Mahoney felt that the measurement instruments were not sufficiently sensitive to the Adlerian approach, and affected results.

Frazier (1974) viewed the parent-child interaction from the perspective of freedom of children, parent behavior change, and parent's perception of children's behavior as the result of attending a 10 week study group with either an Adlerian or Behaviorist base. The author found, using subjective measures, that the Adlerian parents were less restrictive in their attitude toward children's freedom and more inclined to use logical consequences than the Behaviorist group, but there was no significant change in the perception of children's behavior among the two treatment and control groups.

Agati and Iovino (1974) implemented an Adlerian-based parent counseling program. Both five week (starter) and continuous (ongoing) groups were formed. A group-process model was employed. Subjective evaluation was used. The authors found:

Parents needed to understand that they can learn and implement alternative models of discipline which can work, produce psychological growth, and be consistent with what is happening in society. Many parents had become threatened by their children's demands for equality and their own inability to deal successfully with these demands. Through the Adlerian approach which stressed equality of respect and responsibility, this program sought to provide some direct help to many parents. (p. 127)

Freeman (1971) compared the effectiveness of Adlerian and traditional mother discussion groups relative to each other and to a control. 36 mothers and their 55 children of elementary age were included. Each of two leaders led an Adlerian and a traditional discussion group. The Adlerian group used Children, the Challenge (Dreikurs and Soltz, 1964) and the groups met for a total of 15 hours. A posttest only design, using the Attitude toward the Freedom of Children - Scale II, indicated that the Adlerian group scored significantly lower than the Control group, indicating that child-rearing attitudes were less restrictive for that group. A Children's Behavior Checklist filled out by the
mothers, while they were not significant, showed that children of Adlerian mothers had fewer bothersome behaviors at the end of treatment. The author concluded that the Adlerian frame of reference, as presented, was more effective than no treatment in changing children's bothersome behavior, some child-rearing practices and mothers' child rearing attitudes.

Berrett (1973) studied 27 mothers of normal and hearing-impaired children in 10 week Adlerian groups. Tested on the Attitude toward the Freedom of Children, Scale II, mothers in the treatment group suggested a more liberal attitude toward freedom of children. Responding to the Child Behavior Checklist, mothers of hearing-impaired children indicated that their children displayed a lower occurrence of negative behaviors than either normal children whose parents took Adlerian training or control children.

Peterson (1975) designed research to assess the effect of an Adlerian intervention program on the children of trained parents. Using a self-report instrument, children in high (31) and low (21) achieving groups showed a significant positive relationship between achievement and assumption of internal responsibility as found on a Pearson r. While high achievers whose parents had received training assumed more home responsibility than children of controls, there was no improvement of self-concept or internal responsibility. Low achieving children showed no significant change on any of the measures.

Investigating one aspect of children's academic achievement, reading achievement, DeLaurier (1975) hypothesized that there would be a difference in reading achievement, classroom behavior and parent's attitudes toward child-rearing as the result of Adlerian parent group education. Using several measurement instruments, no significant differences were found, although subjective verbal reactions to the program were positive.

Laine's (1973) study of the impact of the Dreikurs parent study group method on parental attitudes toward and behavioral interaction with the school used 20 parents of primary-aged children. Semantic differential scales were used to measure changes in attitudes toward
the school. No significant change was found. A Parent Activity Description Questionnaire was used to assess intentional behavior, and the results showed positive intentions at the completion of the program.

McKay (1976) investigated whether participation in a STEP group would result in positive changes in mothers' perceptions of their Target Child's behavior, as measured by the APACBS, and in observed verbal behavior of the mothers, as measured by the Mother-Child Interaction Exercise (Goula and McKay, 1976). Significant positive changes in the mothers' perceptions were found (p=.022) but no significant change was found in the mothers' observed verbal behavior.

**Self Concept Studies**

Lewis (1970) described the self as developing through one's interactions with the environment, and conversely, these interactions influenced by the developing self. "The person becomes an individual, defining himself to others through his behavior in interpersonal situations, and reinforcing or modifying his self concept through his perception of the actions of others" (p. 42). Lewis sees a healthy personality as one in which the self concept is realistic, "...[Thus] enabling the individual to perceive his environment realistically and to acknowledge his experiences" (p. 42). If, however, the self concept is not congruent with reality, the person may try to protect his unrealistic self concept by denying an aspect of his self which he is incapable of accepting.

Overman (1974), using the Downing program as the intervention, assessed changes in parent and child behavior. Using posttest measures, she found higher mean scores, though they did not reach significance, for the experimental parent group on the appreciation of the child's unique makeup and total parental acceptance. There was a significant positive correlation between parents' self esteem scores and parental acceptance scores. Subjective reports indicated that parents in the experimental groups became "more objective and realistic in their acceptance of themselves and the children and that experimental parents and their children were making positive behavioral and attitudinal changes" (p. 5826A).
Auvenshine (1973), using a parent discussion group technique and a group-designed content format, found that parents who participated in the experimental group experienced a positive change in attitudes of family relations, social relations, and self-concept, as well as expressing less feelings of authoritarian-control and greater feelings of democratic attitudes on the post evaluation. The size of the group, 25, was larger than most of those reported in the literature.

Price (1971) found that even short term (three week) parent discussion groups brought subjective impressions of increased self-esteem.

The Measurement Instruments

The instruments used as criterion and covariate measures were chosen to ascertain whether the STEP treatment or the Dreikurs treatment affects parents' perceptions of their children's behavior and their own self-concept. The instruments chosen were the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (Fitts, 1965) and the Adlerian Parental Assessment of Child Behavior Scale (McKay, 1976). Literature related to these scales will be reviewed in this section.

