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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to assess the effects of a six-week parent education video program followed by reflective writing on maternal efficacy and examine the components of mothers’ reflective writings. The study was guided by a theoretical framework composed of two established theories of learning: (1) constructivist learning theory and (2) social learning theory. These theories were examined with reference to maternal efficacy within the social context.

The study was based on a pre- and post-test design using a control group. Data were collected from 32 mothers of preschool aged children in Florida. The 16 mothers in the experimental groups participated in a reflective writing activity base after viewing parent education videos over a six week period. The 16 mothers in the control group participated in viewing the parent education videos during the same time period, but they did not complete the reflective writing tasks. The instruments used were a Parenting Sense of Competence (PSOC) and Parental Self-Efficacy of Scale (PSES). Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics of means and standard deviation, individual sample t-test, and analyses of covariance (ANCOVA). There was a statistically significant difference in the means of obtained by the experimental and control groups on the measure of maternal efficacy. Mothers exposed to the parent education video program with reflective writing activities had higher scores on the measure of maternal efficacy.

Parent education video program with reflective writing activities proved more effective in improving mothers’ knowledge of parenting issues. The reflective writing of the mothers addressed the following themes or topics: parenting style, the methods of choice, mutual respect, logical consequence, “I” messages, four goals of behavior, the FLAC method, the BANK method, and building on strengths. Their written products included three components: description, analysis, and application. Results are discussed in terms of the use of reflective strategies in parent education programs.
As children grow up, there are many aspects of their lives which can potentially influence their individual development, in both positive and negative ways. These aspects can be grouped into four general areas: (1) child context, (2) family/home context, (3) learning context, and (4) community context (See Figure 1). In general, developmental changes are thought to occur as a result of interaction among these four contexts (Bronfenbrenner, 1989). While educators have focused on learning and community contexts, developmental psychologists have placed more emphasis on the family-home context. Therefore, educators and researchers attend to various learning and community contexts, such as early care and educational programs, health care settings, and other community learning sites that have primary influence on children’s overall development (Belsky, 1984; Caldwell & Bradley, 2001; Kreppner & Lerner 1989).

![Figure 1: Contexts for development.](image-url)
Developmental psychologists, on the other hand, claim that it is the family-home context that has the greatest influence on children’s cognitive and socio-emotional development (Bronfenbrenner, 1998; Harter, 1999; Weiss, Caspe, & Lopez, 2008).

Educators and developmental psychologists tend to agree that of these contexts it is the family, and mothers in particular, that represent the most constant and important factor in a child’s life. Furthermore, the family has a central role in a child’s development. This role, however, has undergone dramatic changes during the past few decades. For example, since the 1960’s, there has been a dramatic shift in the participation rate of mothers in the labor force. While fewer than 19% of mothers with children were employed in the 1960s, by 1998 over 75% of married women with school-age children, and over 63% of mothers with children under age six were employed (U.S. Census Bureau, 1998).

Changes in maternal employment led some researchers to study the amount of time mothers spend with their children. Mattox (1990), for example claimed that one consequence of the increasing numbers of mothers in the work force is that mothers spend less time with their children, thereby reducing the influence of parenting on children’s growth and well-being. In contrast, Bianchi (2000) claimed that between 1981 and 1997, there was little change in the amount of time mothers spent with their children, despite the fact that there were dramatic increases in maternal employment. Like Bianchi (2000), Gottfried, Gottfried, and Bathurst (2002) also argued that there was little difference between the amount of time that mothers spend with their children in dual and father-only employed families. It seems, therefore, that in current society, parenting is important and mothers continue to have a powerful impact on their children’s development.

Since the 1960s, there has been considerable interest in the issue of good or quality parenting (Barth, 1996). Several studies sought to define successful parenting and identify important factors of quality parenting (e.g., Cohen, 1999; Heath, 2009). Other researchers focused on the relationship between quality parenting, mothers’ demographic factors, and children’s school achievement. Thus, it seems that many factors need to be considered when considering quality parenting.

Most recently, research studies emphasized parent’s cognitive and psychological responses, such as self-reported parenting attitudes and values. These responses were considered by some researchers to be important predictors of quality parenting (Borwin, Joana, Dirk,
Andreas, Göran, & Eckart, 2005; Fred, Carol, & Bogat, 2008; Hall, Gurley, Sachs, & Kryscio, 1991). Others, however, claimed that these cognitive factors were rather poor measures for observing actual parenting practices (Haskett, Scott, Willoughby, Ahern, & Nears, 2006; Holden & Edwards, 1989). Consequently, extant studies maintain that alternative cognitive factors should be considered. One of these factors is the mother’s cognitive belief about her own effectiveness as a mother. Mothers’ belief, or efficacy, is now considered a more significant predictor of parenting than previous self-reported parenting attitudes or values (Jones & Prinz, 2005; Ystrom et al., 2008).

Recent studies have examined the effects of maternal efficacy on various aspects of child development (e.g., Ardelt & Eccles, 2001; Bogenschneider, Small, & Tsay, 1997; Corapci & Wachs, 2002; Jones & Prinz, 2005; Hill & Bush, 2001; King & Elder, 1998; Swick and Hassell, 1990). For example, Swick and Hassell (1990) found that maternal efficacy influences the development of children’s social competence. Likewise, Bogenschneider, Small, and Tsay (1997) suggested that maternal efficacy exerts an influence on the development of children’s behavior. Murry and Brody (1999) also studied maternal efficacy, and they suggested that it exerts a strong influence on children’s emotional development. The findings of Ardelt and Eccles (2001) seem to be consistent with previous studies suggesting that a mother’s sense of efficacy influences children’s self-efficacy and academic success, both directly and indirectly. The indirect influence is by way of various parenting strategies, while the direct influence comes from the parent being seen as a positive role model. These findings highlight the importance of supporting and encouraging the development of positive maternal efficacy. In order to determine the types of support that are needed, it is first necessary to identify those factors that lead to low maternal efficacy.

Several studies have identified risk factors for low maternal efficacy. Belsky (1984)’s study identified risk factors within three general categories: (1) personal risk characteristics of mothers (e.g., mother has a poor developmental history or psychological difficulties), (2) situational risk characteristics (e.g., low income or single mother), (3) and child risk characteristics (e.g., a child has a difficult temperament or a child is developmentally disabled or chronically ill). On the other hand, Corapci and Wachs (2002) found that low maternal efficacy was due to a lack of child-rearing skills, knowledge, experience, and understanding of young children.
The current study builds on Corapci and Wach’s notion of a lack of parenting information as opposed the three risk factors postulated by Belsky (1984). The lack of parenting information is surprising given that there are approximately 50,000 parent programs offered nationwide each year (Carter, 1996). Also, according to Heath (2009), there are 1,500 books concerning parenting in print, and a great number of internet websites that provide parenting information. Since the early 1970s, media programs for parents have also been developed and studied (Sanders et al., 2000; Webster-Stratton, 1981). Perhaps it is not the lack of information that is important, but rather how the information is used.

Despite the fact that a number of parenting programs are conducted through formal and informal educational approaches, some scholars believe that there are limitations in terms of the parenting knowledge that these programs provide (e.g., Owen & Mulvihill, 1994; Tolan & Mckay, 1996; Thomas, 1996). First, Owen and Mulvihill (1994) suggested that the availability of resources for mothers is not necessarily related to improved child outcomes. Furthermore, there seem to be limits to the extent to which parenting behaviors can be changed by educating parents, or by convincing them of a different value (Hoff-Ginsberg & Tardif, 1995). While parent education can affect those aspects of parenting that derive from mothers’ beliefs about children’s abilities and the values of different childrearing practices, it will not necessarily change practices that derive from the larger social structure, or from individual personality characteristics. It seems that some researchers view parent education programs as more of a stop-gap approach (Thomas, 1996). That is, some parenting programs are not used as a permanent solution, but simply a temporary approach or convenience for parents. Indeed, the knowledge provided by such parent education programs cannot offer all solutions for every parent (Thomas, 1998). It follows that if parents cannot find and develop appropriate and relevant parenting skills from external educational parenting programs, then their parenting efficacy is likely to decrease (Macphee, Fritz, & Miller-Heyl, 1996).

Many of the traditional parent education programs tend to be unidirectional, whereby knowledge is directly transmitted by various means to the participants. According to Kaminski et al., (2008) such programs are limited. Indeed, educators across the globe have expressed concerns about the limitations associated with the unidirectional knowledge transmission approach of contemporary parenting programs. Their main concern is that unidirectional knowledge transmission (e.g., single path form program staffs to parents) will eventually lead to
passive learning. Their concern is exacerbated given that the majority of parent education programs relies on unidirectional verbal training methods, such as didactic lectures, prepared brochures, and programmed texts (Kaminski et al., 2008; Webster-Stratton, 1981). Research evaluating such unidirectional verbal approaches has shown them to be somewhat unreliable in terms of the extent to which they lead to behavioral changes in parents and children.

The unreliable nature of unidirectional parent education programs led to increased emphasis on the use of bidirectional learning methods. These methods are thought to increase the effectiveness of parent education programs (Kaiser et al., 1999; Kaminski et al., 2008; Webster-Stratton, 1981). Bidirectional approaches include educational delivery methods such as modeling, homework, group discussion, rehearsal, and role-playing (Pelletier & Brent, 2002). Also in this category is the use of reflective strategies such as self-reflective journal writing, wall exercise, concentric circles, or in-class journal (Lee, 2008; Nay, 1976; O’Dell, et al. 1979, as cited in Webster-Stratton, 1981). The general consensus of opinion is that reflective thinking through writing strongly empowers a learner to make his or her own sense of information, problems, and issues, rather than receiving information directly or through answers provided by others (Bransford, Franks, Vye & Sherwood, 1989, 1986; Brookfield, 1987; Broud, Keogh, & Walker, 1985; Bruner, 1986; Fosnot, 1989; Schön, 1991; Vygotsky, 1978). That is, by participating in reflective writing based on education, the learner is able to construct true understanding and incorporate the new knowledge into his or her own life.

1.1 Statement of Problem

This current study emerged from consideration of three broad themes: (1) maternal efficacy, (2) videoed parent educational programs, and (3) reflective writing. Previous research on these topics (i.e., maternal efficacy, videoed parenting program, and reflective writing) has focused primarily on five areas. Of the five areas, maternal efficacy is the only one that has been actively studied.

The first of the five areas involves the effects of maternal efficacy on a child’s emotional development and academic achievement (Bondy & Mash, 1999). The second area concerns the socio demographic characteristics of mothers with low maternal efficacy (Hurlbut, Culp, Jambunathan, & Butler, 1997). The third area describes the relationship between maternal efficacy and the extent of mothers’ school involvement, competence, or the types of discipline
they use (Shumow & Lomax, 2002; Gross et al., 1999; Day, Factor, & Szkiba-Day, 1994). The fourth area addresses the impact of the mother’s writing on parent-child interaction or relationship (Burns & Casbergue, 1992). The fifth area is concerned with the use of videotape modeling in parent education (Sanders, Calam, Durand, Liversidge, & Carmont, 2008; Webster-Stratton, 1981). Careful examination of previous studies, however, reveals certain limitations which should be considered in conducting the current study, and in determining the potential contribution of the findings. The following section describes these areas of caution.

First, there has been an increase in the numbers of educational media programs about parenting (e.g., Sanders, 2003), but their effectiveness have not been thoroughly examined. As the Center for Community Child Health (2004) reported, media programs have become part of the popular culture, and a preferred way for parents to access information about parenting. Yet, despite the important role of media, such as video programs for parent education, only a handful of studies have examined the effects of such approaches (Sanders et al., 2000).

Second, is that very little is known about the use of reflective writing with mothers (Powell, 2005). While reflective writing has been effectively used with low-efficacy novice, struggling teachers, or university students (Hilier, 2005; Fendler, 2003; Howard, 2003), there has been some difficulty associated with reflective writing for young children’s mothers. Several researchers identified possible reasons for the lack of research in this area. Webster-Stratton (1981), for example, noted that deficiencies in mothers’ reading-writing level, education, and/or general intellectual level place limits on the design, conduct, and interpretation of studies. As Harris and Perzynski (2001) noted, most mothers and even child-care center staff are afraid of writing as a skill, and they are often reluctant to have their written products exposed to an audience. In the study, family educators reported that mothers had not been trained to read and assess reflective writing.

The third area of concern is that previous studies examining the effects of reflective writing on parent-child relationships have typically relied on quantitative methods (e.g., Josie, David, & Robert, 2010; Nicholson & Sanders, 1999). Typically, these studies have relied on participants’ self-reported survey data to analyze changes in participants’ beliefs or values. Results from these studies, though informative, were limited due to the fact that they relied on numerical descriptive data. In addition, they lacked detailed characteristics of participants’
reflective writing or the procedures that they used. There is a need therefore for studies to adopt a more qualitative approach toward analyzing mothers’ reflective writing.

Given these issues, the current study was designed to explore the possibility that a parent education program presented on video followed by reflective writing could lead to an improvement in the maternal efficacy of mothers of preschool aged children. The findings should be of interest to developers of parenting programs and video designers who may be considering the use of reflective writing as a method of encouraging participants to reconsider their attitudes and perceptions about parenting.

1.2 Purpose and Significance of the Study

Even though a number of studies have focused on the content of parent educational programs, there is a need for more research on the contribution of various learning approaches used in parenting programs (Pelletier & Brent, 2002). Furthermore, Kaminski, Valle, Filene, and Boyle (2008) expressed concerns about the parent education programs that rely on unidirectional knowledge transmission as opposed to more active learning approaches. Therefore, the first purpose of this study was to determine the relative effects of participation in a self-reflective writing activity after viewing six educational parenting videos on participants’ maternal efficacy. The current study compared the maternal efficacy of two groups of mothers (i.e., experimental group: reflective writing & educational parenting videos, and control group: educational parenting videos) using a pre- and-post-test design.

A second purpose of the study was to examine the nature of the reflective writing of mothers’ of preschool aged children. A limited number of studies have examined the nature of reflective thinking and writing by different groups of individuals, such as pre-service teachers (Carli & Lori, 2010; Francis, 1995; Hoover, 1994). However, to the researcher’s knowledge, similar examinations of the nature and perceptions of mothers of young preschooler’s, and their reflective writings have not been conducted. Understanding the thoughts and perceptions of mothers is important because it can contribute toward the development of more appropriate content for parent education programs, and programs that serve mothers with lower levels of maternal efficacy in particular.
1.3 Research Questions, Hypotheses, and Sub-Questions

The overall purpose of the study was to determine the relative effects of reflective writing on maternal efficacy. The proposed study examined mothers’ participation in a parent education approach involving the use of videos followed by reflective writing.

1.3.1 Research Questions

The study was guided by the following two questions.

1. What are the relative effects of participation in a video parent education program and reflective writing on the maternal efficacy of mothers of preschool aged children?
2. What are the main components of the reflective writing of mothers of preschool aged children?

1.3.2 Research Hypotheses

1. \((H_1)\) The mean maternal efficacy score of mothers who participate in a video and reflective writing parent education program is significantly different from the mean maternal efficacy scores of mothers who participate in a video with no reflective writing parent education program.

2.1 \((H_{2-1})\) The mean maternal efficacy rating (PSOC) of mothers who participate in a video and reflective writing parent education program is significantly higher than the mean maternal efficacy scores of mothers who participate in a video with no reflective writing parent education program.

2.2 \((H_{2-2})\) The mean maternal efficacy rating (PSES-Discipline) of mothers who participate in a video and reflective writing parent education program is significantly higher than the mean maternal efficacy scores of mothers who participate in a video with no reflective writing parent education program.

2.3 \((H_{2-3})\) The mean maternal efficacy rating (PSES-Suitability) of mothers who participate in a video and reflective writing parent education program is significantly higher than the mean maternal efficacy scores of mothers who participate in a video with no reflective writing parent education program.

2.4 \((H_{2-4})\) The mean maternal efficacy rating (PSES-Communication) of mothers who
participate in a video and reflective writing parent education program is significantly higher than the mean maternal efficacy scores of mothers who participate in a video with no reflective writing parent education program.

2.5 \((H_{2.5})\) The mean maternal efficacy rating (PSES-Personal Efficacy) of mothers who participate in a video and reflective writing parent education program is significantly higher than the mean maternal efficacy scores of mothers who participate in a video with no reflective writing parent education program.

1.3.3 Research Sub-Questions

1. What themes or topics are expressed by mothers of preschool aged children in their reflective writing about each of the parenting videos?
2. What are the main components of the reflective writing of mothers of preschool aged children?

