



Caesar Pacifici, Ph.D.
Director of Research

June 17, 1996

Minalee Saks
Birth To Three
3875 Kincaid, #15
Eugene, OR 97405

Dear Minalee,

This letter is to document that I have completed an evaluation report for the *Make Parenting A Pleasure Program*. The report fulfills my commitment to the US West Foundation grant.

I would welcome working with you in the future on a consulting basis if you want to expand the evaluation activity for this or other programs.

Very sincerely,

Caesar Pacifici, Ph.D.
Director of Research
Northwest Media, Inc.

326 West 12th Avenue
Eugene, OR 97401
(541) 343-6636
(541) 343-0177 fax
research@northwestmedia.com

PROGRAM EVALUATION OF *MAKE PARENTING A PLEASURE*

PRELIMINARY REPORT

The following is a preliminary evaluation report of the revised *Make Parenting A Pleasure* (MPAP) program.

Sample Characteristics

The evaluation included 52 parents from Lane County. Classes were held in two locations, Whiteaker and Maple. The intervention group consisted of 29 parents; 12 from Whiteaker and 17 from Maple. The control group consisted of 23 parents on a wait list for the MPAP program. The total sample included 33 females and 19 males. Thirty-two parents were either married or had a live-in partner; 20 were either divorced, separated or single. One-quarter of the sample had annual incomes below \$6,000; about half the parents reported incomes of \$6,000 to \$15,000; and the remaining quarter had incomes above \$15,000. The average age of parents was 28 years. The average education level was completion of high school. There were an average 1.5 children per family. Children parents selected for their responses to questionnaires included 24 girls and 28 boys, with a mean age of 2.9 years.

In general, the intervention groups (Maple and Whiteaker) and control group (wait list) were equivalent on the above demographic variables. However, parents in the intervention group were significantly older (30.3 years) than parents in the control group (24.7 years). Also, target children in the treatment group were older (3.4 years) than children in the control group (2.3 years).

Assessment Procedure

Parents completed a battery of questionnaires one week prior to beginning the program and again one week following the completion of the program. Measures included in the assessment battery are described below.

Measures

The measures used in the evaluation are presented according to four areas of intended impact:

A. Parent Emotions

- *Index of Self-Esteem (ISE)*: The ISE is a 25-item self-report rating scale that measures the degree to which individuals have a problem with self-esteem (Hudson, 1982). The ISE is easy to understand and quickly administered. It was derived from clinical and nonclinical populations across a variety of ethnic groups. An overall mean score was computed based on parent ratings (1, none of the time, to 5, most of the time) of self-esteem statements. Higher scores indicated lower self-esteem.
- *Parenting Stress Index (PSI)*: The PSI is a 101-item self-report rating scale that measures the level of stressors perceived by parents associated with a variety of parent and child characteristics (up to age 10; Abidin, 1987). Parents rate how much they agree (1, strongly

agree to 5, strongly disagree) with statements related to a variety of stressors. Three primary scores were computed for the PSI: an overall score, a total score for child-related stressors, and a total score for parent-related stressors. In addition, several subscale scores were computed for parent and child-related stressors. Child subscales included: adaptability, acceptability, demandingness, mood, hyperactive/distractability, and reinforces parent. Parent subscales included: depression, attachment, restriction of role, sense of competence, social isolation, relationship with spouse, parental health. Finally, there is an index of general life stress events. All scores were weighted totals. Higher scores indicated higher levels of stress.

B. Parent Attitudes and Expectations

- *Child Abuse Potential Inventory (CAPI)*: This is a 160-item forced-choice self-report measure that is used to help screen for child abuse potential in adults (Milner, 1986). The CAPI is easy to read and is appropriate for parents and caregivers of any age. The instrument has been widely used. Parents indicate whether they agree or disagree with a statement for each item. A total child abuse potential score was computed as the sum of agreements to 77 core items. Several other scores were computed on factors relating to parenting distress, rigidity, unhappiness, problems with child, problems with family, problems with others, ego stability, and loneliness. Higher scores indicated higher abuse potential.
- *Eyberg Child Behavior Inventory (CBI)*: This is a 36-item self-report rating scale that measures parent perceptions of their child's behavior problems (2-16 years; Eyberg, 1978). The ECBI is widely used. Scores for two scales were computed. An intensity score is the mean rating of the frequency of problem behavior (1, never to 7 always). A problem score is the total number of child behaviors parents felt were currently a problem for them. Higher scores indicated parents perceived higher levels of problem child behavior.