Tennessee Self Concept Scale

Validation of the TSCS is of four types: (1) content validity, (2) discrimination between groups, (3) correlation with other personality measures, and (4) personality changes under certain conditions (Fitts, 1965, p. 17). The author and test reviewers were concerned with these four issues.

Fitts (1965) sought to establish content validity by choosing only scale items that were unanimously chosen by judges (pp. 17-18). Discrimination between groups was established by comparing the 626 non-patients in the norming group with 369 psychiatric patients, showing generally highly significant difference. Fitts uses research on patient vs. non-patient populations (Condon, 1958; Piety, 1958; Havener, 1961; and Wayne, 1963) to corroborate his findings. Type of disorder and degree of disorder should be distinguishable in order to justify discrimination between groups. Huffman's (1964) work is cited for supplying this data. Correlations with the MMPI (Hathaway and McKinley, 1951) were done by McGee (1960) and "...most of the scores of the Scale correlate
with MMPI scores in ways one would expect from the nature of the score. In some instances (Variability Scores, Distribution Scores, and Conflict Scores) there is relatively little linear correlation. With the same scores, however, the correlation ratios are substantially higher" (Fitts, 1965, p.24). In Quinn's 1957 study of teacher trainees, a negative correlation of -.534 with TSCS total P and the Minnesota Teacher Inventory was found, which concluded that "people with positive self concepts tend to have more desirable attitudes for teaching" (In Fitts, 1965, p. 28). Fitts also reports substantial correlations with Izard's Self Rating Positive Affect Scale (Wayne, 1963; Wehmer and Izard, 1962) and with the Kell-Hoefline Incomplete Sentence Blank (Searles, 1962) between the self concept and the family relations scale. Certain life experiences were seen as affecting the way in which a person sees himself, and Fitts reported studies reflecting personality changes under particular conditions (Gividen, 1959; Ashcraft and Fitts, 1974; and Congdon, 1958).

Several reviewers discuss the TSCS and its use. Bentler (in Buros, 1972, pp. 151-152) points out that it has several scores which have high correlations with other personality measures. Total positive on the TSCS correlates -.70 with the Taylor Anxiety Scale; correlations with various MMPI scales are often in the .50's and .60's. Bentler notes defects of the scale, citing lack of data on the interval consistency of the scale or on any of subscale scores. While he believes such internal consistency coefficients would be high, based on correlations with the MMPI scales, he believes such information should be provided. Another problem, Bentler sees, relates to the scores of 29 variables given, for which no principal components analysis of factor analysis is reported. "This reviewer [Bentler] would suspect that two or three dimensions at best exist in the scale..." (p. 51). If indeed there are only a few independent dimensions, it would seem to invalidate the author's claim that the TSCS is "multi-dimensional in its description of the self concept" (Fitts, 1965, p.1). Bentler also mentions the cumbersome scoring procedure.

Suinn, also reviewing in Buros (1972), mentions "the lack of descriptive statistics on the normative sample, method of selection
of samples and the exact nature of results leading to the author's various conclusions" (p. 368). Suinn feels that individual scores should have empirical validation, especially in regard to behavioral correlatives. Suinn also mentions the need for factor analysis and the tediousness of scoring, but feels that "the TSCS offers great potential as a promising clinical instrument" (p. 369).

**Adlerian Parental Assessment of Child Behavior Scale**

Since one of the purposes of this study is to contribute to the national norming data for this instrument, there is a dearth of research literature on this scale because of its recent development.

Mahoney (1974), reporting on Adlerian groups, discussed the difficulty in measuring Adlerian concepts with measurement instruments not specifically designed for that use, and the subsequent lack of sensitivity to such constructs.

In a personal communication from the author (McKay, 1977), content validity was obtained by interjudge agreement on scale items by judges who were familiar with Adlerian philosophy and practice, and who were asked to critique the items specifically for relevancy to an Adlerian base. Only three items were felt to be non-specific to Adlerian philosophy, but were included to represent specific information otherwise contained in the STEP program. The reliability data for internal consistency and stability over time for the pilot study and the research project (McKay, 1976, p. 37) were felt to be sufficient to allow use of the instrument for further research purposes.
Chapter 3
Methodology

This study was made in order to assess the effects of the Systematic Training for Effective Parenting (STEP) program on certain aspects of self concept and the subjective perception of parents concerning the behavior of their Target Child.

This study also evaluated the effectiveness of the process-oriented and didactic groups of the STEP program vs. an Adlerian-based Parent Education group.

Finally, this study sought to evaluate predictor variables such as sex, age, education, ethnic group and delivery system in the overall effectiveness of the STEP program.

This chapter is concerned with procedures involved in testing the hypotheses of this study. This chapter includes: (a) population and sampling procedure, (b) the research design, (c) research and treatment procedures, (d) instruments, (e) statistical analysis methods, and (f) limitations of the study.

Population and Sampling Procedure

Subjects for this study were 90 volunteers drawn from two adjacent geographic areas. The program was offered to parents at an Elementary school (k-5) in Newport News, Virginia (four groups), and to parents of children in the Poquoson, Virginia School (three groups). The Newport News location is suburban; the Poquoson situation predominantly rural, with a considerable number of military families in both areas.

Parents who met the following criteria were accepted for inclusion in the study: (1) were willing to help in evaluating the program, (2) had one child between the ages of two and 18 that could be identified as a Target Child and (3) attended at least seven of the nine treatment sessions.

In Newport News, parents were invited by the PTA president, with the concurrence of the administration. In Poquoson, they were invited by the Director of Instruction.