1.4 Theoretical Framework and Rationale

This study was guided by a theoretical framework composed of two established theories of learning: (1) constructivist learning theory and (2) social learning theory. These theories were examined with reference to maternal efficacy within the social context (e.g., educational parenting video program).

1.4.1 Constructivist Learning Theory

The Constructivist learning theory is useful in describing how mothers can acquire or develop their parenting skills by way of videoed parent education programs. Furthermore, this theory can also help explain how maternal efficacy can change and improve as a result of engaging in reflective writing. While Constructivism is a theory of learning, it is also a theory of knowing (Walker & Lambert, 1995). Constructivism has its roots in philosophy and it has been applied to such varied fields as sociology and anthropology, as well as cognitive psychology and education (Caprio, 1994).

In recent years education has undergone a momentous shift in consideration of the essence of human learning and the conditions that can best advance the varied dimensions of human learning. Cooper (1993) noted that there has been a paradigm shift in designed instruction
for the field of psychology from behaviorism to cognitivism, and to constructivism. Indeed, constructivism has been one of the most influential views of learning for more than two decades.

According to Gruber and Voneche (1977), the term constructivism is derived from Piaget’s reference to his views as ‘constructivist’, as well as from Bruner’s description of discovery learning as ‘constructionist’ (1966). Other terms are also used to refer to constructivist views of learning. These include: (1) generative learning (Wittrock, 1990), (2) situated learning and authentic instruction (Brown, Collins, & Duguid, 1989), (3) postmodern curricula (Hlynka, 1991), and (4) educational semiotic (Cunningham, 1992).

Reflection and reflective writing have been important topics in the field of adult education for some time (Chirema, 2007; Hoover, 1994; Kennedy, 1993). Researchers have developed a diverse range of theories and related studies about reflective writing (Hoover, 1994; Kerka, 1996; SchÖn, 1987, 1991). Each perspective presents different yet related views and values about the nature of active learning. Each study measured the impact of specific learning strategies on various constructs.

The first constructivist philosopher, Vico commented in a treatise in 1710 that "one only knows something if one can explain it" (Yager, 1991). Kant further elaborated on this idea by asserting that human beings are not passive recipients of information (Cheek, 1992). The theory of constructivism proposes that learners actively take knowledge and connect the collected knowledge. In doing so the learner personalizes new knowledge by constructing his or her own interpretation (Cheek, 1992).

Focusing on a more educational description of constructivism, this theory is intimately connected to experiences. That is, learners have their own experience and a cognitive structure based on those experiences. These preconceived structures can be valid, invalid, or incomplete. The learner will reformulate his or her existing structures only if new information or experiences are connected to prior knowledge. Inferences, elaborations, and relationships between old perceptions and new ideas must be personally drawn by the learner in order for the new idea to become an integrated, useful part of his or her memory. In short, the learner must actively construct new information into his or her existing mental framework for meaningful learning to occur.

Constructivists believe that meaningful learning of purposeful knowledge may be encouraged by a learning environment that has the following four features: (1) the use of
authentic problems, (2) the representation of natural complexity in the real world, (3) the avoidance of oversimplification of the task and instruction, and (4) the collaborative knowledge construction through social negotiation (Jonassen, 1991). Through the combination of complex, real world problems, and meaningful social interaction among learners and educators, constructivists state that learners are encouraged to discover or create new rules or revise traditional rules, and in the process come to a deeper understanding of underlying concepts and principles.

In addition, constructivists believe that learners construct knowledge through a process of conceptual change (Hennessey, 2003). A theory about conceptual change has been built on a constructivist epistemology, and it is useful in supporting reflective writing as a motivating factor for conceptual change.

1.4.1.1 Conceptual Changes Theory. This theory is based on a constructivist epistemology and the assumption that learners construct knowledge through a process of conceptual change. This theory is useful in supporting how mothers’ knowledge construction (parenting skills) and conceptual change (i.e., maternal efficacy) can be facilitated through a process of reflection (i.e., reflective writing).

One of the most prominent conceptual change theories is defined by Posner, Strike, Hewson, and Gertzog (1982). This theory is consistent with Kuhn’s notion of a paradigm shift, or Piaget’s notion of accommodation (Özdemir & Clark, 2007). Kuhn pointed out that science is not a steady, cumulative acquisition of knowledge. Instead science is “a series of peaceful interludes punctuated by intellectually violent revolutions”. When a paradigm shift takes place, “the scientists’ world is qualitatively transformed and quantitatively enriched by fundamental novelties of either fact or theory”. Strike and Posner (1992), and Dole and Sinatra’s (1998) Cognitive Reconstruction of Knowledge Model (CRKM) described the importance of cognitive conflict as a motivating factor for conceptual change.

According to this model a learner’s current conception is functional, and if the learner is able to solve current problems within the existing conceptual schema, then the learner does not feel a need to change or enhance the current conception (Özdemir & Clark, 2007). However, if the learner becomes dissatisfied with his or her current explanatory knowledge, and perceives the new knowledge as intelligible, then he or she accepts it as a plausible alternative and regards it as
fruitful knowledge (Hewson & Hewson 1988; Hewson & Thorley 1989; Posner, Strike, Hewson & Gertzog 1982). When the current conception does not successfully solve some problems, the learner may make moderate changes to his or her conceptions. In general, this is called “conceptual capture” (Hewson, 1981) or “weak restructuring” (Carey, 1985). When there is more radical change, however, it is called “conceptual exchange” (Hewson, 1981).

Pintrich, Marx, and Boyle (1993) claimed that conceptual shifts do not occur in a vacuum merely as an unconscious response to outside influences such as text and instruction. Instead, they maintained that conceptual change is an outcome of an interaction between the message and learner characteristics, including motivation, leading to engagement in persuasive messages (Hynd, 2003). In addition, Anderson and Thomas (1992) said that knowledge construction, or conceptual changes, can occur in the process of reflection, inquiry, and action.

While several factors can stimulate conceptual change, one of the most important is engagement in reflection (Brookfield, 1987; Boud et. al., 1985; Bruner, 1986; SchÔn, 1991). Approaches which allow learners to examine personal experiences through reflection are channels to enhance meaning construction (Brookfield, 1987; SchÔn, 1991). Reflection is considered a purposeful activity directed towards a particular goal. Boud et al. (1985) described three important elements in the process of promoting purposeful reflection: (1) returning to one’s experiences and recalling important features, (2) attending to positive or restrictive feelings that may aid or impede a thorough examination of the experience, and (3) reevaluating these experiences based on personally defined intentions that incorporate new knowledge.

It is such cognitive activities that can result in altered conceptions and perspectives. According to Lee (2008), the impetus for adult learning is precipitated by reflecting upon one’s life occurrences. However, simply drawing upon learners’ prior experiences and providing for the active engagement of learners is not enough (Boud et al., 1985). Thus, practitioners have examined other approaches for promoting cognitive change. One promising approach emphasizes the role of the writing process.

Various avenues for representing individual’s thoughts have been discussed by psychological theorists. Bruner (1966), for example, posited that people acquire knowledge by symbolizing it in language. He considered writing as a multi-representational form because it involves the eye, and mind in a supportive and facilitative relationship. The writing process provides deeper processing through elaboration as one attempts to express and communicate
ones’ knowledge and feelings, through symbols. Luria (1971) and Bruner (1971) suggested that written language plays an important role for many higher cognitive functions. Similarly, Hoover (1994) maintained that writing is considered a particularly suitable activity to encourage reflection because it captures the original experience so it will not be lost. Additionally, Britton (1972) proposed that people understand and learn from events by giving them shape in language. It seems that conscious exploration demanded by writing can improve a person’s understanding of the subject at hand (O’dell, 1981). In addition, according to Emig (1977), writing is an effective learning strategy that can promote conceptual change. It follows that writing could be a mechanism for encouraging other cognitive activities (Kerka, 1996) and could help learners appreciate the actual process of reflection and conceptual change (Yinger, 1981).

In summary, these theories (i.e., constructivist learning and conceptual change theory) lend support to the notion that mothers of preschoolers may be able to reconstruct their own parenting knowledge, as well as enhance their maternal efficacy through their own observations of the parenting programs and their reflective writing experiences. These observing and writing experiences may act as facilitators which encourage the mothers to discover principles of parenting for children. In turn, completing the reflection exercise should serve to advance the mothers’ maternal efficacy.

1.4.2 Social Learning Theory

The Social learning theory developed by Bandura lends support to the potential impact or influence of educational parenting video programs on maternal self-efficacy. Albert Bandura (1977) claimed that people learn from one another, through processes such as observational learning, imitation, and modeling. In other words, this type of learning serves as a guide for action (Bandura, 1977).

Social learning theory explains human behavior in terms of continuous reciprocal interaction between cognitive, behavioral, and environmental influences. Therefore, this theory has often been called a bridge between behaviorist and cognitive learning theories. In addition, this theory focuses on the learning that occurs within a social context. Among a number of social contexts, this study focuses on media education including providing several parenting examples and parenting knowledge for helping mothers develop better parenting behaviors. Since media education, such as video presentations, can encourage mothers to reflect on their behaviors,
imitate proper parenting attributes, establish meanings, and develop a consciousness that increases parental efficacy. It is reasonable to assume that the video parent education program is one such environmental influences and social context (Brown, 1991, p.27).

Social Learning Theory is also related to Vygotsky’s Social Development Theory and Lave’s Situated Learning, which also emphasize the importance of social learning. Vygotsky focused on the connections between people and the socio-cultural context in which they act and interact in shared experiences (Crawford, 1996). Social interaction plays a fundamental role in the process of cognitive development. Vygotsky mentioned the More Knowledgeable Other (MKO) as anyone who has a better understanding or a higher ability level than the learner, with respect to a particular task, process, or concept. The MKO is normally thought of as being a teacher, coach, or older adult, but the MKO could also be peers, a younger person, or even computers. According to Vygotsky, humans use tools that lead to the development of a culture, such as speech and writing, and to mediate their social environments. He believed that the internalization of tools leads to higher order thinking skills. For this reason, reflective writing can be used as a tool for mediating mothers’ social environments. Situated learning was proposed by Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger as a model of learning in a community of practice. In doing so they argued that learning should not be viewed as simply the transmission of abstract and decontextualized knowledge from one individual to another, but rather as a social process whereby knowledge is co-constructed. In sum they suggest that such learning is situated in a specific context and embedded within a particular social and physical environment.

Many of the original examples from Lave and Wenger were concerned with adult learners, and situated learning still has a particular resonance for adult education. For example, Hansman (1995) shows how adult learners discover, shape, and make explicit their own knowledge through situated learning within a community of practice. For this reason, it is possible that Social Learning Theory can support the use of reflective writing in adult education.

1.5 Definitions of Terms

In order to insure an accurate examination of the research questions, the following definitions are provided.

1.5.1 Parenting
Parenting means the process of promoting and supporting the physical, emotional, social, and intellectual development of a child from infancy to adulthood (Hill & Bush, 2001). Parenting refers to the activity of raising a child rather than the biological relationship (Davies, 2000). However, Hill and Bush (2001) said that parenting differs from child rearing in that child rearing emphasizes the act of training or bringing up the children and the interaction between the parent and child, while parenting emphasizes the responsibility and qualities of exemplary behavior of the parent wherein the parent supports the child by exercising authority and through consistent, empathic, appropriate behavior in response to the child's needs. Therefore, in this study, the term of parenting describes the attitudes, values, and practices of parenting preschool aged children.

### 1.5.2 Maternal Efficacy

Ardelt and Eccles (2001) defined maternal efficacy as a mother’s belief in her ability to influence her child and the environment in ways that would foster the child’s development and success. Teti and Gelfand (1991) also defined it as the belief that mothers can effectively perform or manage tasks related to parenting. Similar to these definitions, Schunk (1990) and Swick (1987) defined maternal efficacy as the mastery of the attitudes, skills, and behaviors essential to exerting control over various parenting and family roles. This concept (i.e., maternal efficacy) differs from general self-efficacy, or a person's belief that he or she can perform well compared with others in a particular situation. In this study, the meaning of parental efficacy is limited to a belief in one’s parenting skills, abilities and resources to parent effectively, including the ability to protect children from negative influences.

### 1.5.3 Parental Competence

Parental competence refers to how confident parents feel in their ability to handle their child’s problems (Johnston & Mash, 1989). However, Sabatelli and Waldron (1995) view the concept of parental competence in two different ways. First, they said parental competence is objective in that it includes a judgment of whether parenting behaviors are consistent with societal norms and expectations. The judgment of competence is made by external sources (e.g., other family member and child protection officers). Second, they also said that parental competence is subjective when mentioning the parent’s assessment of how well they perform within their
parenting role regarding their expectations. In this study, parental competence indicates how confident mothers feel in their parenting behaviors.

1.5.4 Self Reflection

According to Dewey (1933), self-reflection is an active, persistent, and careful consideration of a belief or supposed form of knowledge in light of the grounds that support it and the further conclusion to which it tends. Introspection may be used synonymously with self-reflection and used in a similar way (Anderson & Thomas, 1992). Introspection indicates the self-observation and reporting of conscious inner thoughts, desires, and sensations. It is a conscious mental and usually purposive process relying on thinking, reasoning, and examining one's own thoughts, feelings, and, in more spiritual cases, one's soul. In this study, the meaning of parents’ self-reflection is the process of looking inward and examining their self and their own parenting actions and philosophy.

1.5.5 Reflective Writing

Reflective writing is closely related to writing therapy and expressive writing. It is a practice in which the writer describes a real or imagined scene, event, interaction, passing thought, memory, or observation in either essay or poetic form, adding a personal reflection on the meaning of the item or incident, thought, feeling, emotion, or situation in his or her life (Hoover, 1994). While anyone can use reflective writing for personal development, the practice is often incorporated into professionalism training for physicians, nurses, teachers, social workers, and others who are in the process of developing understanding of one’s and others in order to offer more humane and compassionate service to their patients or clients. In this study, the meaning of reflective writing is a process by which mothers write about their parenting experiences, opinions, events, thoughts, and new information with an emphasis on promoting spontaneity and awareness.

1.5.6 Parent Education Video Program

Educational parenting programs indicate organized and programmatic programs involving thoughtful conveyance of information enabling parents to provide high quality childrearing. In this study, a parent education video program illustrates how to effectively raise a child. It also describes how parents may foster independence in their children by encouraging them to work
out their own ideas and decisions, instead of asking those questions or simply responding to directions and commands.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter addresses the topics and paths outlined in Figure 2 by way of a review of relevant theoretical and empirical research studies. This second chapter consists of seven main sections as follows: (1) the concept of parent education, (2) mass media (i.e., parent education video program) of parent education from historical perspectives, (3) the effect of reflective writing on learners (i.e., mothers), (4) the concepts of self-efficacy and maternal efficacy, (5) the relationship among maternal efficacy, parenting, and child development, (6) the relationship between maternal efficacy and parenting, (7) the relationship between maternal efficacy and child development, and (8) literature summary.

The needs and movement of parent education are described in the first section. The transition of materials in parent education, the effect of media on parents, and parent education video programs on mothers are reviewed and discussed in the second section. Then, in the third section, the effect of reflective writing on learners (i.e., mothers) is considered. In the fourth section, the concepts of self-efficacy and maternal efficacy are addressed. The fifth section reviews the relationship among maternal efficacy, parenting, and child development. In the sixth section, the relationship between maternal efficacy and parenting is reviewed and the seventh section presents the relationship between maternal efficacy and child development. The final section presents a summary of the review of literature.

Figure 2: The paths for literature review.
2.1 Parent Education

2.1.1 The Need for Parent Education

Children in the United States have been regarded as “the most disadvantaged minority” (Time, 1990, as cited in Simpson, 1997). According to the National Center (1996), one out of every four young children lives in poverty. In addition, approximately one million cases of child abuse are confirmed each year, and 1,000 children die as a result from abuse (Wang & Daro, 1997). Based on these disturbing statistics, many leaders believe that it is of the utmost importance to consider the welfare of children, not only for children’s sake, but also for the future of American society (Carnegie Council, 1995; Carnegie Task Force, 1994). It is hardly surprising; therefore, that children’s issues have taken a prominent position on national political and social agendas (Simpson, 1997). Children’s issues have also become a catalyst for creating diverse approaches designed to prevent and treat the many problems facing children today (Simpson, 1997). Many of these approaches focus on the American family as a key to the well-being of children, and ultimately American society (Simpson, 1997). Many leaders also claimed that there are diverse reasons for the serious problems concerning children, such as a breakdown in traditional family structure and values, weaknesses in parent-child relationships and maternal responsibility, and a lack of proper economic and social support for families (Hinds, 1996). The different reasons presented, are all concerned with parenting, and they share a common interest in educating and supporting parents. That is, they acknowledge that families need to be changed, and one of the most critical agents of change is the parents themselves (Simpson, 1997). Thus, parents have become the target of a vast array of messages and organizational efforts.