C. Parenting Skills

- *Parent-Child Communication Questionnaire (PCCQ)*: This questionnaire was designed for this study to test parents' knowledge and use of parent-parent and parent-child communication skills. Skills included: tempering emotions, use of turn-taking, verbal and non-verbal communication, active and passive listening, positive self-expression, nurturing, and developmentally appropriate language. Parents rated whether they agreed with parent communication statements that reflected the above skills. Total scores was computed for parent-parent communication and parent-child communication. Higher scores indicated higher level communication skills.
- *Behavior Management Questionnaire (DMQ)*: This questionnaire was designed for this study to test parents' knowledge and use of behavior management skills. Skills included: responding to children's individual needs and temperament, understanding the difference between discipline and punishment; using preventive strategies, and how to respond to specific types of behavior. The instrument presented 16 brief parenting situations. Parents were asked to respond which of five possible actions they would take in each situation. One of the five possibilities was considered a correct response. A sum score was computed of correct responses.

- *Parenting Stress Index*

There was a significant time x condition interaction effect for the total parent stressors score, $F(1,29) = 3.72, p < .05$. Of the parent-related scales, there was a significant time x condition interaction effect for the spouse scale, $F(1,29) = 12.96, p < .01$. Effects and trends were in the hypothesized directions.

Means and Standard Deviations for *Parenting Stress Index* Scores by Condition and Time

	Control Condition						Treatment Condition					
	Pre			Post			Pre			Post		
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>
Total	274.07	48.27	14	271.64	37.68	14	282.88	49.24	17	271.06	32.86	17
Child Total	114.27	18.91	14	112.43	14.15	17	120.59	25.25	17	117.24	17.69	17
Adapt	27.21	6.00		27.5	5.68		30.82	6.61		29.77	4.88	
Accept	14.00	4.02		13.79	4.04		13.59	3.36		12.71	3.41	
Demand	22.43	4.91		21.07	4.55		23.71	6.15		22.29	6.31	
Mood	10.29	3.58		10.86	3.26		12.71	4.28		12.47	3.13	
Hyperactive	27.64	4.55		27.07	4.41		27.77	6.40		27.65	4.86	
Reinforcing	12.71	3.32		12.14	4.35		12.00	3.30		12.35	2.78	
Parent Total'	141.36	30.42	14	142.00	23.43	14	147.06	24.51	17	137.88	18.15	17
Depress	22.00	7.77		21.86	6.67		22.71	5.76		20.94	4.13	
Attach	13.00	2.66		13.93	3.13		13.24	3.01		13.71	2.69	
Restrict	21.36	7.01		21.29	6.38		21.00	4.84		20.53	4.96	
Competence	33.36	7.49		33.14	5.95		33.41	5.44		32.24	4.52	
Isolated	16.71	3.52		14.64	3.57		16.82	5.60		15.29	4.21	
Spouse*	20.86	5.61		22.00	5.31		24.65	5.70		20.53	4.91	
Health	14.07	4.81		15.14	4.04		15.24	3.82		14.65	3.20	
Life Stress	18.43	9.65	14	17.21	9.49	14	15.24	11.45	17	15.94	13.18	17

*Significant effects

D. Social Support

- *Family Support Scale (FSS)*: This is an 18-item questionnaire that assesses the level of social support in child rearing families (C. J. Dunst, Western Carolina Center, Morganton, NC). The number and helpfulness of social supports are measured on a five-point scale ranging from "not at all helpful" to "extremely helpful." The scale taps a broad range of social supports and is simple to administer. It has been recommended as a means of monitoring program impact on the quality of client social support. Two scores were computed: the helpfulness of current support, and the number of current supports. Higher scores indicated higher levels of perceived helpfulness with social supports.