Research Design

The Experimental Group - Control Group, utilizing intact groups,
with a pretest-posttest design was used (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 342).

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
Y_b & X_1 & Y_a \\
Y_b & X_2 & Y_a \\
Y_b & X_3 & Y_a \\
Y_b & \sim X & Y_a \\
\end{array}
\]

Figure 1

Y = population
b = pretest
X = treatment
a = posttest
X = no treatment
\sim X = Control

The use of intact groups was necessary because many parents could attend only on a certain night or in a certain geographic area, although randomization would have strengthened the design. The different treatments were assigned to the groups at random.

For the STEP groups, the treatment consisted of the materials and delivery system contained in the STEP program. For the Adlerian Parent Study Group, the materials consisted of Children, the Challenge (Dreikurs and Soltz, 1964) and supplementary readings recommended by the authors. The delivery system was that described by Soltz for use with the text. The dependent variable for both programs was (1) each parent's subjective perception of the behavior of his/her Target Child as measured by the Adlerian Parental Assessment of Child Behavior Scale (McKay, 1976) and (2) a measure of parental self concept, as measured by five scales (total score, identity, self-satisfaction, behavior, and family self) of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (Fitts, 1965).

**Hypothesis 1**

There will be a significant difference in parental assessment of parent-child interaction between the groups (process-oriented and didactic) participating in the STEP training and the group not participating in the STEP training, at the completion of the nine-week program, as measured by the APACBS. The statistical proposition, \(X_1 + X_2 \sim X\), will be tested in null form, \(X_1 + X_2 - \sim X = 0\).
(a) The parents in the process-oriented group will show greater gains than parents in the didactic group. The statistical proposition $X_1 > X_2$ will be tested in the null form, $X_1 - X_2 = 0$.

**Hypothesis 2**

There will be a significant difference in self concept between the groups (process-oriented and didactic) participating in the STEP training and the group not participating, at the completion of the nine-week program, as measured by the following scales of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale: (a) total score, (b) identity or self concept, (c) satisfaction, (d) behavior, and (e) family self.

(a) The parents in the process-oriented group will show greater gains than parents in the didactic group.

The statistical propositions and null hypotheses will be the same as in Hypothesis 1, but using data from the TSCS.

**Hypothesis 3**

There will be a significant difference in parental assessment of parent-child interaction between the Dreikurs group and the group receiving no training, at the completion of the nine-week training period, as measured by the APACBS. The null hypothesis, $X_3 - \sim X = 0$, will be tested, using data from the APACBS.

**Hypothesis 4**

There will be a significant difference in self-concept between the Dreikurs group and the control group, at the completion of the nine-week course, as measured by the following scales of the TSCS: (a) total score, (b) identity or self concept, (c) self-satisfaction, (d) behavior, and (e) family self. The statistical proposition and null hypothesis will be the same as in Hypothesis 3, using data from the TSCS.

**Hypothesis 5**

Gain scores for the parental assessment of parent-child interaction will be greater for the STEP groups than for the Dreikurs group, as measured by the APACBS. The statistical proposition, $X_1 + X_2 > X_3$, will be tested in null form, $X_1 + X_2 - X_3 = 0$. 

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Research and Treatment Procedures

Parents who were enrolled in the courses at an Elementary school in Newport News, Virginia and in Poquoson, Virginia constituted the experimental groups. Parents who requested the course but were unable to attend because of time conflict or because the group had already been closed were designated as the control group.

The two pretest measures were given during the first week of classes, at the first meeting of each experimental group and during the same week to the control group. The TSCS and the APACBS were administered in class to the experimental groups and individually at home to the control group. Standard instructions were given to all.

During the nine-week intervention period, the STEP experimental groups were exposed to eight topics which included group interaction in the following areas: understanding behavior and misbehavior, how children use emotions to involve parents, encouragement, communication (listening), communication (exploring alternatives, expressing ideas and feelings), developing responsibility, decision making, the family meeting, and developing confidence. For the Adlerian Parent Study Group, the topics were the same, but not necessarily in the same order. It was more heavily weighted toward Adlerian practices than communication skills. During this period, the control group received no intervention.

The two posttest measures were administered to both the experimental and control groups at the completion of the program. The posttest measures were identical to the pretest measures and the instructions were the same as those given for the pretest. The experimental groups received their posttest evaluation in class and the control group at home, as in the pretest procedure. Scores are available for 75 parents in the experimental groups and 15 parents in the control group. The scoring was done by the experimenter. The appropriate data was transferred to IBM cards and processed by the College of William and Mary Computer Center.

Measurement Instruments

The instruments which were used as criterion measures were chosen for their relevance to the concept being measured, and for the similarity
of philosophical base.

Adlerian Parental Assessment of Child Behavior Scale (McKay, 1976)

The APACBS is a seven point interval rating scale designed to measure a parent's perception of the behavior of a selected child (Target Child). The instrument was judged for its content validity by three judges familiar with the STEP program. Reliability data available from a pilot study and subsequent research study yielded the following results:

The Cronbach's alpha (Cronbach, 1951) test for internal consistency ranged from .90 to .91. The Pearson r test for stability over time yielded a coefficient of .97. The Cronbach's alpha range during the research project was .81 to .89. The Pearson r yielded a coefficient of .83. (McKay, 1976, p. 37)

The instrument consists of 32 statements, half of them positive and half negative, toward which the parent is asked to subjectively respond.