2.1.2 The Parent Education Movement

Historically, expanding and building on the parent education movement has been part of American society. Carter (1995) estimated that there are more than 50,000 parenting programs reaching millions of parents and caregivers every day. In a 1996 survey by the Commonwealth Fund, over one-third of parents of young children reported that they had attended a class or discussion about child-rearing or parenting (Young, Davis, & Schoen, 1996). Carter (1995) concluded that “interest in parenting is sweeping this country like a tidal wave.”
Parenting programs generally offer diverse information and support for parents. Such programs include: (1) clinical support groups for abusive parents, (2) organizations promoting media literacy, (3) religious classes in marriage preparation, (4) home visiting programs for parents of newborns, (5) programs to strengthen particular racial and ethnic families, (6) workplace parenting seminars, (7) hospital classes in childbirth preparation, (8) nursing mothers’ groups, (9) day care outreach programs, (10) school curriculum segments on caring and family, (11) pediatric services in health education, (12) parent-child activities, (13) court-based classes for divorcing parents and more (Simpson, 1997). While some of these programs exclusively target parents and those in parenting roles, others only target caregivers with family responsibilities or families at risk.

In the early 1900s, federal support for parenting programs began to appear. In 1914, the Children’s Bureau began publishing *Infant Care* pamphlets (Young, 1990). Then, in the 1920s, activities in parent education were stimulated by major funding organizations, such as the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial for child development research (Schlossman, 1983). The gradual increases in child studies contributed to the role of child-rearing advice from outside the family (Bigner, 1994). By the 1960s, interest in parent education and family support had triggered a federal social program, namely the Head Start program (Kagan, Moore, & Bredekamp, 1995). Then in the 1970s, the growing family resource movement focused on family economic risk, health care, divorced families, or violence, and addressed these areas through the parent education movement (Kagan, 1995). Since that time, early intervention and education for all parents in order to develop their parenting skills have continued to be emphasized.

### 2.2 The Mass Media in Parent Education

#### 2.2.1 Transition of Materials in Parent Education

As early as the 14th century, child instruction manuals were written and used in Europe (Schlossman, 1983, as cited in Simpson, 1997). Child rearing manuals were imported from England in colonial times (Walzer, 1988) and this continued until the early 19th century. Books and periodicals concerning parenting were in abundance by the mid-1800s, and reinforced in the 19th century and 20th century. Parenting organizations published books and magazines, such as
National Congress of Mothers, which became the National Parent Teacher Association (PTA) in the early 20th century (Schlossman, 1983, as cited in Simpson, 1997).

Since the 1960s, media activity has been prominent in the growth of parent education. Increasing numbers of books on parenting have been published (Simpson, 1997), and numerous magazines on parenting have been sold. In the early 1990s, family and children’s issues were given emphasis in news coverage and the numbers of public broadcasts dealing with parenting and children’s issues increased. Parenting series have been broadcast through cable television channels and, more recently, other technologies, such as video and the internet, have also carried parenting programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>1300s</th>
<th>1400s</th>
<th>1500s</th>
<th>1600s</th>
<th>1700s</th>
<th>1800s</th>
<th>1900s</th>
<th>2000s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child instruction manuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting books and periodicals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., TV cable, Internet, video, magazine, newspaper, etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: Transition of parent education materials.

According to Lino (1996) and Kerwin (1995), parents are heavy consumers of commercial products because they usually spend $4,500 to $12,000 a year per child. Parents today spend twice as much per year in goods and services for children in comparison to their parents (Cutler, 1990). Industry analysts who consider media, such as cable television, television news, magazines, the internet, newspaper, etc, share a common perception that current parents want more information about parenting from the media, and it is acceptable for them to seek out information from the media (Heaton, 1996). Simpson (1997) suggested that other factors have contributed to the growth in media activity related to parenting, such as changes in technology, baby boomers, and political and social campaigns.

Since the middle of 1990s, commercial organizations have developed parent education videos. For example, there were over 750 video titles on child care and parenting produced in the
1990’s (Bowker, 1996, as cited in Simpson, 1997). One of the videoed programs, “About Us: The Dignity of Children”, has been incorporated into the proposal of WGBH in Boston for its “Kids and How to Grow Them” parenting series (Mayer, 1997). Similarly, Barry Zuckerman, professor and chairman of the Department of Pediatrics at Boston Medical Center, developed a film in which infant behavior was depicted in slow motion to show to professionals who work with children. Since 1994, there has been a significant increase in the number of parenting websites on the internet, such as ParentSoup, Disney’s Family.Com, Scholastics, and Ivillage. Many of the major parenting sites have been launched by or are linked to parenting print media. The Family Education Network was launched by the publisher of Education Today and has partnerships with Education Week and other print media (Simpson, 1997).

2.2.2 The Effect of Media on Mothers

According to Bushman and Huesmann (2006), the mass media has a number of direct and indirect effects on its audiences. Research on media suggests that parents are among the audiences who are influenced by media. Although parenting is often considered to be a largely instinctive enterprise, both theory and research posit that parenting can be shaped by diverse environmental factors, including those involving the media (Holden, 1997; Hammer & Turner, 1996). Theoretical perspectives posit significant media influences on audiences, including social learning theory, social cognitive theories, cultivation theory, and cultural studies or critical theory (Dorr & Rabin, 1995). With respect to changes, mass media effects have been described...
as having seven levels: exposure to messages, awareness of messages, being informed by messages, being persuaded by messages, expressing intent to change behavior, changing behavior, and maintaining a change in behavior (Backer, Rogers, & Sopory, 1992: See Figure 5).

![Figure 5: The mass media effects process.](image)

To the extent that media can teach parenting skills, it is evident that media are important in influencing parenting behavior and child outcomes. The message from media can influence parents’ knowledge, beliefs, attitudes, and social sources. In turn, these constructs have been shown to influence parenting behavior and child outcomes (Simpson, 1997). For example, knowledge of child development has been shown to significantly influence both parents’ interactions with children and children’s cognitive development (Tinsley & Lees, 1995). Consistent with this finding, Bogenschneider and Stone (1997) found that information regarding child development contributed to changes in parenting attitudes and behaviors. When parents are taught such skills as child management, anger management, advocacy, observation, problem-
solving, and perspective-taking, parenting behavior and beliefs can change (e.g., Chamberlain & Patterson, 1995; Tinsley & Lees, 1995).

2.2.3 Parent Education Video Programs

Several studies suggest that a videoed program can increase the viewer’s knowledge. A number of experimental studies examined the impact of video versus live presentation formats on different variables such as knowledge gain, attitudes and skill acquisition. Some studies suggest that both formats are as equally effective (Fortner, 1985; Wager, 1980). Others show that videotaped instruction was more effective in increasing knowledge in comparison to other methods such as live lecture and written materials (Stalonas, Keane, & Foy, 1979). Several researchers have shown that video programs can increase short-term knowledge (Stalonas et al., 1982; Cohen, 1983). There is also some evidence that when applied to well-defined, self-limited, stressful situations, video modeling decreases anxiety, pain, and sympathetic arousal while increasing knowledge, cooperation, and overall coping ability (Bradlyn, Christoff, Sikora, O’Dell, & Harris, 1986). Nay (1975) claimed that using videos to model parenting skills primarily among white, educated, middle-class parents was equivalent to other approaches such as a lecture in increasing knowledge.

Kashima et al. (1986) examined two different formats of instruction in contrast to no instruction: (a) live training including lecture; group exercised, and brief videotaped skits, (b) video training with a facilitator who had no prior experience with the curriculum content, and (c) a control group. This study was designed to find effective ways to train parents in teaching self-help skills to their developmentally disabled children. This study included pre- and post-training assessments, and maintained four weekly group sessions and four subsequent home sessions. All subjects in both training conditions increased their scores and showed significant differences from the control group. However, no differences were found between two training approaches in terms of understanding and evaluation of the program.

Webster-Stratton (1982) evaluated the long-term effectiveness of a parent-training program based on videotaped modeling. Thirty-two mothers and their preschool children were evaluated in terms of mother-child interactions and parent attitudinal measures. The majority of mothers in the parent-training program presented positive behavior changes in parenting. Mothers continued to perceive a reduction in the intensity of child behavior problems. However,
the positive results decline in a one year follow up test. O'Dell and Colleagues (1979) and Webster-Stratton (1982) also found that video groups were significantly better in implementing parenting skills.

In conclusion, video programs consistently increase short-term knowledge, they instruct as well as, and often more effectively, than written materials, lectures, or even individual counselors. However, decay in long-term knowledge retention and compliance remains as much of a problem after video intervention as after traditional methods of education.

2.3 Reflective Writing and Learning

Since the middle of 1980s, the necessity of reflective writing in learning has been studied and emphasized by researchers. According to Walker (1985), reflective writing is highly rated as a means of facilitating reflection, integrating between theory and practice (Holly, 1984; Ballantyne & Packer, 1995), stimulating critical thinking and other higher levels of learning (Wwagenaar, 1984; Hettich, 1990), developing personal theories about practice (Thornbury, 1991), and examining and evaluation held beliefs and concepts (Wodlinger, 1990).

Boud, Keogh, & Walker (1985, p. 18) state that reflection is an active process of exploration and discovery which often leads to unexpected outcomes. In other words, experience alone from learning is not sufficient for learning to take place. As a result, writing is regarded as a tool that can foster reflection (Walkers, 1985). By writing, people are able to explicitly state their own thoughts and actions and encourage critical reflection (Andrews & Wheeler, 1990;
Moreover, reflective writing is one of the most common ways to promote reflection (Copeland, 1986; Zeichner & Liston, 1987). Reflective writing is considered an integral part of the supervisory process of pre-service trainee teachers’ personal and professional development.

For this reason, the importance of using reflective writing has been emphasized in diverse educational fields targeted for preservice teachers, medical students, university students, and adults. First of all, reflection and reflective writing have come to be widely recognized as a vital element in the professional growth of teachers (Zeichner, 1992; Calderhead & Gates, 1993). According to Team (2002), the inclusion of reflective writing in teacher training curricula has received wide interest in teacher education. Hoover (1994) found that written assignments such as reflective writing were more useful in making secondary preservice teachers' cognitive processes explicit than in their actively constructing knowledge about teaching and learning. Similarly, Kyles and Olafson (2008) reported consistent results in that through reflective writing, participating preservice teachers’ beliefs about diversity advanced. Ray and Coulter (2008)’s results indicated the use of blogs as reflective journals among language arts teachers in their study led to changes in practice.

Table 1: Research on the effect of reflective writing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Researcher(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflection &amp; Reflective</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Professional growth of teachers &amp; Gates, (1993) Zeichner (1992); Calderhead (1992); Calderhead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective writing</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Training curricula</td>
<td>Team (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective writing</td>
<td>Preservice teacher</td>
<td>Cognitive processes</td>
<td>Hoover (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective writing</td>
<td>Preservice teacher’s</td>
<td>Belief about diversity</td>
<td>Kyles &amp; Olafson (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective writing</td>
<td>Patients</td>
<td>Physical health</td>
<td>Bruce (1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective writing</td>
<td>Patients</td>
<td>Psychological health</td>
<td>Adam (1998)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the adult education field, reflective writing is used as a tool to help learners in terms of personal growth, synthesis, and reflection on new information that they acquire (Hiemstra, 2001). Hiemstra stated that reflective writing has gained cogency as an instructional or learning tool in adult education during the past three decades. Reflective writing can help leaning goals or expected outcomes as integrating life experiences with learning endeavors as well as enhanced
ability at self-discovery. By trusting the one’s voice and interpreting new thoughts self-efficacy increases. Reflective writing also aids in the solution of problems because personal insights and reflections on life experience can be developed through writing. Finally, reflective writing can improve personal physical or psychological health (Adam, 1998; Bruce, 1998). Bruce (1998) described research with subjects who wrote thoughtfully and emotionally about their traumatic experiences, and most of them generally experienced improved physical health. Thus, for some, reflective writing is an effective therapy (Adam, 1998). Reflective writing can support people by functioning as a tunnel to release emotions, counter anger or frustration, and overcome stress. It seems that engaging in reflective writing may help adult learners increase their ability to reflect critically on what they are studying or learning.

Parent education has become an increasingly important alternative to supporting parents in their child rearing roles (Anderson & Thomas, 1992). There is increasing interest in designing programs that can empower parents to become more competent and confident in their parenting roles, to make informed decisions, and to assume control over their lives (Fine, 1989; Anderson & Thomas, 1992: See Figure 7). However, some researchers have expressed concern that simply including parents in parent educational processes cannot be effective in enabling parents to transform their practices (Fine, 1989; Powell, 1989; Anderson & Thomas, 1992).

Figure 7: The paths between reflective writing and parent education.
Studies of learning suggest that true understanding is constructed by learners trying to make their own sense of information, problems, and issues rather than receiving information and answers directly from others (Schön, 1991; Anderson & Thomas, 1992; Fosnot, 1989). As a result, various scholars view reflection as a central process in new learning (Brookfield, 1987; Boud et al., 1985). Although the inclusion of reflective writing has received considerable attention in the field of teacher education (Ponnudurai et al., 2002), only a handful of studies (e.g., Anderson & Thomas, 1992; Thomas, 1996) have examined the effect of reflective writing on parent education. Thomas (1996) found that parents who are more emotionally and cognitively mature or advanced are better able to support their children’s development than parents who are less mature or advanced. Therefore, in order to foster parents, he suggested that there should be more emphasis on the principles of child development, parenting practices related to problems that parents’ experience, and confidence-building through reflective writing. The result of the study suggested that supporting parenting knowledge by reflective writing can increase the level of maternal efficacy. This finding is consistent with those of previous studies (e.g. Baharudin & Lai Mun, 1998; Parks & Smeriglio, 1986; Rozumah, 1995). These researchers, and others, argue that knowledge of child development is an important asset for parents. Studies have shown that parenting knowledge is positively and significantly related to maternal efficacy. When the effects of other family-oriented social context variables were statistically controlled, parenting knowledge was found to uniquely predict maternal efficacy. Parents who have a higher level of parenting knowledge, perceive themselves as having a higher level of maternal efficacy (e.g., Luster and Kain, 1987; Baharudin & Lai Mun, 1998; Teti & Gelfand, 1991).

2.4 Self-Efficacy and Maternal Efficacy

2.4.1 Self-Efficacy

Research on maternal efficacy is guided by Bandura’s Self-Efficacy Theory (Bandura, 1989). According to this theory, one of the important factors concerning people’s actions and behavior is the belief they have the ability to control and change their behavior. Bandura proposed that individual’s actions, affective states, and motivation that influences a task are based on their perceptions of their ability to succeed rather than on their true abilities. This estimation of one’s own efficacy is considered a reliable predictor of successful task performance. In other words, if an individual believes he or she can perform a task, he or she will be more likely to persevere in
the face of adversity, have higher motivation, set higher goals, remain more focused on tasks, visualize him or herself as succeeding, and be more likely to perform generally better than someone with lower self-efficacy (Bandura, 1989; Tomczewski, 2009).

Self-efficacy is both general and domain specific. For example, if someone has a high sense of self-efficacy, he or she is likely to have slightly higher efficacy in many domains. Self-efficacy can be cultivated through either increasing knowledge of the task, or through more experience with the task because self-efficacy is positively influenced by previous experience in successfully dealing with similar situations (Bandura, 1989).

This concept of increasing efficacy through increased familiarity or experience is similar to Erikson’s theory concerning “trying on roles,” in which adolescents and young adults seek to develop their sense of self by envisioning their lives with different roles, such as parents (Erikson, 1959, as cited in Tomczewski, 2009). Tomczewski (2009) maintained that many young adults are still in the process of developing their identity and in understanding their role expectations. Anticipated maternal efficacy may be one way that emerging adults engage in Erikson’s identity and role development.