Results

Separate 2 (Time) x 2 (Condition) repeated measures MANOVAs were used to test for differences in all dependent variables.

A. Parent Emotions

- *Index of Self-Esteem*

There was no significant time x condition interaction effect.

Means and Standard Deviations for Index of Self-Esteem Scores by Condition and Time

	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>
Pre-intervention			
control	2.51	.86	14
treatment	2.50	.79	23
Post-intervention			
control	2.49	.61	14
treatment	2.39	.60	23

B. Parent Attitudes and Expectations

- *Child Abuse Potential Inventory*

There was a significant time x condition interaction effect for the problems with family scale, $F(1,35) = 4.71, p < .05$. There were also time x interaction trends for the abuse scale, $F(1,35) = 1.95, p < .17$; the stress scale, $F(1,35) = 1.81, p < .19$; the rigidity scale, $F(1,35) = 2.57, p < .10$; and the unhappiness scale, $F(1,35) = 2.61, p < .10$. Effects and trends were in the hypothesized directions, except for the unhappiness scale.

Means and Standard Deviations for Child Abuse Potential Inventory Scores by Condition and Time

	Control Condition						Treatment Condition					
	Pre			Post			Pre			Post		
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>
Abuse †	29.14	12.67	14	29.29	11.00	14	32.96	12.85	23	27.39	10.56	23
Stress †	15.50	10.35		15.29	9.49		19.04	10.28		14.48	9.41	
Rigidity †	2.36	2.06		2.36	2.31		2.91	2.59		1.87	1.06	
Unhappiness †	6.57	2.07		6.21	1.67		5.96	1.75		6.65	1.19	
Problem/Child	1.00	.78		1.14	1.03		1.30	1.02		1.17	.94	
Problem/Family*	1.50	1.40		2.07	1.59		1.39	1.23		1.04	.98	
Problem/Other	2.07	1.64		2.07	1.86		2.44	1.67		2.09	1.81	
Ego	19.36	10.26		18.86	9.65		23.00	10.34		18.57	9.62	
Loneliness	6.71	3.83		6.71	3.93		8.57	4.41		7.09	4.20	

*Significant effects / †Trends

- *Eyberg Child Behavior Inventory*

There was no significant time x condition interaction effect for either the intensity or problem scale.

Means and Standard Deviations for Child Behavior Inventory Scores by Condition and Time

	Control Condition						Treatment Condition					
	Pre			Post			Pre			Post		
	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n
Intensity	3.71	.66	9	3.62	.59	9	3.49	.68	13	3.37	.55	13
Problem	9.67	6.00		9.11	4.60		10.92	6.97		8.00	5.40	

C. Parenting Skills

- *Parent-Child Communication Questionnaire*

There was a time x condition interaction trend for the parent-parent communication scale, $F(1,31) = 2.19, p < .10$. The trend was in the hypothesized direction.

Means and Standard Deviations for Parent-Child Communication Questionnaire Scores by Condition and Time

	Control Condition						Treatment Condition					
	Pre			Post			Pre			Post		
	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n
Parent-Parent [†]	3.42	.36	12	3.72	.44	12	3.25	.47	21	3.79	.38	21
Parent-Child	3.95	.59		3.95	.53		3.91	.49		3.96	.30	

[†]Trends

- *Behavior Management Questionnaire*

There was no significant time x condition interaction effect.

Means and Standard Deviations for Behavior Management Questionnaire Scores by Condition and Time

	M	SD	n
Pre-intervention			
control	11.87	2.77	15
treatment	11.96	2.36	23
Post-intervention			
control	12.80	2.15	15
treatment	12.90	1.36	23

D. Social Support

- *Family Support Scale*

There were no significant time x condition interaction effects for the helpfulness of support or the number of supports scores.

Means and Standard Deviations for Family Social Support Scores by Condition and Time

	Control Condition						Treatment Condition					
	Pre			Post			Pre			Post		
	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n
Helpfulness	2.15	.77	14	2.29	.80	14	1.88	.52	23	1.99	.63	23
Number	8.80	2.27	15	8.20	3.63	15	8.17	3.07	29	7.79	4.92	29