Tennessee Self Concept Scale (Fitts, 1965)

This measure of self concept is composed of 100 statements. The subject is asked to mark those which are self-descriptive. The instrument is considered appropriate for literate adults. Of the two scoring systems available, the counseling form was utilized. The counseling form gives fifteen separate scores -- nine self-esteem scores, three for variability of response, and one each for self-criticism, distribution and time scores. Following are the scales and a description of each as given in the manual (Fitts, 1965) which was used in the study:

Total score This is the most important single score ... [reflecting] the overall level of self-esteem. Persons with high scores tend to like themselves, feel that they are persons of value and worth, have confidence in themselves and act accordingly. People with low scores are doubtful about their own worth; see themselves as undesirable; often feel anxious, depressed, and unhappy; and have little faith or confidence in themselves. (p. 2)
Identity or Self-Concept  These are the 'what I am' items. Here, the individual is describing his basic identity -- what he is as he see himself. (p. 2)

Behavior  This score comes from those items that say 'this is what I do, or this is the way I act'. Thus, this score measures the individual's perception of his own behavior of the way he functions. (p. 3)

Self-Satisfaction  This score comes from those items where the individual describes how he feels about the self he perceives. In general, this score reflects the level of self-satisfaction or self acceptance. (pp. 2-3)

Family Self  This score reflects one's feelings of adequacy, worth, and value as a family member. It refers to the individual's perception of self in reference to his closest and most immediate circle of associates. (p.3)

The TSCS is well validated and Buros (1972) reported numerous studies using this scale. It has been found to be useful in discrimination between groups as well as giving self concept information. Inter-judge agreement on item content and high correlations with other personality measures were used in validating the instrument. The reliability data varies for different scale scores, but it is generally in the high 80's. Fitts reported test - retest data with college students over a two week period to vary from .88 to .92.

The five scales of the Tennessee were used on a pretest - posttest basis with all subjects, treatment and control, in the study.

Statistical Methods

Statistical tests of significance were performed upon the data in null form by one-way analysis of covariance. The effects of the independent variable (the STEP program and the Dreikurs program respectively) were determined by a comparison between experimental and control groups. Pretest scores on the APACBS and TSCS estimates were used as covariates to control for inequalities in these areas.

Gain scores on the APACBS for all parents in the experimental groups were dicotomized with a median split and placed into high -
low categories. A one-way analysis of covariance with step-down option and a multiple regression analysis were used to evaluate the following predictor variables: age, sex, education, race, approach method (didactic or process-oriented) and pretest scores on the APACBS.
Chapter 4
Results

The results of this study are presented in this chapter according to hypothesis. The data and statistical findings for each hypothesis will be reviewed and interpreted as applicable.

Hypothesis 1

There will be a significant difference in parental assessment of parent-child interaction between the groups (process-oriented and didactic) participating in the STEP training and the group not participating, at the completion of the nine week program, as measured by the APACBS.

Table 1 presents pre- and posttest means on the APACBS for the STEP groups and the control group. Both treatment groups showed significantly (p < .01) increased APACBS scores. The treatment given to the STEP groups, that is the STEP program, succeeded in changing parents' perceptions of parent-child interaction. While the actual posttest scores on control and treatment show little difference, the pretest scores show that the control group started with a higher mean and improved little, while the treatment group's pretest means were lower, and improved considerably. Analysis of variance of pretest means, however (appendix A & B), found that the groups were not significantly different at the outset. The hypothesis was accepted at the .05 level.

Hypothesis 1 (a)

The parents in the process-oriented group will show greater gains than parents in the didactic group.

Table 2 presents pre- and posttest means on the APACBS for the process-oriented and didactic STEP groups. The two approaches were not significantly different (F [1,63] = 0.060, p = 0.807). The hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 2

There will be a significant difference in self concept between the groups (process-oriented and didactic) participating in the STEP training and the group not participating, at the completion of the
Table 1
Hypothesis 1 Variables
Adlerian Parental Assessment of Child Behavior Scale
STEP Groups vs. Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covariate APACBS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10363.469</td>
<td>73.245</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1383.132</td>
<td>9.775</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22499.867</td>
<td>41.510</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pretest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>144.8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP (process)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>132.6667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(didactic)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>136.4839</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 1 Analysis of Variance
With APACBS Pretest as Covariate
STEP Groups vs. Control
Table 2
Hypothesis 1a Variables
Adlerian Parental Assessment of Child Behavior Scale
STEP (process) vs. STEP (didactic)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariate APACBS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7865.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>18343.383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 1a Analysis of Variance
With APACBS Pretest as Covariate
STEP (process) vs. STEP (didactic)

STEP (process) 33 132.6660 15.56 118.1818 16.83
STEP (didactic) 31 136.4839 18.93 151.4516 17.41
nine week program, as measured by the following scales of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale: (a) total score, (b) identity or self concept, (c) satisfaction, (d) behavior, and (e) family self.

Tables 3 - 7 give descriptive data on the five subscales of the TSCS, presenting mean scores for both the pre- and posttest data on each subscale, and analyses of covariance for the STEP and Control groups relative to those same subscales.

Table 3 gives pre- and posttest means for the Total Score subscale of the TSCS and analysis of covariance showing that treatment for the STEP groups gave an $F[1,78] = 1.126, p = 0.292$. Table 4 gives data on the subscale Self Concept, showing an $F[1,78] = 0.0948, p = 0.333$. Table 5 gives data on the subscale Self Satisfaction, showing an $F[1,78] = 1.236, p = 0.270$. Table 6 gives data on the subscale Behavior, showing an $F[1,78] = 0.056, p = 0.814$. Table 7 gives data on the subscale Family Self, showing an $F[1,78] = 3.480, p = 0.060$. In no case was treatment significant at the .05 level of confidence. The hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 2 (a)

Using the TSCS, differences between the STEP (process) and STEP (didactic) groups were analyzed in Tables 8 - 12 relevant to the hypothesis that the parents in the process-oriented group would show greater gains than parents in the didactic group.