2.4.2 Maternal Efficacy

As with mother’s socio-demographic factors, mother’s cognitive or psychological responses through self-reported parenting attitude and values have been studied as important predictors for quality of actual parenting (Haskett, Scott, Willoughby, Ahern, & Nears, 2006; Holden & Edwards, 1989). As a result, mothers’ beliefs about their effectiveness as mothers may also be influential predictors of parenting quality (Bugental, Johnston, New & Silver, 1998; Cloeman & Karraker, 1998; Hill & Bush, 2001; Jones & Prinz, 2005). Maternal efficacy is defined as the extent to which mothers feel that they are capable of successfully implementing behaviors associated with positive child rearing (Coleman & Karraker, 1998) and developmental success (Ardelt & Eccles, 2001).

High maternal efficacy has been linked to more action-oriented coping strategies by mothers (Dumka, Stoerzinger, Jackson, & Roosa, 1996; Wells-Parker, Miller, & Topping, 1990), an interest in promoting children's concerns (Dumka et al., 1996), and a lack of behavioral problems in children (Johnson & Mash, 1989). Vrezh (2006) found a connection between maternal efficacy beliefs and an authoritative parenting style, which involves striking a balance.
between being demanding and responsive. Mothers who employ this style of parenting are assertive without being intrusive or restrictive.

Conversely, low maternal efficacy has been linked to maternal depression (Cutrona & Troutman, 1986; Teti & Gelfand, 1991), behavior problems in children (Gibaud-Wallson & Waudersman, 1978 as cited in Johnson & Mash, 1989), maternal perceptions of having "difficult" children (Bugental & Cortez, 1988), ineffective and passive coping styles (Bugental & Cortez, 1988; Wells-Parker et al., 1990), and maternal stress (Wells-Parker et al., 1990). Bugental and Cortez (1988) have also demonstrated that a relationship exists between increased physiological arousal and negative affect in females who perceived caregiving failure as inevitable.

While the maternal efficacy literature consistently illustrates the importance of this variable in impacting the quality of the environment that mothers provide for their children, much of the previous research has been criticized due to the poor psychometric properties of assessments instruments, the lack of conceptual clarity and the homogeneous, middle-class, Caucasian, and normative samples that have been used (Coleman & Karraker, 1998)

2.5 Maternal Efficacy, Parenting, and Child Development

Maternal efficacy has been related to parent's involvement in their children's schoolwork (Eccles & Harold, 1996; Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1997; Shumow & Lomax, 2002) and is indicative of supportive parenting strategies (Ardelt & Eccles, 2001), and activities that foster children's skills. Jones and Prinz (2005) in reviewing Ardelt and Eccles’ (2001) study maintained that maternal efficacy proved to be more important than measures of social network processes in explaining the variance associated with parenting. In doing so maternal efficacy was posited as an antecedent (i.e., input), a consequence, mediator, as well as a transactional variable depending on the particular conceptualization and application.
For example, parents with high maternal efficacy as an antecedent variable exude high confidence in obtaining and utilizing effective parenting skills. In contrast, parents with low maternal efficacy find it more difficult to parent effectively in the face of challenging child situations.

In addition, maternal efficacy as a consequence variable is influenced by ecological context and by child problems. Variables related to socioeconomic disadvantages and neighborhood characteristics are thought to undermine or limit the development of maternal efficacy (Prints, 2005). Moreover, child problems of a particularly challenging nature (e.g., severe oppositional-defiant disorder or ADHD, autism, delinquent behavior) also affect maternal efficacy. Bandura (1997) also found that the following various factors influence maternal efficacy: (1) a temperamentally difficult child, (2) lack of social support, (3) maternal depression, and (4) child health problems. Arderlt and Eccles’ model is further complicated by the consideration that the interaction among maternal efficacy, parenting, and child outcomes is likely to be affected by environmental and family contexts. They note that parents faced with
challenging child behavior problems may find it difficult to maintain high maternal efficacy given the adverse results.

Maternal efficacy may serve as a mediator variable by linking ecological variables and parenting competence. Environmental conditions may undermine a mother’s confidence and account for less effective parenting. For example, Bandura (1995) theorized that the impact of family structure can be mediated or buffered by the impact of maternal efficacy. Thus, single mothers who are efficacious in their parenting skills would be more likely than those single mothers who have low maternal efficacy to promote their children's developmental success. Both qualitative (Furstenberg, 1993) and quantitative research (Ardelt & Eccles, 2001) demonstrated that the possession of personal competence and efficacy in parenting ability can be a critical safeguard against multiple stressors in impoverished communities or in situations where external resources are limited and risk is great. However, the exact mechanisms behind these connections have yet to be determined.

Finally, Jones and Prinz (2005) explained that maternal efficacy operates as a transactional variable. For example, mothers with higher levels of maternal efficacy may reflect great success in parenting, resulting in better child outcomes which in turn increases maternal efficacy even further as in a feedback loop (Jones & Prinz, 2005). Similarly, parents who have lower levels of maternal efficacy may struggle with parenting, experience frustration and non-optimal child outcomes, and have maternal efficacy further undermined.

2.6 The Effect of Maternal Efficacy on Parenting

Previous studies found the strongest evidence of the correlation between maternal efficacy and parenting (See figure 6). Cloeman and Karraker (1998) found that high maternal efficacy has been linked with competent and positive parenting practices, strategies, and behaviors. This finding seems consistent with the results of a study by Hill and Bush (2001) who found that maternal efficacy was positively related to positive parenting practices, and negatively associated with negative parenting such as inconsistent discipline and love withdrawal. Another study concerning maternal efficacy was conducted by Arderlt and Eccles (2001) who described a conceptual model for maternal efficacy. The model is based on qualitative research by Furstenberg (1993) and Bandura’s (1997) theory. In the model, parents who feel efficacious are inclined to be engaged in supporting parenting strategies. They also argued that there can be
reverse effects. For example, parents with lower maternal efficacy struggle to use supportive parenting strategies and give up easily when challenges arise, which in turn may confirm their beliefs of lower efficacy.

Turner and Johnson (2003) found that maternal efficacy was predictive of a more positive parent-child relationship, based on the variables of communication, closeness, enjoyment of time spent together, and the encouragement of child autonomy. Similarly, in a study of parents of 6 to 9 year old children, Brody, Flor, and Gibson (1999) found that parents who felt efficacious with respect to their parenting skills, set developmentally appropriate goals for their children, and assumed more competence in promoting parenting practices. In turn these outcomes were related to children's academic and psychosocial competence, as mediated through children's motivation.

However, it should be noted here that there are four studies which did not support the relationship between parenting and maternal efficacy (Bohlin & Hagekull, 1987; Brody, Flor, & Gibson, 1999; Coleman & Karraker, 2003; Corapci & Wachs, 2002). Bohlin and Hagekull (1987) found that the relationship between maternal impinging behavior and maternal self-efficacy did not reach significance. Then, Brody et al. (1999), using structural equation modeling to test a complex model examining financial strain, parenting beliefs and behaviors, and child self-regulation and competence, found no significant direct effect of maternal efficacy on parenting practices. Coleman and Karraker (2003) also found that maternal competence was not significantly correlated with either a task-related maternal efficacy measure or a general maternal
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Turner and Johnson (2003) found that maternal efficacy was predictive of a more positive parent-child relationship, based on the variables of communication, closeness, enjoyment of time spent together, and the encouragement of child autonomy. Similarly, in a study of parents of 6 to 9 year old children, Brody, Flor, and Gibson (1999) found that parents who felt efficacious with respect to their parenting skills, set developmentally appropriate goals for their children, and assumed more competence in promoting parenting practices. In turn these outcomes were related to children's academic and psychosocial competence, as mediated through children's motivation.

However, it should be noted here that there are four studies which did not support the relationship between parenting and maternal efficacy (Bohlin & Hagekull, 1987; Brody, Flor, & Gibson, 1999; Coleman & Karraker, 2003; Corapci & Wachs, 2002). Bohlin and Hagekull (1987) found that the relationship between maternal impinging behavior and maternal self-efficacy did not reach significance. Then, Brody et al. (1999), using structural equation modeling to test a complex model examining financial strain, parenting beliefs and behaviors, and child self-regulation and competence, found no significant direct effect of maternal efficacy on parenting practices. Coleman and Karraker (2003) also found that maternal competence was not significantly correlated with either a task-related maternal efficacy measure or a general maternal
efficacy measure. Corapci and Wachs (2002) found that no support for a relationship between maternal efficacy and parenting, nor for maternal efficacy as a mediator between home chaos and parenting behavior. These studies, however, focused on families with young children, and they all assessed parenting practices via observation as a main source of measurement.

### 2.7 Maternal Efficacy and Child Development

Previous studies found the strongest evidence of the correlation between maternal efficacy and child development (See figure 10). Depending on the children’s ages, different observation methods were utilized. Studies of young and middle childhood have tended to rely on parent reports, while studies of infants rely solely on observations, and studies of adolescents used self-report. Despite the various methods employed, these studies found a similar correlation between maternal efficacy and child development.

![Figure 10: The paths between maternal efficacy and parenting.](image)

The early study by Bohlin and Hagekull (1987) found that maternal self-efficacy was correlated with observers’ assessments of adequate infant interactive behavior and signaling capacity. In other words, they found significant correlations between maternal self-efficacy and observed infant social interactions. Bogenschneider et al. (1997) also found that the adolescents sons and daughters of mothers with higher maternal efficacy tended to show fewer behavioral problems. They found that sons of mothers with high maternal efficacy reported fewer delinquent behaviors. Also, daughters of high maternal efficacy mothers reported greater seeking
out of parents over peers to confer about personal problems, and both genders of high maternal efficacy parents reported lower substance abuse. Higher maternal efficacy among fathers was associated to some extent with better youth adjustment as well. Murry and Brody (1999) also found that maternal efficacy was significantly correlated with child self-regulation and self worth.

Day et al. (1994) studied a large sample of mothers with clinic-referred children ages 6 to 12 who were being seen for conduct problems and found that mothers with lower discipline-related maternal efficacy tended to perceive their children as having higher rates of behavior problems than mothers with higher maternal efficacy. Also, Coleman and Karraker (2003) found that a significant relationship between maternal efficacy and observed toddler adjustment. High task-related maternal efficacy significantly predicted high child enthusiasm, compliance, affection, and low child avoidance and negativity.

In several intervention studies, Sanders et al. (2000) found that both maternal efficacy and child behavior problems were affected by educational intervention. Furthermore, Sanders found that maternal efficacy was related to child behavioral issues. In other words, some educational interventions have not only increased maternal efficacy, but also decreased child behavioral problems (e.g., Sanders et al., 2000; Sofronoff & Farbotko, 2002).

One of the few intervention studies to target maternal efficacy centrally via a mother management training intervention (Sofronoff & Farbotko, 2002) found that mothers in the intervention conditions reported increased maternal efficacy and decreased child behavioral problems. Mothers in either a workshop group format or an individual treatment format reported higher maternal efficacy, while the control group mothers reported decreased maternal efficacy. The analysis, unfortunately, did not offer evidence as to the relationship between the decreased report of child behavior problems and the increased maternal efficacy. In a different intervention study using a non-therapy format, Sanders and his colleagues (2000) tested a prevention program involving an infotainment television series for families with children aged two to eight in a randomized design. Compared to mothers in the control group, the mothers who watched the television series reported increased maternal efficacy and decreased child behavior problems, but there was no significant change in parenting styles.

Hill and Bush (2001) found that maternal efficacy was inversely related to children’s reports of child anxiety for Caucasian (but not African American) kindergarten-aged children.
Further analyses suggested that maternal efficacy may have protected children from developing anxiety, albeit indirectly via parenting practices (Hill & Bush, 2001). Ardelt and Eccles (2001) found that maternal efficacy directly impacted youth self-efficacy.

Some researchers have proposed that maternal efficacy impacts child socio-emotional functioning via its effects on different aspects of maternal adjustment (Brody et al., 1999; Izzo et al., 2000; Shumow & Lomax, 2002). Izzo et al. (2000) found that maternal efficacy predicted positive child socio-emotional adjustment initially. According to Shumow and Lomax (2002), maternal efficacy predicted maternal monitoring that was, in turn, predictive of adolescent social-emotional adjustment. This body of research suggests that maternal efficacy may relate to child socio-emotional functioning indirectly through its influence on aspects of maternal adjustment.

There is some evidence supporting a direct relationship between maternal efficacy and child school performance. For example, Bogenschneider et al. (1997) found that children of parents with higher maternal efficacy reported higher school grades. Using a composite measure of child academic success that included child self-report, parent report, and interview assessment, Ardelt and Eccles (2001) found both direct and indirect effects of maternal efficacy on adolescent academic success for African American families, but not for Caucasian families. However, for both African American and Caucasian mothers, parenting was not significantly related to youth academic performance.

2.8 Summary

Chapter two supports the importance of reflective writing in order to advance subjects’ maternal efficacy when it is included with or follows parent education video programs. This review of literature provides an overview of the transition of parent education in terms of major materials; how maternal efficacy can have an effect on parenting and child development; and how reflective writing is important to parents as learners of reflection strategies. The relevant research discussed in this chapter supports the notion that utilizing reflective writing about topics that mothers learn and think about when viewing a parent education video program can positively advance maternal efficacy.
Figure 11: The paths from reflective writing and media to child.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter is divided into eleven sections: (1) study purpose, (2) research questions, hypotheses, and sub-questions, (3) study design, (4) variables, (5) sampling procedures, (6) participants, (7) material, (8) instrumentations, (9) data collection procedures, (10) data analysis, and (11) methodology summary.

In the first section, the purpose of the study is described. This is followed in the second section by a list of the research questions and hypotheses. Then, I describe the study design in the third section. The fourth section describes the relevant variables. Next, the sampling procedures for the study are addressed in the fifth section. The sixth section provides information about the participants, and the seventh describes the materials (i.e., parenting DVDs) that were used in the study. Then, in the eighth section, the instruments (i.e., Demographics, PSOC, and PSES) used for the pre-, and post-tests are described. The data collection procedures are outlined in the ninth section followed, in the tenth section, by an overview of the analytical procedures that were employed in the study. The final section summarizes that methodology.

3.1 Study Purpose

The purpose of the study was to determine the relative effect of mothers’ participation in a self-reflective writing activity after viewing six parent education videos on maternal efficacy. The study compared two groups (i.e., the experimental group: reflective writing and educational parenting videos: and the control group: educational parenting videos) of participants’ perceptions of maternal efficacy before and after intervention (i.e., reflective writing and/or educational parenting videos). The data collected on the pre- and post- test surveys were analyzed for the following components of maternal efficacy: (1) Parenting Sense of Competence (PSOC), (2) Parental Self-Efficacy about Discipline (PSES-Discipline), (3) Parental Self-Efficacy about Suitability (PSES-Suitability), (4) Parental Self-Efficacy about Communication (PSES-Communication), and (5) Parental Self-Efficacy about Personal Efficacy (PSES-Personal
Efficacy). The reflective writing data were analyzed for the following components: description, analysis, and application style.

3.2 Research Questions, Hypotheses, and Sub-Questions

3.2.1 Research Questions

This quasi-experimental study was guided by the following questions:

1. What are the relative effects of participation in a video parent education program and reflective writing on the maternal efficacy of mothers of preschool aged children?
2. What are the main components of the reflective writing of mothers of preschool aged children?

3.2.2 Research Hypotheses

There were six hypotheses (i.e., $H_1$ and $H_{2-5}$) for the first question and two sub-questions (i.e., 3 and 4) for the second question.

1. ($H_1$) The mean maternal efficacy score of mothers who participate in video and reflective writing training is significantly different from the mean maternal efficacy scores of mothers who participate in video training with no reflective writing.
2.1 ($H_{2-1}$) The mean maternal efficacy rating (PSOC) of mothers who participate in video and reflective writing will be significantly higher than the mean maternal efficacy rating of mothers who participate in video training with no reflective writing.
2.2 ($H_{2-2}$) The mean maternal efficacy rating (PSES-Discipline) of mothers who participate in video and reflective writing will be significantly higher than the mean maternal efficacy rating of mothers who participate in video training with no reflective writing.
2.3 ($H_{2-3}$) The mean maternal efficacy rating (PSES-Suitability) of mothers who participate in video and reflective writing will be significantly higher than the mean maternal efficacy rating of mothers who participate in video training with no reflective writing.
2.4 ($H_{2-4}$) The mean maternal efficacy rating (PSES-Communication) of mothers who participate in video and reflective writing will be significantly higher than the mean maternal efficacy rating of mothers who participate in video training with no reflective writing.
2.5 \((H2.5)\) The mean maternal efficacy rating (PSES-Personal Efficacy) of mothers who participate in video and reflective writing will be significantly higher than the mean maternal efficacy rating of mothers who participate in video training with no reflective writing.