Table 8 gives pre- and posttest means for each of the STEP groups, process and didactic, and an analysis of covariance for the subscale Total Score, with an $F[1,63] = 0.072, p = 0.790$. Table 9 gives data on the subscale Self Concept, showing $F[1,63] = 0.333, p = 0.566$. Table 10 gives data on the subscale Self Satisfaction, with an $F[1,63] = 1.225, p = 0.273$. Table 11 gives pre- and posttest means on the subscale Behavior, and an analysis of variance yields an $F[1,63] = 0.046, p = 0.830$. Table 12 gives data on the subscale Family Self, with an $F[1,63] = 0.021, p = 0.884$. In no case did data show any significant differences between the two STEP groups. The hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 3

There will be a significant difference in parental assessment of
Table 3  
Hypothesis 2 Variables  
Tennessee Self Concept Scale - Total Score Subscale  
STEP Groups vs. Control  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>345.000</td>
<td>40.78</td>
<td>346.000</td>
<td>39.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP (process)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>336.8484</td>
<td>32.76</td>
<td>344.818</td>
<td>32.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(didactic)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>344.4514</td>
<td>38.41</td>
<td>349.870</td>
<td>36.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 2 Analysis of Variance  
With TSCS Total Score Pretest as Covariate  
STEP Groups vs. Control  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covariate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74236.3</td>
<td>268.142</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSCS (Total)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>311.670</td>
<td>1.126</td>
<td>0.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>95588.875</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4

#### Hypothesis 2 Variables

**Tennessee Self Concept Scale - Self Concept Subscale**

**STEP Groups vs. Control**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>126.8000</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>125.8667</td>
<td>11.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP Groups</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(process)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>123.3939</td>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>125.5454</td>
<td>7.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(didactic)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>123.3226</td>
<td>12.28</td>
<td>124.5484</td>
<td>11.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Hypothesis 2 Analysis of Variance

**With TSCS Self Concept Pretest as Covariate**

**STEP Groups vs. Control**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covariate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5724.184</td>
<td>147.853</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSCS (SC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36.691</td>
<td>0.948</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>8703.246</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5
Hypothesis 2 Variables
Tennessee Self Concept Scale - Self Satisfaction Subscale
STEP Groups vs. Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>103.3333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP Groups</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>102.8182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(process)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>105.6774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(didactic)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>107.7283</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 2 Analysis of Variance
With TSCS Satisfaction Pretest as Covariate
STEP Groups vs. Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covariate TSCS (Satisf)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14038.188</td>
<td>263.357</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65.909</td>
<td>1.236</td>
<td>0.2700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>18155.254</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6
Hypothesis 2 Variables
Tennessee Self Concept Scale - Behavior Subscale
STEP Groups vs. Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>114.7333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP Groups</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>110.6364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(process)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>115.2581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(didactic)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>111.4000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 2 Analysis of Variance
With TSCS Behavior Pretest as Covariate
STEP Groups vs. Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covariate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6167.313</td>
<td>146.521</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSCS (Behav)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.336</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>9368.624</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7
Hypothesis 2 Variables
Tennessee Self Concept Scale - Family Self Subscale
STEP Groups vs. Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th></th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>69.2267</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>69.0667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP Groups</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>69.0909</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>71.5444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(process)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>70.6129</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>72.4193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(didactic)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 2 Analysis of Variance
With TSCS Family Self Pretest as Covariate
STEP Groups vs. Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covariate</td>
<td></td>
<td>2408.304</td>
<td>110.203</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSCS</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.480</td>
<td>0.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>76.042</td>
<td>3.480</td>
<td>0.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4145.199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Variance</td>
<td>D.F.</td>
<td>Sum of Squares</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Significance Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariate TSCS (Total)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53804.305</td>
<td>165.274</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.318</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>73685.938</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8
Hypothesis 2a Variables
Tennessee Self Concept Scale - Total Score Subscale
STEP (process) vs. STEP (didactic)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP (process)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>132.6667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP (didactic)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>136.4839</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 2a Analysis of Variance
With TSCS Total Score Pretest as Covariate
STEP (process) vs. STEP (didactic)
Table 9
Hypothesis 2a Variables
Tennessee Self Concept Scale - Self Concept Subscale
STEP (process) vs. STEP (didactic)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covariate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4123.180</td>
<td>95.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSCS (SC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.346</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6767.688</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(process)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>123.3939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(didactic)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>123.3226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 2a Analysis of Variance
With TSCS Self Concept Pretest as Covariate
STEP (process) vs. STEP (didactic)
Table 10
Hypothesis 2a Variables
Tennessee Self Concept Scale - Self Satisfaction Subscale
STEP (process) vs. STEP (didactic)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covariate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9651.418</td>
<td>158.088</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSCS (SS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74.758</td>
<td>1.225</td>
<td>0.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>13450.289</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP (process)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pretest Mean</th>
<th>Pretest SD</th>
<th>Posttest Mean</th>
<th>Posttest SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>102.8182</td>
<td>14.51</td>
<td>107.7273</td>
<td>13.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>105.6774</td>
<td>16.41</td>
<td>107.8710</td>
<td>15.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP (didactic)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pretest Mean</th>
<th>Pretest SD</th>
<th>Posttest Mean</th>
<th>Posttest SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>102.8182</td>
<td>14.51</td>
<td>107.7273</td>
<td>13.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>105.6774</td>
<td>16.41</td>
<td>107.8710</td>
<td>15.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11
Hypothesis 2a Variables
Tennessee Self Concept Scale - Behavior Subscale
STEP (process) vs. STEP (didactic)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covariate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4055.009</td>
<td>86.346</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSCS (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.176</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6921.875</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP (process)</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>110.6364</td>
<td>11.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>115.2581</td>
<td>12.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 2a Analysis of Variance
With TSCS Behavior Pretest as Covariate
STEP (process) vs. STEP (didactic)
Table 12
Hypothesis 2a Variables
Tennessee Self Concept Scale - Family Self Subscale
STEP (process) vs. STEP (didactic)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP (process)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>69.0909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP (didactic)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>70.6129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 2a Analysis of Variance
With TSCS Family Self Pretest as Covariate
STEP (process) vs. STEP (didactic)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covariate TSCS (FS)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1840.294</td>
<td>81.633</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3215.931</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
parent-child interaction between the Dreikurs group and the group receiving no training, at the completion of the nine week graining period, as measured by the APACBS.

At the completion of the nine week treatment program, the Dreikurs group showed that the main effects of treatment was significant, $F_{[1,25]} = 4.765, p = .040$. The means and analysis of covariance are given in Table 13. The hypothesis was accepted at the .05 level of confidence. The treatment given to the Dreikurs group, that is the program developed by Dreikurs and Soltz, was successful in changing parental perceptions of parent-child interaction.

Hypothesis 4

There will be a significant difference in self concept between the Dreikurs group and the control group, at the completion of the nine week course, as measured by the following scales of the TSCS: (a) total score, (b) identity or self concept, (c) self satisfaction, (d) behavior, and (e) family self.

Tables 14 - 18 provide data for the five subscales on the TSCS, using their pretests as covariates. Mean scores and analyses of covariance are given for each subscale for the Dreikurs and Control groups.

Table 14 gives pre- and posttest means for the subscale Total Score, and analysis of covariance showing $F_{[1,25]} = 6.233, p = .020$. Table 15 gives data for the subscale Self Concept, with $F_{[1,25]} = 1.760, p = .198$. Table 16 gives pre- and posttest means for the subscale Self Satisfaction, showing in an analysis of variance that $F_{[1,25]} = 3.345, p = .80$. Table 17 gives data on the subscale Behavior with $F_{[1,25]} = 6.083, p = .022$. Table 18 gives pre- and posttest data on the subscale Family Self, with $F_{[1,25]} = 3.303, p = .082$. The two subscales, Total Score and Behavior, appear to be more sensitive to changes made in the behavior patterns and perceptions of parent-child interaction made by the parents. The hypothesis is rejected for subscales Self-Concept, Self Satisfaction, and Family Self, and accepted for subscales Total Score and Behavior, at the .05 level of confidence.
### Table 13

**Hypothesis 3 Variables**  
Adlerian Parental Assessment of Child Behavior Scale  
Dreikurs vs. Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covariate APACBS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4659.160</td>
<td>52.346</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>424.105</td>
<td>4.765</td>
<td>0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7130.441</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 14**

**Hypothesis 4 Variables**

**Tennessee Self Concept Scale - Total Score Subscale**

**Dreikurs vs. Control**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th></th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>345.0000</td>
<td>40.78</td>
<td>346.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dreikurs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>342.3635</td>
<td>15.77</td>
<td>356.6362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis 4 Analysis of Variance**

**With TSCS Total Score Pretest as Covariate**

**Dreikurs Group vs. Control**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covariate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22464.820</td>
<td>128.423</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSCS (Total)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1090.290</td>
<td>6.233</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27578.465</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15
Hypothesis 4 Variables
Tennessee Self Concept Scale - Self Concept Subscale
Dreikurs vs. Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th></th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>126.8000</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>125.8667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dreikurs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>127.0000</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>128.9091</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 4 Analysis of Variance
With TSCS Self Concept Pretest as Covariate
Dreikurs Group vs. Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covariate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1776.217</td>
<td>60.149</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSCS (SC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51.974</td>
<td>1.760</td>
<td>0.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2507.382</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 16

**Hypothesis 4 Variables**

Tennessee Self Concept Scale - Self Satisfaction Subscale

Dreikurs vs. Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>103.3333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dreikurs</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>103.8182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis 4 Analysis of Variance**

With TSCS Self Satisfaction Pretest as Covariate

Dreikurs Group vs. Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covariate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5255.621</td>
<td>86.976</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TSCS (SS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>202.102</td>
<td>3.345</td>
<td>0.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6847.516</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17
Hypothesis 4 Variables
Tennessee Self Concept Scale - Behavior Subscale
Dreikurs vs. Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>114.7333</td>
<td>13.95</td>
<td>115.4000</td>
<td>13.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dreikurs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>115.5454</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>116.9091</td>
<td>6.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 4 Analysis of Variance
With TSCS Behavior Pretest as Covariate
Dreikurs Group vs. Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>D.F</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covariate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2300.311</td>
<td>117.648</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSCS (Beh)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>118.940</td>
<td>6.083</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2868.959</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18
Hypothesis 4 Variables
Tennessee Self Concept Scale - Family Self Subscale
Dreikurs vs. Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th></th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>69.2667</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>69.0667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dreikurs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>69.9091</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>72.6364</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 4 Analysis of Variance
With TSCS Family Self Pretest as Covariate
Dreikurs Group vs. Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covariate TSCS (Fam)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>906.000</td>
<td>52.451</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57.060</td>
<td>3.303</td>
<td>0.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1360.344</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 5

Gain scores for the parental assessment of parent-child interaction will be greater for the STEP groups than for the Dreikurs group, as measured by the APACBS.