3.2.3 Research Sub-Questions

1. What themes or topics are expressed by mothers of preschool aged children in their reflective writing about each of the parenting videos?
2. What are the main components of the reflective writing of mothers of preschool aged children?

3.3 Study Design

The current study is a quasi-experimental, pre- and post-test, study (i.e., nonequivalent group pre- and post-test, or nonrandomized control group pre- and post-test study). Thirty-two mothers participated in the study and they were assigned into two groups (i.e., experimental and control groups). This procedure was adopted in part because of the availability of the participants, and also because the setting placed limits on the creation of artificial groups (Creswell, 2007). The sixteen mothers in the control group received and watched the six parent education videos. The other 16 participants in the experimental group received and watched the same videos and they also competed reflective writing after watching each video program.

An instrument designed to measure maternal efficacy was administered to all of the participants (i.e., demographics, pre-PSOC, and pre-PSES). Then, after completing the pre-test the two groups watched each of the six educational parenting videos. After watching each program participants in the experimental group completed a reflective writing task. No such task was completed by the 16 mothers in the control group. Finally, both groups were administered the maternal efficacy instrument (i.e., pre-PSOC and pre-PSES). A format for the design is presented in Table 2.
Table 2: Study design.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Selected Experimental Group</th>
<th>Selected Control Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>V1, V2, V3, V4, V5, &amp; V6</td>
<td>V1, V2, V3, V4, V5, &amp; V6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>with reflective writings</td>
<td>without reflective writing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pre- and post-test designs are widely used in behavioral research, primarily for the purpose of comparing groups and measuring change resulting from experimental treatments. However, a quasi-experimental pre- and post-test design (i.e., non-equivalent control group pre-test) has certain disadvantages that can potentially reduce internal validity (e.g., selection bias, history, maturation, regression, mortality, interactions with selections). Such threats to internal validity can limit the extent to which researchers can draw any causal conclusions (Creswell, 2007). On the other hand, a quasi-experimental design does provide some information concerning cause and effect relationships (i.e., reflective writing effect). Of the potential threats to internal validity, selection bias (i.e., pre-existing group differences at the onset of the study) problems can be estimated by comparing group means on pre-test measures. In the current an independent sample $t$-test using pre-test scores (i.e., pre-PSOC and pre-PSES) was used to determine whether the equivalency of the two groups of participants (See 4.2 in Chapter 4). The results of the $t$-test analyses suggested that there were significant pre-existing differences between the two groups with regard to maternal efficacy. Therefore, in order to control for initial differences between the groups the post-test data were analyzed using analyses of covariance (ANCOVA) with scores on the pre-test used as the covariate measures (i.e., pre-PSOC and pre-PSES).
3.4 Variables

3.4.1 Grouping Variable

The grouping, or independent variable, for this study was two levels of reflective writing: (1) participation in the self-reflective writing activity, and (2) no participation in the self-reflective writing activity. The study also included a within-subjects variable, namely two levels of the time of testing.

3.4.2 Outcome Variable

The outcome variable of interest in this study was maternal efficacy. This was measured as the participants’ scores on several subscales: (1) Parenting Sense of Competence (PSOC), and (2) Parental Self-Efficacy about Discipline (PSES-Discipline), (3) Parental Self-Efficacy about Suitability (PSES-Suitability), (4) Parental Self-Efficacy about Communication (PSES-Communication), and (5) Parental Self-Efficacy about Personal Efficacy (PSES-Personal Efficacy).

3.5 Sampling Procedures

Permission to access the study participants was obtained from the Coordinator of the Mothers of Preschoolers Organization (MOPS), and from the director of the Florida State University (FSU) Child Development Program (See Appendix B and D). Next, the institutional Review Boards (IRB) at FSU reviewed and approved the proposed study. Once the study had been approved, the potential participants were provided with binders that included materials describing the study, as well as the formal consent forms (See Appendix A). The coordinator of MOPS and two managers of the FSU child development program were trained by the researcher on how to discuss the study with potential participants. They were also provided with information to help them answer questions that the potential participants may have had. Then the researcher met with the mothers who had agreed to participate in the study to further explain the procedures and have them sign consent forms \((n=27)\). A separate meeting was held with the participants \((n=5)\). from the FSU child development programs during which the researcher distributed the same information and collected signed consent forms.
3.6 Participants

Eligibility for participation in the study was limited to mothers of at least one preschool child between the ages of three and five years. In order to limit the possibility of confounding factors, participation in the study was also limited to mothers of children with no chronic illness, disability, or children who were being treated for behavioral or psychological problems. This precaution was taken because such disorders could potentially interfere with the participants’ maternal efficacy, thereby limiting the validity of the study. Additionally, the study was limited to native English speakers, or non-native speakers who were fluent in English. This was necessary in order to ensure that the participants could understand the parent education videos and so they could complete the reflective writing task with relative ease. Finally, the study was also limited to mothers who were not overly concerned about writing. This was because excessive apprehension towards writing or high apprehension could negatively influence writing performance and reflective writing.

The number of participants needed for the study was determined using power analysis. This analysis was conducted using the G* Power software. The independent sample t-test was used to determine whether there was a statistically significant difference within and between the experimental and control groups on each of the five dependent measures (i.e., PSOC and PSES-Discipline, Suitability, Communication, Self-efficacy). For the analysis an effect size of 0.50, power at 0.80, and alpha (i.e., α error probability) of 0.05 was adopted. The results of the power analysis suggested that a sample size of 32 would be sufficient.

3.6.1 Demographics

Thirty-two mothers of young children participated in this study (n=16 experimental and n=16 control subjects). The participants were recruited from a preschool and an organization for mothers of preschool aged students. Information concerning the participants is reported in Table 3.2 and the survey used to solicit this information is included in Appendix A.

As shown in Table 2, both groups participating in the study consisted of 16 mothers of young children. Most of the participants in the experimental group were over 30 years old. Only two (12.5 %) of the participants were between 26 and 30 years old, and one (6.3 %) was a relatively young mother (i.e., less than 25 years old). The age distribution of those participants in the control group differed. Six of the participants (37.5 %) were in their middle and late twenties.
(i.e., between 26 and 30 years old) and three (18.7 %) were in their early and mid thirties (i.e., between 31 and 35 years old). Most of the participants were White/Caucasian as shown in Table 3. The majority of the participants \( (n=14, 87.5 \%) \) in the experimental group were married, three (18.7 %) were divorced, and one (6.3 %) was single (never married). This distribution was similar across the control group, most were married \( (n=12, 75 \%) \); one (18.7 %) was widowed; and one mother was divorced.

The participants’ educational qualifications, ranging from high school diploma to masters’ degree, seemed to be evenly distributed across both groups of participants. However, there was a greater proportion of mothers who had a bachelors \( (n=5, 31.2 \%) \) and masters degree \( (n=8, 50 \%) \) in the control group in comparison to those mothers in the experimental group.

Data on the employment of the mothers showed that more of the mothers in the control group \( (n=9, 56.3 \%) \) were employed than were those in the experimental group \( (n=6, 37.5 \%) \). As for working hours per week, mothers in the control group showed a somewhat even distribution of working hours, from less than 20 hours to 21-50 hours. However, in the experimental group, most of mothers worked 20 hours \( (n=5, 31.2 \%) \) per week. Most of the mothers in the experimental \( (n=11, 68.7 \%) \) and control \( (n=13, 81.2 \%) \) groups had two young children.

Data on the gender of the mothers’ first child showed that mothers in the control group \( (n=10, 62.5 \%) \) had more female than male children. However, in the experimental group, the proportion of mothers with male or female children was equal for each \( (n=8, 50 \%) \). The distribution of the second child’s gender was similar across both groups. With regard to mothers with a third child, one subject in the experimental group had a male child, while another had a female child. Finally, only four of the mothers had previously participated in a parent education program.
Table 3: Demographic characteristics of the participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control Group (n=16)</th>
<th>Experimental Group (n=16)</th>
<th>Total (n=32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 25</td>
<td>1 (6.3 %)</td>
<td>1 (6.3 %)</td>
<td>2 (6.3 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 ~ 30</td>
<td>6 (37.5 %)</td>
<td>2 (12.5 %)</td>
<td>8 (25 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 ~ 35</td>
<td>3 (18.7 %)</td>
<td>6 (37.5 %)</td>
<td>9 (28.1 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 36</td>
<td>6 (37.5 %)</td>
<td>7 (43.7 %)</td>
<td>13 (40.6 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16 (100 %)</strong></td>
<td><strong>16 (100 %)</strong></td>
<td><strong>32 (100 %)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>13 (81.1 %)</td>
<td>14 (87.5 %)</td>
<td>27 (84.3 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>1 (6.3 %)</td>
<td>1 (6.3 %)</td>
<td>2 (6.3 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/ Latina</td>
<td>1 (6.3 %)</td>
<td>0 (0 %)</td>
<td>1 (3.1 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>1 (6.3 %)</td>
<td>1 (6.3 %)</td>
<td>2 (6.3 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16 (100 %)</strong></td>
<td><strong>16 (100 %)</strong></td>
<td><strong>32 (100 %)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>12 (75 %)</td>
<td>14 (87.5 %)</td>
<td>26 (81.3 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>0 (0 %)</td>
<td>1 (6.3 %)</td>
<td>1 (3.1 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>1 (6.3 %)</td>
<td>0 (0 %)</td>
<td>1 (3.1 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>3 (18.7 %)</td>
<td>1 (6.3 %)</td>
<td>2 (12.5 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16 (100 %)</strong></td>
<td><strong>16 (100 %)</strong></td>
<td><strong>32 (100 %)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>0 (0 %)</td>
<td>3 (18.7 %)</td>
<td>3 (9.4 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College</td>
<td>2 (12.5 %)</td>
<td>3 (18.7 %)</td>
<td>5 (15.6 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>5 (31.2 %)</td>
<td>4 (25 %)</td>
<td>9 (28.1 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>8 (50 %)</td>
<td>5 (31.2 %)</td>
<td>13 (40.6 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>1 (6.3 %)</td>
<td>1 (6.3 %)</td>
<td>2 (6.3 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16 (100 %)</strong></td>
<td><strong>16 (100 %)</strong></td>
<td><strong>32 (100 %)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7 (43.7 %)</td>
<td>10 (62.5 %)</td>
<td>17 (53.1 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9 (56.3 %)</td>
<td>6 (37.5 %)</td>
<td>15 (46.9 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16 (100 %)</strong></td>
<td><strong>16 (100 %)</strong></td>
<td><strong>32 (100 %)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Working hours per a week</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20 hours</td>
<td>2 (12.5 %)</td>
<td>0 (0 %)</td>
<td>2 (6.3 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 hours</td>
<td>3 (18.7 %)</td>
<td>5 (31.2 %)</td>
<td>8 (25 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 ~ 45 hours</td>
<td>4 (25 %)</td>
<td>1 (6.3 %)</td>
<td>5 (15.6 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>7 (43.8 %)</td>
<td>10 (62.5 %)</td>
<td>17 (53.1 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16 (100 %)</strong></td>
<td><strong>16 (100 %)</strong></td>
<td><strong>32 (100 %)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How many children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 (31.3 %)</td>
<td>1 (6.3 %)</td>
<td>6 (18.7 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11 (68.7 %)</td>
<td>13 (81.2 %)</td>
<td>24 (75 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0 (0 %)</td>
<td>2 (12.5 %)</td>
<td>2 (6.3 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16 (100 %)</strong></td>
<td><strong>16 (100 %)</strong></td>
<td><strong>32 (100 %)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7 Materials

All participants were provided with a set of six parent education videos, ‘Active Parenting Now’. This material was distributed on a weekly basis such that every week the mothers received one DVD. Those mothers that were to complete the reflective writing task also received written information with guidelines for the reflective writing task. All of the videos lasted approximately 25-30 minutes. The participants were instructed to watch the videos in their own home at a convenient time. Those in the experimental group were also asked to read the accompanying tipsheet (Appendix J) and they also received weekly emails reminding them to watch each video. They were also reminded to complete the reflective writing based on the ‘Active Parenting Now’ video program.

Numerous attempts have been made by scholars to establish the effectiveness of parent education video programs (e.g., Gordon, 2000; Sanders, Calam, Durand, Liversidge & Carmont, 2008). Gordon (2000) found that an interactive parent education video program improved parents’ knowledge of parenting principles and skills, and that there was a reduction in their
children’s problem behaviors. Sanders et al. (2008) also reported that parents who watched media programs on parenting engaged in fewer dysfunctional parenting practices, and like Gordon (2000) found that there were significant improvements in their children’s behaviors. These researchers were able to show that the provision of additional activities or materials (e.g., a self-help workbook, extra web support involving downloaded parenting tip sheets, audio and video streaming of positive parenting messages, and email support) led to positive outcomes for parents.

Information from these studies, and others, were used to select appropriate parent education videos for the current study. The series of videos titled ‘Active Parenting Now’ were selected for the study. The set of six videos address the following topics: (1) Parenting in the 21st Century – What’s your style and how does it influence your child?, (2) Active Communication- How to win cooperation with your child?, (3) Effective Discipline- How to raise a responsible child, (4) Sidestepping the Power Struggles- Redirecting your child’s misbehavior, (5) Building Character- Courage and self-esteem in your child, (6) The Magic of Family Meeting – Teaching problem solving and positive values.

There were several reasons for using this particular set of videos’. First, the series has been used as parent education for over two million parents. Second, the series featured families of different races and configurations. Third, the purposes and targets of the videos were appropriate for the parents who participated in the study. These videos were created for parents with children aged five to twelve to inspire them to acquire good parenting skills, and parental efficacy. Fourth, each of the six sessions was designed to last 30 minutes, but the program is flexible and can be tailored to suit each parent’s need. Fifth, the video series received several awards, thereby attesting to the quality of the videos. The first video in the series, ‘Parenting in the 21st Century.’ received awards from What’s New in 2003. In addition, the third video, ‘Effective Discipline.’ is a winner of the National Council on Family Relations (NCFR) media Award. Systematically structured programs can be effective in teaching parenting skills to parents of toddlers and preschool children as stand-alone interventions (Markie-Dadd & Sanders, 2006; Sanders, Bor & Morawska, 2007). Finally, the videos include discussion guidelines and a reproducible “Parent’s Tips” sheet. I considered these ancillary guidelines to be appropriate for this study.
3.8 Instruments

The instrument adopted for this study was adapted from questions from the PSOC and the PSES (See Appendix D, E, and F). The 6-point Likert-type scale of maternal efficacy was adapted from two existing measures, the Parenting Sense of Competence (PSOC; Johnston & Mash, 1989) and the Parental Self-Efficacy Scale (PSES; Bachicha 1993). The measure used a 6-point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (6).

3.8.1 Demographic Survey

A background questionnaire was used to collect demographic information about the participants. The questionnaire asked participants to respond to items regarding their family (e.g., marital status, child’s age, number of siblings, ethnicity), their educational level, employment status, and their children’s health (See Appendix D).

3.8.2 Parenting Sense of Competence (PSOC; Johnston & Mash, 1989)

The PSOC was used to assess mothers’ maternal perception of personal competence in the parenting role. The PSOC is a 17-item questionnaire that assesses parental perception of their competence on 2 dimensions, satisfaction with their parental role and their feeling of efficacy as a parent. This instrument provides a Total Score as well as Satisfaction and Efficacy scores. All three measures have been shown to have satisfactory levels of internal consistency ($\alpha$ = .79, .75, and .76 respectively; Johnston & Mash, 1989). However, the Total Score from this measure was used to assess the mothers’ sense of competence in this study (see Appendix E).

3.8.3 The Parental Self-Efficacy Scale (PSES: Bachicha 1993)

The parental self-efficacy scale (PSES; Bachicha, 1993) assessed participants’ expectations of their effectiveness in carrying out maternal role behaviors in both familiar (e.g., at home) and less familiar (e.g., in the store) situations. Participants’ responded to the 35 items of the PSES concerning child-oriented efficacy (e.g., “verbally control my child’s behavior without yelling” and “get my child to understand verbal commands”; $\alpha = .97$) and the 33 items related to self-oriented efficacy (e.g., “I organize my daily activities very well”; $\alpha = .89$) were summed separately to yield four subscale scores. The child-oriented efficacy section was composed of
discipline questions (i.e., PSES-Discipline), while the self-oriented efficacy consists of three parts, including suitability, communication, and person efficacy (i.e., PSES-Suitability, PSES-Communication, and PSES-Personal Efficacy; See Appendix F).