Table 19 shows mean scores and results from an analysis of covariance between the STEP program (both groups) and the Dreikurs program, using the APACBS as covariate. The treatment did not contribute significantly ($F \ [1,74] = 0.525, p = 0.471$. The hypothesis was rejected. There was no significant difference in the results obtained by training parents in either the Dreikurs or STEP groups.
Table 19
Hypothesis 5 Variable
Adlerian Parental Assessment of Child Behavior Scale
STEP Groups vs. Dreikurs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covariate APACBS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8987.309</td>
<td>52.473</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89.895</td>
<td>0.525</td>
<td>0.4710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>21409.020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(process)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>132.6667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(didactic)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>136.4839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dreikurs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>139.2727</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5
Summary, Conclusions, Limitations
and Recommendations

This chapter will summarize the study and interpret the results with conclusions and implications. Limitations of the study will be noted and recommendations for further study will be given.

Summary

Changes in the social structure of contemporary society have made the rearing of children an increasingly difficult task. Many "causes" have been implicated, such as mobility, T.V., and breakdown of the family unit. Although many books and articles have been written, the problems remain. This study evaluated an educational program for parents which combines an Adlerian socioteleological model with communication skills training. It attempts to assay the effects of the program on parent-child interaction as subjectively perceived and upon the self concept of the parents. Parents from the Poquoson City school system, Poquoson, Virginia, comprised one part of the population for the study (N=44). The remaining subjects (N=46) were parents of children in the Newport News City School system, Newport News, Virginia. An analysis of variance of APACBS and TSCS pretest scores was done to ascertain homogeneity of groups (appendix A & B) and the groups were subsequently combined to forming an experimental group of 75 and control of 15.

Subjects were administered the APACBS and five subscales of the TSCS as pretest and posttest measures. Treatment consisted of one class per week, which met for one and one-half hours, for nine consecutive weeks, during the first five months of 1977. Subject treatment included (a) reading assignment (nine chapters in the parent handbook [Dinkmeyer and McKay, 1976] or selected chapters in Children, the Challenge [Dreikurs and Soltz, 1964]), (b) lectures or discussion about effective parenting techniques, (c) homework, and (d) class participation. The STEP, in addition, included nine tape recordings of role-playing and/or presentations of lecture material.

Because of the location and time constraints on many parents,
random assignment was not possible. Intact groups with random assignment of treatment/control conditions was used. Statistical treatments consisted of analyses of covariance with pretest scores on the TSCS and APACBS as covariates. All hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of confidence.

Conclusions

The modality of the group is seen as having been a useful one, as expected. Economy of professional time is seen since 75 parents received treatment within a nine-week period. As a socio-process group, previously defined as one which had as its goal a "solution to a current problem or evaluation of some past undertaking", responses both on measurement instruments and on subjective responses, achievement was reached. The clients were seen as having been helped "to perceive, understand, and act upon process events which occur[red] in the client's environment" (Schein, 1969).

Central to the concept of self theory, Rogers sees the self as always in process, continually changing and growing as the result of its continuing interaction with the phenomenal field (Hansen et al., 1972, p.78). Insofar as the TSCS and the APACBS measure perceptions by the individual of his beliefs and functioning, change in a positive direction has been shown to occur, and significantly so for the APACBS. The stability of these changes over time cannot be assessed as the result of this study, but would require longitudinal evaluation.

Adlerians believe that personality rests on a wholistic foundation, with the individual interacting with his social environment. The basic motivation of psychological movement is seen as goal-related. This implies both trait and state properties, with the trait properties relatively stable over time, but the state properties reflecting the environmental press.

The two measurement instruments were chosen on the basis of the belief that each would measure one aspect: the Tennessee would measure changes in the more enduring trait aspects, and the APACBS in the state aspects. The results show that the APACBS posttest scores reflect the fact that all treatment groups exhibited positive movement to a
significant degree ($p < .05$), adequately measuring changes which are sensitive to short term environmental manipulation, at least as far as Adlerian concepts are concerned. There has been the need for an instrument which is sensitive to Adlerian theory and practices that could be used with the proliferation of Adlerian programs that have become so widespread in recent years, and it appears that the APACBS has met this need. Whether it will be sensitive to perceptions of behavior change as the result of parent education via another intervention, e.g., one with behaviorist orientation, must be the subject of further research.

Using data from the APACBS, conclusions directly related to the hypotheses were reached that: (1) there was no appreciable difference between the process and didactic delivery systems (STEP) and hence no preference for method of presentation, (2) there was no significant difference between the STEP and Dreikurs programs, and (3) both programs showed parents perceived their interaction with their children as having significantly improved following treatment. Whether this perception of change occurred because of behavior changes resulting from new or more efficient family management skills, or from a tolerance to the misbehavior of their children, or for some other reason, is not possible to ascertain.

**Limitations**

Limitations are present in three areas: control, population, and instrument choice. Because of the necessity of using intact groups, some of the control which would have been achieved through randomization was lost, although some control was retained by randomizing treatment/control and by statistical procedures.

The relatively homogeneous population for this study in a predominantly white, middle-class area, restricts generalization from this study. The conclusions drawn, while they may also apply to other groups, must be considered valid for only the groups used in this study.

Because of the recent development of the APACBS instrument and the paucity of research relative to its support and use, it must be considered to be experimental at this time, and conclusions based on its
use must be regarded as tentative

**Recommendations**

Relative to the limitations, replication of this study using randomization should be done to substantiate findings and increase control. Use of the program for other populations would increase its generalizability. Additional norming data and additional studies using the STEP and APACBS will allow conclusions which are made on the basis of data from the APACBS to be more viable.