### 3.9 Data Collection

Although the study was primarily quantitative there was also some qualitative data. This data resulted from the fact that participants were asked to complete a weekly reflective writing task. Designed as a quasi-experiment, the quantitative data was used to determine whether the intervention (i.e., reflective writing activity) had an effect on maternal efficacy. Since the participants provided written products the study also provided an opportunity to examine the nature and content of mothers’ reflective writing. This qualitative data was examined to identify components and themes addressed in the written artifacts.

#### 3.9.1 Quantitative Data

The survey (i.e., PSOC and PSES) was administered to both groups of 16 mothers at the beginning and at the end of the six weeks of intervention.

#### 3.9.2 Qualitative Data

The reflective writings of participants were collected every week from the fourth week of January to the first week of March (2011). The researcher provided the participants with a handout in the form of a brochure explaining the requirements for the reflective writing task. This information was sent to the mothers on a weekly basis throughout the study. Participants returned the writing task to the researcher via email. The format for the reflective writing is outlined in Table 4.
Table 4: Format of reflective writing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Assignment Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Themes or Topics</td>
<td>While watching the video, keep record of three to five key themes or ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 The most impressive guide Remind my parenting history</td>
<td>Reflect on your own parenting experiences in connection with the video; then write down your response or reaction to the video (minimum of one paragraph). Be sure to express your opinions and/or feelings in your response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Plans for implication</td>
<td>Next, write a minimum of one paragraph highlighting the most impressive lesson or advice given in the video and your plans for applying the lesson or advice to your life.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.10 Data Analysis

The study was designed as a quasi-experiment that yielded both pre- and post-test quantitative data. The two sets of data were analyzed separately. The quantitative data using PSOC and PSES surveys (i.e., pre- and post-test) were examined to determine whether there were statistically significant differences in the mean maternal efficacy scores obtained by the two groups of participants. To this end an Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted for each of the subscale scores. For these analyses, participants’ scores on the relevant pre-test instruments were used as covariate measures.

Since the intervention included a reflective writing task, the study also yielded some qualitative data. The data from the mothers’ reflective writing were used to examine the themes or topics that they had written about in their journals. Furthermore, the reflective writing data were used to examine the predominant components of the mothers’ reflective writing. Of interest here were those topics concerning parenting and maternal efficacy.
3.10.1 Quantitative Data Analysis

3.10.1.1 Descriptive Statistics. The initial analyses involved computing descriptive statistics for all of the participants’ demographic information as well as their pre- and post-maternal efficacy scores. These descriptive analyses yielded means, percentages, and standard deviations for each of the variables of interest.

3.10.1.2 Independent samples t-tests. Independent sample t-tests were conducted on the mean maternal efficacy scores of the experimental and control groups. The purpose of these analyses was to determine the initial equivalence of the two groups of participants. The t-test analyses therefore compared the mean scores of the two groups on their pre-test scores for PSOC, PSES (Discipline), PSES (Suitability), PSES (Communication), and PSES (Personal Efficacy). This results of these analyses suggested that the two groups differed in terms of their maternal efficacy. Given the pre-existing differences between two groups it was considered appropriate to use Analyses of Covariance (ANCOVA) on the post test maternal efficacy scores.

3.10.1.3 Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA). A one-way ANCOVA was employed because the research was designed as a two-group pre- and post- test that compared the impact of two different interventions, taking a priori and post hoc measures for each group. The one-way ANCOVA was considered an appropriate statistical method for this study because it is a statistical technique that measures the power of an F test for a main effect (i.e., reflective writing activity) by reducing the error term (i.e., pre-existing differences between groups). Pre-existing differences can make it difficult to identify or demonstrate final between group differences resulting from a main effect (i.e., reflective writing activity). Therefore, controlling the effect of individual differences (i.e., pre-test scores) as a covariate measure can increase the likelihood of detecting final between group differences. In the current study, this approach should enable determination of the efficacy of the intervention...

Although there are a number of issues and assumptions associated with ANCOVA, three key assumptions for ANCOVA were tested (i.e., reliability of covariates, linearity, and homogeneity of regression slopes) in this study. Decisions concerning acceptance or rejection of the relevant hypotheses were based on two indexes, a p-value and an index of effect size (eta-squared; η2). A “small” p-value (i.e., p < .05) in combination with a “large” (i.e., η2 > .1) effect size (η2) was considered sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis (Cohen, 1988).
3.10.2 Qualitative Data Analysis

The study sought to identify the parenting topics or themes that the mothers wrote about. Therefore, the mothers’ reflective writing was examined to identify key themes or topics and how they related to the issues addressed in the parent education videos. This analysis of the mothers’ reflective writing was guided by the work of Fenwick (2001) who analyzed pre-service teacher’s reflective journals. For the purposes of the current study several categories were created to identify predominant components of the mothers’ reflective writings. Once the new component category (i.e., description, analyze, and application) was developed, each piece of reflective writing was analyzed and sorted accordingly. To check the level of each components, the researcher used three kinds of coding markers (i.e., blank, O, and OO). ‘OO’ described the mothers who attempted to describe and/or analyze their prior or current parenting experiences, opinions, and attitudes in detail and through reasoning and rationale. ‘O’ signified simple description or analyses, with only minimal explanation about the child and mother’s own childhood background. Finally, a blank indicated that the researcher could not find any meaningful description and/or analyses about parenting from the mother’s reflective writings.

3.11 Summary

This study investigated the effect of the main intervention treatment (i.e., self-reflective writing activity) on the maternal efficacy of two groups of mothers in an experimental and control group. The analyses focused on several subscale measures: Parenting Sense of Competence (PSOC) and Parental Self-Efficacy (PSES-Discipline, Suitability, Communication, and Personal Efficacy).

The participants were 32 preschooler’s mothers of preschool aged children. The mothers in the experimental groups participated in a reflective writing activity base on several parent education videos over a period of six weeks. At the same time, the mothers in the control group participated in viewing the same parent education videos. These mothers, however, did not participate in any writing task.

Preliminary analyses included independent sample t-tests on the pre-test measures (i.e., pre-PSOC and pre-PSES), descriptive statistics (i.e., pre- and post-test scores), and tests to determine whether any assumptions associated with the statistical analyses had been violated. Similarly, analyses were conducted to identify any initial differences in the maternal efficacy of the two groups of mothers.
Finally, the reflective writing produced by the participants was analyzed by identifying the parenting themes or topics. Also, the main components (i.e., description, analysis, and application) of mothers’ reflective writings were described.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The data analysis and results of the study are presented in this chapter. Included in the chapter are the following sections: (1) descriptive information on pre- and post-tests scores with regard to PSOC and PSES, (2) pre-test differences between experimental and control groups, (3) reliability, (4) linearity, (5) homogeneity of regression, (6) post-test differences between two groups, (7) test for treatment effect (i.e., reflective writing), (8) the comparisons of themes or topics about videoed parenting programs, (9) participants’ reflective writing components, and finally (10) summary of results.

The first section provides complete descriptive information of the comparison of pre- and post-maternal efficacy scores between the two groups. The following section reports the result of an independent sample *t*-test that compared mean pre maternal efficacy scores (i.e., pre-PSOC or pre-PSES) between the two groups of mothers. This analysis was used to justify the use of ANCOVA (i.e., adjusting pre-test scores) by revealing pre-existing differences between the two groups with regard to pre-PSOC or pre-PSES levels. The third section of this chapter presents the results of the estimated internal consistency of the two surveys (PSOC and PSES) in order to test the assumption of reliability of the covariate. The fourth section discusses the relationship between the covariate (i.e., pre-PSOC and pre-PSES) and the dependent variable (i.e., post-PSOC and post-PSES) for all groups as part of ANCOVA assumption tests for linearity. The next section presents results of the analyses examining the relationship between the covariate (i.e., pre-PSOC and pre-PSES) and the dependent variable (i.e., post-PSOC and post-PSES) for both groups of participants. The sixth section presents results of the comparison of the post-test scores (i.e., post-PSOC and post-PSES) of the two groups, as well the results of the data analyses used to test the first research hypothesis (i.e., $H_1$). The seventh section shows the relative effectiveness of reflective writing (i.e., the main treatment effect) on subjects’ PSOC and PSES scores as part of maternal efficacy tests. The findings related to the remaining research
hypotheses (i.e., \(H_2.1\) to \(H_2.5\)) are answered in this seventh part. The eighth section describes the themes or topics of the participants’ reflective writing based on each of the parent education videos. Description of these themes was used to answer the third research question. The ninth section answers the fourth research questions by describing the main components of the participants’ reflective writings. The final section presents a summary of results.

### 4.1 Pre- and post-test Scores

Means and standard deviation scores for each of the dependent variables (i.e., PSOC and PSES-Discipline, Suitability, Communication, and Personal Efficacy) are displayed in Table 5. Here the analyses are used to compare the control group’s pre- and post-test PSOC and PSES scores. Similarly, the data is used to compare the pre- and post-test PSOC and PSES scores. The descriptive statistics suggest that there were pre to post-test increases for both experimental and control groups. It should be noted, however, that there were differences in the means of the two groups on the pre-test measures.

Table 5: Comparison of experimental and control groups on pre- and post-test scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Control group (n=16)</th>
<th>Experimental group (n=16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PSOC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>52.75</td>
<td>11.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>57.43</td>
<td>10.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>139.88</td>
<td>23.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>155.13</td>
<td>21.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Suitability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>40.25</td>
<td>9.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>48.25</td>
<td>6.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>45.36</td>
<td>7.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>46.75</td>
<td>6.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Personal Efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>44.81</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>46.13</td>
<td>5.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Pre-test Differences Between Groups

An independent samples \( t \)-test was conducted to determine the statistical significance of differences between the experimental and control groups before the video and/or reflective writing interventions with regard to Parenting Sense of Competence Levels (PSOC) and the Parental Self-Efficacy levels (PSES- Discipline, Suitability, Communication, and Personal Efficacy). A \( p = .05 \) level of significance was adopted for these analyses. The participants were not randomly assigned to two the groups; therefore, pre-test differences (e.g., systematic bias) between groups could influence the interpretation of post-test differences (Dimitrov and Rumrill, 2003). For this reason, \( t \)-tests of pre-test differences between the two groups were performed.

Table 6 shows that there was a statistically significant difference in pre-PSOC test scores for the experimental (\( M=45.86, SD=6.26 \)) and control group (\( M=52.75, SD=11.56 \)), \( t(30)= -2.09, p = .48 \), with the exception of the pre-PSES-Communication test scores. The magnitude of the differences in the means was considered large (\( \eta^2 = .13 \)). Interpretation of the effect size was based on Cohen’ (1988) guideline; i.e., .01= small effect, .06= moderate effect, .14= large effect.

Table 6 shows that there were statistically significant differences in pre-PSES-Discipline test scores for the experimental (\( M=158.06, SD=24.43 \)) and control group (\( M=139.88, SD=23.39 \)), \( t(30)= 2.15, p=.04 \); in pre-PSES-Suitability test scores for the experimental group (\( M=47.5, SD=9.44 \)) and control group (\( M=40.25, SD=9.42 \)), \( t(30)= 2.18, p=.38 \); and in pre-PSES-Personal Efficacy test scores for the experimental group (\( M=51.31, SD=10.97 \)) and control (\( M=44.81, SD=6.02 \)), \( t(30)= -2.08, p = .46 \). The magnitude of the differences in the pre-(PSES) test score means was judged to be large (Discipline, \( \eta^2 = .13 \); Suitability, \( \eta^2 = .13 \); Personal Efficacy, \( \eta^2 = .13 \)).
Table 6: The independent sample $t$-test summary for pretest difference between groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>$t$-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-PSOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assumed</td>
<td>7.771</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-PSES–Discipline)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre (PSES-Suitability)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre (PSES-Communication)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre (PSES-Personal Efficacy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances</td>
<td>2.824</td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.

$a$  MD = Mean Difference

$b$  SD = Std. Error Difference
4.3 Reliability

An internal consistency reliability analysis was conducted to determine the estimated internal consistency of the PSOC and PSES as applied to the sample in the present study. For the most reliable measuring tools, the assumption concerning the reliability of the covariate (pre-test scores) should be tested because a psychometric scale (e.g., a 6 point Likert-type scale) was used in the PSOC and PSES measures.

Table 7 presents the Cronbach’s Alpha for the 17 items of PSOC, $\alpha = .80$, suggesting that the items have relatively high internal consistency (Huck & Cormier, 1996). Additionally, Table 7 shows the Cronbach’s Alpha for the four sub scales of the PSES. The dimensions generally show good internal consistency reliability, PSES-Discipline ($\alpha = .96$), PSES-Suitability ($\alpha = .91$), PSES-Communication ($\alpha = .90$), and PSES-Personal Efficacy ($\alpha = .88$), based on the generally accepted standard for reliability estimates (Huck & Cormier, 1996). Cronbach’s Alpha Value for the total scale of PSES is judged to be high, $\alpha = .96$.

Table 7: Reliability analysis of the PSOC and PSES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cronbach’s $\alpha$</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Sense of Competence Scale (PSOC)</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Parental Self-Efficacy Scale (PSES)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Efficacy</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSES Scale total</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 Assumption of Linearity

Scatter-plots based on a one-way ANCOVA were used to assess the assumption concerning the linear relationships between each of dependent variables (i.e., post-PSOC and post-PSES) and the covariate measures (e.g., pre-PSOC and pre-PSES) for each of the groups.

The results of the analyses suggest that there was no curvilinear relationship (See Figure 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16). Had the relationship been curvilinear it would have been necessary to consider transforming the data. In this case violations of the assumption of linearity were not detected and therefore, no such transformations were necessary.

4.4.1 Linearity Between Pre- and Post-tests (PSOC)

Figure 12 clearly illustrates that the relationship between the pre- and post-tests scores (PSOC) is linear. Thus, the assumption of linearity is not violated. Therefore, due to the strong correlation between these two variables, the researcher did not need to consider alternative covariates. For the control group, pre-PSOC test scores explained 29.6 % of the variance in scores at post-PSOC test scores. For the experimental group, pre-PSOC test scores explained 82.3 % of the variance in the post-test scores.

Figure 12: Linear relationship between pre-and post-(PSOC).
4.4.2 Linearity Between Pre- and Post-tests (PSES-Discipline)

Figure 13 shows that the relationship between pre- and post-tests score (PSES-Discipline) is clearly linear. Again, it seems that the assumption of linearity was not violated and thus it seems that the two variables are correlated. Consequently, it was not necessary to consider alternative covariates. For the control group, pre-PSES-Discipline scores explained 50.1 % of the variance in scores in post-PSES-Discipline. For the experimental group, pre-PSES-Discipline scores explained 67.8 % of the variance in the post-test scores.

Figure 13: Linear relationship between pre-and post- (PSES-Discipline).
4.4.3 Linearity Between Pre- and Post-tests (PSES-Suitability)

Figure 14 shows the relationship between pre- and post-tests scores (PSES-Suitability). The data suggest that there was no apparent violation of the assumption of linearity. Again, there is no reason to consider alternative covariates due to the strong correlation between the two variables. For the control group, pre-PSES-Suitability scores explained 66.0 % of the variance in scores in post-PSES-Suitability scores. For the experimental group, pre-PSES-Suitability scores explained 31.7 % of the variance in the post-test scores.

Figure 14: Linearity relationship between pre-and post- tests (PSES-Suitability).
4.4.4 Linearity Between Pre- and Post-tests (PSES-Communication)

Figure 15 depicts the linear relationship between pre- and post-tests scores (PSES-Communication). Again, the assumption of linearity is upheld. For the control group, pre-PSES-Communication scores explained 80.2% of the variance in scores in post-PSES-Communication scores. For the experimental group, pre-PSES-Communication scores explained 85.7% of the variance in the post-test scores.

Figure 15: Linear relationship between pre-and post-tests (PSES-Communication)
4.4.5 Linearity Between Pre- and Post-tests (PSES-Personal Efficacy)

Figure 16 illustrated that linear relationship between the pre-PSES-Personal Efficacy scores and post-PSES-Personal Efficacy. The assumption of linearity is not violated and therefore alternative covariate scores not needed. For the control group, pre-PSES-Personal Efficacy scores explained 53.3% of the variance in scores in post-PSES-Personal Efficacy. For the experimental group, pre-PSES-Personal Efficacy scores explained 54.9% of the variance in the post-test scores.

Figure 16: Linear relationship between pre-and post-tests (PSES-Personal Efficacy).
### 4.5 Assumption of Homogeneity of Regression Slopes

One way Analyses of Covariance were used to assess the assumption concerning the relationship between the covariate (i.e., pre-test scores) and the dependent variable (i.e., post-test scores). As reported in Table 8 there is no interaction between the covariate (i.e., pre-test scores) and the experimental manipulation because all the significance levels for the interaction are greater than .05. Therefore, there is no evidence of violation of the assumption of homogeneity of regression slopes.

Table 8: ANCOVA Summary for treatment effects on PSOC and PSES by group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group* Pretest (PSOC)</td>
<td>1.695</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.695</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group* Pretest (PSES-Discipline)</td>
<td>14.325</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.325</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group* Pretest (PSES-Suitability)</td>
<td>41.920</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41.920</td>
<td>1.977</td>
<td>.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group* Pretest (PSES-Communication)</td>
<td>10.465</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.465</td>
<td>1.545</td>
<td>.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group* Pretest (PSES-Personal efficacy)</td>
<td>8.550</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.550</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td>.493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.6 Post-test Difference Between Groups

4.6.1 Research Question 1 and Hypothesis (H1) - The mean maternal efficacy score of mothers who participate in a video and reflective writing parent education program is significantly different from the mean maternal efficacy scores of mothers who participate in a video with no reflective writing parent education program.

An independent $t$-test was conducted to determine if there were statistically significant differences in the post-test means obtained by the experimental and control groups on the PSOC and PSES measures (See Table 9). A $p = .05$ level of significance was adopted for these analyses.

There is a statistically significant difference in post-PSOC scores for the experimental group ($M=72.25, SD=9.04$) and control group ($M=45.88, SD=6.26$), $t(30)=4.211, p < .001$. The magnitude of the differences in the means was determined to be very large ($\eta^2 = .37$) based on Cohen’s (1988) guideline for interpretation of indexes of effect size: .01= small effect, .06= moderate effect, .14= large effect. With the exception of post-PSES-Communication scores, there are statistically significant differences in post-PSES-Discipline scores for the experimental group ($M=178.85, SD=17.59$) and control group ($M=158.13, SD=6.82$), $t(30)=3.401, p = .002$; in post-PSES-Suitability scores for the experimental group ($M=56.63, SD=5.83$) and control group ($M=51.19, SD=9.44$), $t(30)=3.695, p = .001$; in post-PSES-Personal Efficacy scores for the experimental group ($M=63.19, SD=$) and control group ($M=44.81, SD=6.02$), $t(30)=8.020, p = .000$. The magnitude of the differences in the post-PSES means were judged to be large (Discipline, $\eta^2 = .28$; Suitability, $\eta^2 = .31$; Personal Efficacy, $\eta^2 = .68$).
Table 9: The independent sample $t$-test summary for post-test difference between groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>$t$-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-PSOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td>4.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>4.211</td>
<td>29.11</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-PSES–Discipline)</td>
<td>.560</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td>3.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>3.401</td>
<td>28.86</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post (PSES-Suitability)</td>
<td>.925</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>3.695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>3.695</td>
<td>29.13</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post (PSES-Communication)</td>
<td>.557</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td>1.946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>1.946</td>
<td>28.93</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post (PSES-Personal Efficacy)</td>
<td>1.215</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>8.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>8.020</td>
<td>27.73</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$MD = \text{Mean Difference}$  
$SD = \text{Std. Error Difference}$
4.7 Tests for Treatment Effect

An analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) test was performed for each variable to corroborate the results of the independents t-test for the respective post-test scores (see Table 10). Pre-test scores (e.g., pre-PSOC) represented the covariate measures on each of the dependent measures (e.g., post-PSOC) with an overall \( p = .05 \) alpha level.

4.7.1 Research Question 1 and Hypothesis \((H2-I)\) - The mean maternal efficacy rating (PSOC) of mothers who participate in a video and reflective writing parent education program is significantly higher than the mean maternal efficacy scores of mothers who participate in a video with no reflective writing parent education program

Table 10 and 11 summarize the results of ANCOVA descriptive analysis for Parenting Sense of Competence (PSOC) post-test scores, while controlling Parenting Sense of Competence (PSOC) pre-test scores. The results revealed statistically significant difference between the groups in Parenting Sense of Competence, \( F(1,29) = 72.829, p < .001 \).

Figure 8 showed that the experimental group obtained significantly higher mean post-PSOC scores (\( M = 75.11 \)) than did the control group (\( M = 54.57 \)) while adjusting for pre-PSOC scores. Therefore, the intervention of reflective writings based on educational parenting videos is seems to be more effective in increasing participants' maternal efficacy with regard to PSOC.

Table 10: ANCOVA summary for treatment effects on PSOC by group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>( \eta^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>3551.856(a)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1775.923</td>
<td>43.930***</td>
<td>.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>584.238</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>584.238</td>
<td>14.452**</td>
<td>.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariates: Pretest (PSOC)</td>
<td>1796.565</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1796.565</td>
<td>44.440***</td>
<td>.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main effect : Treatment</td>
<td>2944.227</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2944.227</td>
<td>72.829***</td>
<td>.715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>1172.373</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40.427</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>139275.000</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>4724.219</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( a. \) R Squared = .752 (Adjusted R Squared = .735)

\( *** \) p < .001 \( ** \) p < .01
Table 11: ANCOVA summary for post-test score on PSOC by group.

Covariate Variable: Pre-PSOC
Dependent Variable: Post-PSOC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pretest Before Adjusting Mean</th>
<th>Pretest After Adjusting Mean</th>
<th>Posttest M</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52.75</td>
<td>49.31</td>
<td>54.57</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Group</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45.88</td>
<td>75.11</td>
<td>75.11</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 17: Estimated marginal means of post-test of PSOC
4.7.2 Research Question 1 and Hypothesis (H2-2) - The mean maternal efficacy rating (PSES-Discipline) of mothers who participate in a video and reflective writing parent education program is significantly higher than the mean maternal efficacy scores of mothers who participate in a video with no reflective writing parent education program.

The result of the ANCOVA for post-test scores (PSES-Discipline) with pre-test scores (PSES-Discipline) as a covariate measure are shown in Table 12 and 13. The results suggest that the difference between the groups in PSES-Discipline was statistically significant, $F(1,29)=6.104$, $p < .05$.

Figure 18 shows that the experimental group obtained significantly higher mean post-PSES-discipline scores ($M=173.08$) than did the control group ($M=160.79$). Therefore, the data suggested that the intervention of reflective writings based on parent education videos was more effective in increasing participants’ maternal efficacy with regard to PSES-Discipline.

Table 12: ANCOVA summary for treatment effects on PSES-Discipline by group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>$SS$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$MS$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>11078.865(a)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5539.432</td>
<td>32.329***</td>
<td>.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>4173.731</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4173.731</td>
<td>24.359***</td>
<td>.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariates: Pre-PSES-Discipline</td>
<td>6613.740</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6613.740</td>
<td>38.599***</td>
<td>.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main effect : Treatment</td>
<td>1045.871</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1045.871</td>
<td>6.104*</td>
<td>.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>4969.010</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>171.345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>907828.000</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>16047.875</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. $R^2 = .690$ (Adjusted $R^2 = .669$)

*** $p < .001$  * $p < .05$
Table 13: ANCOVA summary for post-test score on PSES-Discipline by group

Covariate Variable: Pre (PSES-Discipline)
Dependent Variable: Post (PSES-Discipline)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pretest Before Adjusting Mean</th>
<th>Pretest After Adjusting Mean</th>
<th>Posttest M</th>
<th>Posttest SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>138.88</td>
<td>149.00</td>
<td>160.79</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Group</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>158.13</td>
<td>173.08</td>
<td>173.08</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 18: Estimated marginal means of post-test of PSES-Discipline.
4.7.3 Research Question 1 and Hypothesis (H2-3) - The mean maternal efficacy rating (PSES-Suitability) of mothers who participate in a video and reflective writing parent education program is significantly higher than the mean maternal efficacy scores of mothers who participate in a video with no reflective writing parent education program

Table 14 and 15 summarize the result of the ANCOVA descriptive analysis for Parental Self-Efficacy about Suitability (PSES-Suitability) post-test scores, while controlling pre-PSES-Suitability scores. The results revealed that the difference between the groups in PSES-Suitability was statistically significant, \( F(1,29)=7.708, p = .01 \).

Figure 19 illustrated these data and shows mothers in experimental group \((M=54.91)\) had significantly higher post-PSES-suitability mean scores than did mothers in the control group \((M=49.97)\), while adjusting for the pre-test scores of PSES-Suitability. Therefore, the data suggested that the intervention of reflective writings based on parent education videos was more effective in increasing participants’ maternal efficacy with regard to PSES-Suitability.

Table 14: ANCOVA summary for treatment effects on PSES-Suitability by group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>( \eta^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>1158.292(a)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>579.146</td>
<td>26.425***</td>
<td>.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1332.445</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1332.445</td>
<td>60.796***</td>
<td>.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariates : Pre-PSES-Suitability</td>
<td>597.167</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>597.167</td>
<td>27.247***</td>
<td>.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main effect : Treatment</td>
<td>168.938</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>168.938</td>
<td>7.708**</td>
<td>.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>635.583</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21.917</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89784.000</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>1793.875</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( a. \) R Squared = .646 (Adjusted R Squared = .621)

*** \( p < .001 \) ** \( p = .01 \)
Table 15: ANCOVA summary for post-test score on PSES-Suitability by group.

Covariate Variable: Pre (PSES-Suitability)
Dependent Variable: Post (PSES-Suitability)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>Pretest Before Adjusting Mean</th>
<th>Pretest After Adjusting Mean</th>
<th>Posttest M</th>
<th>Posttest SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40.25</td>
<td>43.88</td>
<td>49.97</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Group</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47.50</td>
<td>54.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 19: Estimated marginal means of post-test of PSES-Suitability.
4.7.4 Research Question 1 and Hypothesis (H2-4) - The mean maternal efficacy rating (PSES-Communication) of mothers who participate in a video and reflective writing parent education program is significantly higher than the mean maternal efficacy scores of mothers who participate in a video with no reflective writing parent education program.

The results of the ANCOVA for post-test scores of Parental Self-Efficacy about Communication (PSES-Communication) with pre-test scores (PSES-Communication) as a covariate are reported in Tables 16 and 17. The results suggest that the difference between the groups in PSES-Communication was statistically significant, $F(1,29)=64.029, p < .001$.

Figure 20 showed that the experimental group obtained significantly higher mean post-PSES-Communication scores ($M=52.76$) than did the control group ($M=44.86$). These findings suggest that the intervention of reflective writings based on educational parenting videos was more effective in increasing participants’ maternal efficacy with regard to PSES-Communication.

Table 16: ANCOVA summary for treatment effects on PSES-Communication by group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>$SS$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$MS$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>1014.731(a)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>507.366</td>
<td>73.515***</td>
<td>.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>380.615</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>380.615</td>
<td>55.149***</td>
<td>.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariates: Pre-PSES-Communication</td>
<td>878.606</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>878.606</td>
<td>127.306***</td>
<td>.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main effect : Treatment</td>
<td>441.895</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>441.895</td>
<td>64.029***</td>
<td>.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>200.144</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.902</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77460.000</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>1214.875</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. R Squared = .835 (Adjusted R Squared = .824)  
*** p < .001
Table 17: ANCOVA summary for post-test score on PSES-Communication by group.

Covariate Variable: Pre (PSES-Communication)
Dependent Variable: Post (PSES-Communication)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pretest Before Adjusting Mean</th>
<th>Pretest After Adjusting Mean</th>
<th>Posttest M</th>
<th>Posttest SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45.36</td>
<td>42.63</td>
<td>44.86</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Group</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39.88</td>
<td>52.76</td>
<td>52.76</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 20: Estimated marginal means of post-test of PSES-Communication.
4.7.5 Research Question 1 and Hypothesis (H2-5) - The mean maternal efficacy rating (PSES-Personal Efficacy) of mothers who participate in a video and reflective writing parent education program is significantly higher than the mean maternal efficacy scores of mothers who participate in a video with no reflective writing parent education program.

Table 18 and 19 summarize the results of the ANCOVA descriptive analysis for Parental Self-Efficacy about Personal Efficacy (PSES-Personal Efficacy) post-test scores, while controlling pre-PSES-Personal Efficacy scores. The results suggest that the difference between the groups in post-PSES-Personal Efficacy scores was statistically significant, $F(1,29)=76.851, p < .001$.

Figure 21 suggest that mothers in the experimental group ($M=61.57$) had significantly higher post-PSES-Personal Efficacy mean scores than did those mothers in the control group ($M=47.74$), while adjusting pre-test scores of PSES-Personal efficacy. These data suggested that the intervention of reflective writings based on parent education videos was more effective in increasing participants’ maternal efficacy with regard to PSES-Personal Efficacy.

Table 18: ANCOVA summary for treatment effects on PSES-Personal Efficacy by group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>2910.229(a)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1455.115</td>
<td>83.563***</td>
<td>.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>876.591</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>876.591</td>
<td>50.340***</td>
<td>.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariates: (PSES)-Personal efficacy</td>
<td>581.198</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>581.198</td>
<td>33.376***</td>
<td>.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main effect : Treatment</td>
<td>1338.248</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1338.248</td>
<td>76.851***</td>
<td>.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>504.989</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17.413</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99009.000</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>3415.219</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. R Squared = .852 (Adjusted R Squared = .842)

*** $p < .001$
Table 19: ANCOVA summary for post-test score on PSES-Personal Efficacy by group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Before Adjusting Mean</th>
<th>After Adjusting Mean</th>
<th>Posttest M</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44.81</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>47.74</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Group</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51.19</td>
<td>61.57</td>
<td>61.57</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 21: Estimated marginal means of post-test of PSES-Personal Efficacy.

4.8 Themes or Topics of Reflective Writings

Eight mothers in the experimental group (total=16) agreed to the use of their reflective writings for analysis in terms of the main components of their reflective writings concerning parenting. Additionally, they gave permission for their themes or topics and reflective writings samples to be used in the researcher’s dissertation. Therefore, with eight mothers’ reflective writings
(total=128), the results of two research questions are provided. For anonymity, capital letters from A to I were adopted instead of the subjects’ real names.

4.8.1 Research Question 2 and Sub-Question 1 - What themes or topics are expressed by mothers of preschool aged children in their reflective writing about each of the parenting videos?

Participants in the experimental group were asked to provide three to five themes or topics per writing (See Appendix G). All themes or topics of the eight mothers who gave permission to use their reflective writings are shown in Table 20. The total number of themes or topics per writing ranged from one to five.