Other studies are recommended. These include the use of a different measurement instrument than the TSCS in conjunction with the APACBS. It seems logical to assume that the more "state" (vs. "trait") related the measurement instrument is, the more change could be expected to be recorded. Another way of looking at this would be to expect instruments which measure behavior to be more sensitive to change. Hence choice of instrument will have considerable impact on correlations with the APACBS.

Studies using populations other than parents were suggested by group members. Teachers and teen-agers were seen as deriving benefits. Other suggested groups include: new parents of about-to-be parents, parent-child duos, couples only, men only, and single parents only. Parents from different ethnic, economic, or educational background should also be explored.

Several studies have dealt with behavior change in children following a parent education program (Aronoff, 1976; James, 1975) but there are none using the STEP program. There is a need for more research in the area of behavior change in untreated or concurrently treated children whose parents receive the STEP training.

Another aspect for study related to objective measurement of changes in the child-rearing practices, such as that by McKay (1976). Direct observer evaluation of parent-child interaction could be done.

Measurement of state and trait changes for both objective parent behavior change and changes in children's behavior following parent training could also be evaluated.
Appendix
Appendix A

Analysis of Variance

APACBS Pretest Scores

Homogeneity of Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>95% Conf Int For Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gr 1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>132.6667</td>
<td>15.5637</td>
<td>2.7093</td>
<td>127.1 to 138.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>139.2727</td>
<td>13.3723</td>
<td>4.0319</td>
<td>130.3 to 148.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr 3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>144.8000</td>
<td>22.2203</td>
<td>5.7373</td>
<td>132.5 to 157.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr 4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>136.4839</td>
<td>18.9365</td>
<td>3.4011</td>
<td>129.5 to 143.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>136.8111</td>
<td>17.9899</td>
<td>1.8963</td>
<td>133.0 to 140.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1594.1714</td>
<td>531.3904</td>
<td>1.680</td>
<td>0.1774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>27209.5872</td>
<td>316.3904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>28803.7578</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix B

Analysis of Variance

TSCS Pretest Scores

Homogeneity of Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>95% Conf Int For Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gr 1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>336.8484</td>
<td>32.7606</td>
<td>5.7029</td>
<td>325.2319 to 348.4646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>342.3635</td>
<td>15.7751</td>
<td>4.7564</td>
<td>331.7656 to 352.9612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr 3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>345.0000</td>
<td>40.7816</td>
<td>10.5298</td>
<td>322.4158 to 367.5840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr 4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>344.4514</td>
<td>38.4125</td>
<td>6.8991</td>
<td>330.3616 to 358.5410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>341.5000</td>
<td>34.4385</td>
<td>3.6301</td>
<td>334.2869 to 348.7129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1172.4453</td>
<td>390.8149</td>
<td>0.322</td>
<td>0.8094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>104382.3413</td>
<td>1212.7480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>105554.7500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Adlerian Parental Assessment of Child Behavior Scale (APACBS)*

NAME ________________________________ DATE __________

IDENTIFIED CHILD _______________________ AGE _______ SEX ______
(One of your children with whom you want to improve your relationship)

DIRECTIONS: Please circle the number for each item which best describes your identified child's behavior as you see it. Please try to respond to every item. This information is for the purpose of research only. Your responses will be held in strictest confidence.

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

(PLEASE GO ON TO NEXT PAGE)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Very Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Figures out solutions to his/her own problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Changes behavior when told that it bothers you.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Puts dirty clothes in hamper without being reminded.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Argues with you.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Leaves belongings scattered around the house.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Interrupts you at inappropriate times.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Is on time for meals.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Eats most foods offered without being coaxed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Has table manners which are acceptable to you.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Tattles on other children (for example: brothers or sisters, or children in the neighborhood).</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Throws temper tantrums.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Shares problems (s)he is facing with you.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Is considerate of your feelings.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Requests help on tasks (s)he can do independently.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Cleans up after snacking without being reminded.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Behaves in such a way that you find yourself feeling hurt.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Very Often</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Very Seldom</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Behaves in such a way that you find yourself feeling annoyed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Behaves in such a way that you find yourself feeling discouraged, believing that the child cannot improve.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Behaves in such a way that you find yourself feeling angry.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Stays with difficult tasks until they are completed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Disturbs you when you are driving.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Remembers where he puts personal belongings.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Has to be told more than once to go to bed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Is quiet after going to bed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Used by permission of the author, Dr. Gary McKay
Appendix D

Invitation to Parents

RICHNECK "VIP'S" ANNOUNCE A UNIQUE OPPORTUNITY FOR YOU

Systematic Training for Effective Parenting
A Parent Education Group

In our culture we give training in many skills and jobs, but many times the most important job of all - parenthood - is neglected. Parents often wish they had better ways to communicate with their children, increase understanding of their family relationships and improve parent-child interaction. This program is designed to increase parent effectiveness in these ways.

Systematic Training for Effective Parenting is a nine week course designed by Don Dinkmeyer and Gary McKay, authors of many books and articles on parenting. It will be led by Marcia Bauer, elementary counselor and director of the Child Care Center of Christopher Newport College. The evening group will meet on Monday night at 7:30, beginning January 11, 1977. The afternoon group will meet on Tuesday at 1:00, beginning January 11, 1977. Groups will meet at Richneck School for an hour and a half each week. The course will be offered free of charge and all materials will be provided. You will be asked to help evaluate the course and its usefulness to you by providing information about yourself and your child. All information you give in this regard will be confidential.

Please return the form if you are interested in participating in the parent education group.

_____ I wish to be a member of the evening group
_____ I wish to be a member of the afternoon group
_____ I would like more information
_____ I am interested, but cannot attend at this time

Name ____________________________
Address ___________________________
Telephone Number ____________________
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