In the case of first set of reflective writing, the themes or topics regarding ‘Parenting Style’ were predominant (e.g., Door mat parenting, Autocratic style, Authoritative style, and Active parent). Additionally, several themes or topics related to ‘The Method of Choice’ were selected (e.g., Offering child choice and Giving freedom within expanding limits). In the second set of reflective writing, one of the sub concepts in active communication, ‘Mutual respect’, was predominant. Main themes or topics collected in the third set of reflective writing were ‘Logical Consequences’ and ‘I Message’. In the case of the fourth set of reflective writing, certain words indicating ‘Four Goals of Behavior’ were frequently used such as contact/belonging, power, protection, and withdrawal. These words describe basic goals influencing a child’s behavior, among other themes or topics related to ‘The FLAC Method’ portrayed by words such as ‘feeling, limits, alternatives, and consequences’. In the case of the fifth set of reflective writing, two themes or topics such as ‘BANK Method’ (i.e., Baby steps, Acknowledge, Nudge, and Keep encouraging) and ‘Building on Strengths’ were predominant. The sixth and the final reflective set of writing frequently involved themes or topics concerning a ‘Family Meeting’.
Table 20: List of themes or topics of eight mothers’ reflective writings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes or Topics</th>
<th>1st writing</th>
<th>2nd writing</th>
<th>3rd writing</th>
<th>4th writing</th>
<th>5th writing</th>
<th>6th writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong> - Relationship</td>
<td>Listen</td>
<td>-Reasoning</td>
<td>-Control</td>
<td>-Patience</td>
<td>-Be open and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Spoiled</td>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>-Follow thru</td>
<td>-Emotions</td>
<td>-Praise</td>
<td>honest,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Choices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Choices</td>
<td>-Encourage</td>
<td>-Talk, talk, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Talk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong> - Communication</td>
<td>-Communication</td>
<td>-Polite</td>
<td>-Anger</td>
<td>-Self esteem</td>
<td>-Problem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Consequence</td>
<td>-Mutual respect</td>
<td>-“I” messages</td>
<td>-Hurt</td>
<td>-Courage</td>
<td>solving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Calm</td>
<td>-Listening</td>
<td>-Logical</td>
<td>-Withdraw</td>
<td>-Failure</td>
<td>-Positive values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Reflecting feeling</td>
<td>consequences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Parent filter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Whose problem?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong> -Active parent</td>
<td>-Mutual respect</td>
<td>-Responsibility</td>
<td>-Goals of behavior</td>
<td>-Natural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Autocratic, permissive, authoritative (freedom w/limits)</td>
<td>-Listen</td>
<td>-Choices</td>
<td>(contact, power,</td>
<td>consequences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Talking time to play</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Consequences</td>
<td>protection,</td>
<td>-Logical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Positive “I”</td>
<td>withdrawal)</td>
<td>consequences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>message</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Encouragement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong> -Giving freedom within expanding limits</td>
<td>-Cooperative</td>
<td>-What parents</td>
<td>-Win</td>
<td>-Success cycle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-How to laugh</td>
<td>relationships</td>
<td>do triggers a</td>
<td>-Bend choice</td>
<td>-Building on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Mutual respect</td>
<td>cycle of think,</td>
<td>-Power struggle</td>
<td>strengths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-listen</td>
<td>feel, and do</td>
<td>-FLAC (feeling,</td>
<td>-Valuing the child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>around parents</td>
<td>limits,</td>
<td>-Natural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>feelings</td>
<td>alternatives, and</td>
<td>consequences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>consequences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Active</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Mutual respect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Share values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Follow through</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong> -Parenting style</td>
<td>-Eye opening</td>
<td>-Giving clear</td>
<td>-How to redirect</td>
<td>-Building on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Limits</td>
<td></td>
<td>expectation</td>
<td>negative behavior</td>
<td>strengths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Use of choices</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Family enrichment</td>
<td></td>
<td>-BANK method</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong> -Do be reactive, be active</td>
<td>-Watch for</td>
<td>-Parents can</td>
<td>-The basic</td>
<td>-Become more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Authoritative is freedom with expanding limits</td>
<td>words, tone of</td>
<td>help change</td>
<td>need we all</td>
<td>aware of how</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Take time for fun</td>
<td>voice, and</td>
<td>the way their</td>
<td>have is to</td>
<td>we discourage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nonverbal</td>
<td>children think</td>
<td>belong</td>
<td>our children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>communication</td>
<td>-Freedom of</td>
<td>-FLAC</td>
<td>-Build on our</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>when speaking</td>
<td>choice brings</td>
<td>-Teaching our</td>
<td>children’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with your child</td>
<td>consequences</td>
<td>children a skill</td>
<td>strengths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Give choices</td>
<td>empowers them in</td>
<td>-Help your child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>you can live</td>
<td>a positive way</td>
<td>develop a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with long term</td>
<td></td>
<td>sense of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>independence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Having a plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>before family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Having</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>scheduled regular</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Frequent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong> -Enough freedom</td>
<td>-Responsibility</td>
<td>-Consequences</td>
<td>-FLAC method</td>
<td>-Balancing act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Actively listen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Family meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H</strong> -Doormat parenting</td>
<td>-Clear message</td>
<td>“I” message</td>
<td>-Building on</td>
<td>-Using open</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Offering child choices</td>
<td>-Tone of voice</td>
<td>-Logical</td>
<td>strengths</td>
<td>ended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>consequences</td>
<td></td>
<td>questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. This data related with the first question of Writing Assignment Instructions (see Appendix G)*
4.9 Main Components of Reflective Writings

4.9.1 Research Question 2 and Sub-Question 2- What are the main components of the reflective writing of mothers of preschool aged children?

The fourth question examined the presence of prominent components of preschool mothers’ self-reflective writings. In general, there seemed to be a variety of components to their reflective writings. Fenwick (2001) also described several components of reflective journals (See Table 21). These components suggest that reflective writing could encourage writers to feel the pleasure of writing, to explore their prior and current experiences or situations, to organize arguments in support of their own thoughts, to express their own emotions, and to recognize and clarify the important connections between what they already know and what they are learning.

Table 21: Four components of reflective journals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Four Components of Reflective Journals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Learners trace their learning of a particular skill(s), understanding(s), belief(s), or attitude(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. They write about activities, materials, personal motivations, and emotions, the involvement of other people, the turning points, and the disappointments or frustrations that unfolded in their learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Then they analyze this process to draw conclusions about their own learning patterns, preferences, and processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Learners can also describe critical incidents in their learning biographies: They write down who-what-why-when-where details, then analyze the incident alone or with close friends, examining their assumptions, motivations, learning style, and alternative choices. (p. 82).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22 showed that three components of reflective writing emerged specifically as result of this research.
Table 22: Three components of reflective writing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Description</strong>: Writing includes a description of past and/or current experiences or situations concerning writer’s parenting.</td>
<td>2 <strong>Analysis</strong>: Writing analyzes writer’s prior and current attitudes, feelings, knowledge, values, and/or beliefs including reasons and/or rationales.</td>
<td>3 <strong>Application</strong>: Writing encourages writer to apply new lessons into their life (e.g., parenting) practically.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.9.2 Component- Description

The first component was described as an avenue that allowed the mothers in the experimental group to describe their past or current parenting experiences. The mothers attempted to find personal meaning in the video they saw and revisit their prior parenting experiences. Then, the mothers wrote down their prior parenting experiences who-what-why-when-where details. In order to analyze the presence and extent of these three components (i.e., Description, Analysis, and Application), three kinds of coding marks were used (e.g., blank, O, and OO).

The marks ‘OO’ described the mothers who attempted to describe and/or analyze their prior or current parenting experiences and attitudes in detail and through reasoning and rationale, while ‘O’ identified simple event and experience description and minimal to no explanation about children and their mothers’ background. One blank means the researcher could not find any meaningful description and/or analysis about parenting from mother’s reflective writings. Examples of this descriptive component from the sample writing are provided in terms of ‘O’ and ‘OO’.

#### 4.9.2.1 Examples: ‘O’ stage of description component.

I realize I do a lot of yelling and then wonder why she yells back. I see in the videos that they watch what they say and how they say it. I think I listen pretty well, but do get distracted sometimes.

(Subject A, 2nd writing)
I can see through previous experiences with my son, when I have handled things well and when I really into the misbehavior cycle letting my emotions get ahead of me.  

(Subject C, 4th writing)

I still think I tend to “lay down the law” and if they do not follow the rules then they are choosing the consequences.  

(Subject F, 1st writing)

### 4.9.2.2 Examples: ‘OO’ stage of description component.

My two sons, they do get very frustrated and throw tantrums already. They throw toys at the wall or each other. Right now, it’s hard because I try to remain calm and talk to them in a comforting voice but I can’t yet reasons with them. Which is so hard for me, I get frustrated with myself because I feel like I am lacking a skill that I should have, which is communicating with my children.  

(Subject G, 4th writing)

I could recall hundreds of instances of power struggle with my children. I always gave them a choice: however, all choices ended in the same results-me getting my children to do what I wanted them to do. All choices were ones I could live with. I never gave choices I couldn’t live with. Once the foundation was laid, I withdrew and let me children regroup and do what is right by making his/her choice.  

(Subject D, 4th writing)

This week, my son had not completed his homework and I found him playing video games. I immediately asked him to shut it off. I did not use any “I” messages, and then I firmly gave a consequence that I couldn’t live with. I told him he was not allowed on the Wii for 1 week, when I had already invited a family over for dinner on Friday night and the kids are going to need something to do while the parents chat. I am going to have to make an exception for that night and fell that his undermined my parenting. I know that I can hold up my end, but that would make the other child uncomfortable to also be punished and not be allowed to play while he’s here.  

(Subject B, 3rd writing)
4.9.3 Component-Analysis

The second component was considered to have allowed the mothers to analyze their prior and current parenting, feelings, knowledge, values, and/or beliefs. When analyzing their prior and current parenting, the mothers attempted to (1) explore their parenting using qualities of judgment, (2) recall memories of their childhood, and (3) analyze their children’s environmental background. Two writing examples are provided for each sub analysis component (i.e., writer’s quality of judgment, writer’s childhood background, and writer’s child background) and each stage (i.e., O and OO).

4.9.3.1 Examples: ‘O’ stage of analysis component (writer’s qualified judgment).

Unfortunately, I fall under the “doormat” style. It’s hard to keep that happy medium. I want my daughter to obey me, but I also want her to like me all the time, so if I’m too stick, I feel she won’t like me.

(Subject A, 1st writing)

My parenting style definitely is not the doormat, but more of the dictator. This video reminds me that the dictator style won’t have long term payoffs. It’s easy to see when someone else isn’t parenting effectively, but sometimes you get caught up in the moment and your senses go ‘out the window.

(Subject H, 1st writing).

4.9.3.2 Examples: ‘OO’ stage of analysis component (writer’s qualified judgment).

I always found myself listening intently to my son because he was quiet and I didn’t want to miss a thing! When my daughter came along, I found that I often didn’t listen as well because she was such a talker. I don’t feel like I reflect her feelings back in conversation as much as I did with my son. I do, however, focus intently with her on mutual respect because she is more likely to be verbally disrespectful. I always remind her that I do not speak to her in a disrespectful way and she shouldn’t either.

(Subject B, 2nd writing)
I had never thought about analyzing the problems and conflicts in terms of who actually “owns” the problem. I had just lumped the all together as being all “our” problems.[…] Although humorous, the video that incorporated the various communication blocks was eye-opening. I laugh out loud but can see how similar scenarios play out with families all the time! As a parent, my natural tendency and instinct is to give advice, be judgmental and several of the other “no-no’s”.

(Subject E, 2nd writing)

4.9.3.3 Examples: ‘O’ stage of analysis component(writer’s childhood background).

I had many memories of when I was a child and how my parents responded to me. I remember getting angry at home and they way I was talked to as a child and never really felt respected. It is interesting that I would go to other moms for advice.

(Subject F, 2nd writing)

When I parent, my idea of responding to conflict or communication was based on my experiences from my own parents and what I have learned over the last 30 years of my life.

(Subject E, 4th writing)

4.9.3.4 Examples: ‘OO’ stage of analysis component (writer’s childhood background).

I grew up in a split family with 2 different parent households. One was very autocratic while the other was more permissive, I have tried to take the strengths of both but never really sat down to actively analyze and think about their styles and how it has impacted my style. I think I naturally didn’t want to be on either extreme. This video actually helps make it to all makes sense which I think will help me stay on the ideal track.

(Subject C, 1st writing)

I grew up having family meeting at home. With 5 kids, it was critical to have these problem solving and planning sessions in order to maintain a
balanced household where everyone had a voice and a constructive place to use it. So it was second nature to have this in my family as I became a parent. My son will actually request a family meeting if there is something he feels is important to discuss.

(Subject D, 6th writing)

4.9.3.5 Examples: ‘O’ stage of analysis component (writer’s child background).

There are way too many children (including me as a child) who take on too many responsibilities that their parents may not realize they are placing on the children. When I was 9 my parents divorced and I became the middle man that they would both complain about the other too and take all their frustrations out on. I felt so old at 9, and responsible for both my parent’s feelings and protecting my younger brother from anything negative. I love both my parents with all of my heart, but they handled their problems way wrong.

(Subject G, 2nd writing)

I was enlightened to learn that her behaviors are influenced by 4 basic goals: contact/belonging, power, protection and withdrawal. In reflecting on how this applies to my daughter, we seem to have the most problems when it comes to her negative approach to achieve contact/belonging and power. I often get frustrated by her attention seeking behavior any time I get one the phone or have to get work done on the computer.

(Subject E, 4th writing)

4.9.3.6 Examples: ‘OO’ stage of analysis component (writer’s child background).

My husband does an excellent job of putting himself in our son’s shoes. I strive to be more like him in that respect. Our 10 year old son really needs to feel like he belongs, especially since he has a one year old sister and much attention goes to her. I do my best to praise him and give him hugs when he contributes and cooperates. I do let anger get the best of me more than I should and this is something that I’m working on.

(Subject H, 4th writing)
This week is very interesting, because each of my children require different levels of encouragement. My son is laid back and the farthest personality from perfectionism. I do push him much harder, because he doesn’t push himself. [...] My daughter on the other hand is self motivated, but would really be stressed if I expected perfection. I have to try to expect less with her, because she is hard on herself.

(Subject B, 5th writing)

4.9.4 Component-Application

The third component involved different types of applications shown in the reflective writings: Simple, Specialized, and Modified application. Simple application involved brief parenting or discipline plan in the future, while specialized application constituted detailed and considerable plans for parenting emphasizing the particular parenting situations and disciplines. Last, modified application indicated that the reflective writing involved changed or adjusted application based on the mothers’ reasons and rationales for better parenting. Two writing examples are provided per each application style (i.e., simple, specified, and modified).

4.9.4.1 Examples: Application Component (Simple).

I like how they give choices and I will try to do that. Controlling emotions plays a big part too. It’s hard not to take it personal.

(Subject A, 3rd writing)

The most impressive lesson is offering your child choices. I do this often with my daughter regarding clothes and food. I need to remember to do this more often with my 10 year old. When kids have a voice in what is going on in life, they become much more confident adults.

(Subject H, 1st writing)

4.9.4.2 Examples: Application Component (Specific).

The most impressive piece of information given to me was the idea of using “Logical Consequence” with misbehaviors. Sometimes I think I don’t always give the most logical consequences and I overuse time out. I would like to try to have my daughter choose what she thinks would be a good consequence and to think of something that closely related to the
situation. (Subject F, 3rd writing)

The most impressive lesson this week for me was the advice on how to redirect negative behavior when the child’s goal is power. My child is extremely independent and strong willed and sometimes she uses the negative approach of rebellion. I will try to implement the FLAC (feelings, limits, alternative, and consequences) approach to minimize these outbursts. By not giving in to her unreasonable demands and by remaining calm, offering choices and backing those up with consequences I can live with, I am hopeful our “fights” over potty-time, bath time, meals and sitting in the car seat will become history. (Subject E, 4th writing)

4.9.4.3 Examples: Application Component (Modified).

I think family meetings are a great idea and starting them when you’re children are young will make it a normal experience. When I first heard of this idea, I thought it was just when there was a problem, but the information given gives ideas about having meetings for problem prevention and character talks. We do this as needed, but not on a weekly or timely basis. I like this idea. (Subject B, 6th writing)

I think the family meetings should just be held by the parents and the children, that is my personal opinion, I don’t think grandparents should be involved or anyone else. I am very passionate about this because there are too many people around me or that I know of whose children are being raised by their parents instead of them. If you choose to have children, you find a way to raise your kid. I think meetings should be for all sorts or topics, like decision making, schedule going over’s, future planning, problem solving, and open discussions in general, I think having that trust and foundation involved in family meetings will really help in the long term having a great relationship with my kids. (Subject G, 6th writing)

The following eight tables, Table 23 to Table 30, present the analysis results of each mother’s reflective writing.
Table 23: Analysis of subject A’s reflective writing using three components.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflective Writing</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Experience</td>
<td>Writer’s qualified judgment about parenting</td>
<td>Writer’s background (e.g., parents, major)</td>
<td>Writer’s Child Background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st writing</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd writing</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd writing</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th writing</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th writing</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th writing</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Blank means not be involved, O means be involved, OO means be involved strongly.

Table 24: Analysis of subject B’s reflective writing using three components.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflective Writing</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Experience</td>
<td>Writer’s qualified judgment about parenting</td>
<td>Writer’s background (e.g., parents, major)</td>
<td>Writer’s Child Background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st writing</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>OO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd writing</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>OO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd writing</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th writing</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>OO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th writing</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>OO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th writing</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Blank means not be involved, O means be involved, OO means be involved strongly.
Table 25: Analysis of subject C’s reflective writing using three components.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflective Writing</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parenting Experience</td>
<td>Writer’s qualified judgment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>about parenting</td>
<td>Writer’s background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(e.g., parents, major)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Writer’s Child Background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st writing</td>
<td></td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd writing</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd writing</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th writing</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th writing</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th writing</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note, Blank means not be involved, O means be involved. OO means be involved strongly.

Table 26: Analysis of subject D’s reflective writing using three components.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflective Writing</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parenting Experience</td>
<td>Writer’s qualified judgment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>about parenting</td>
<td>Writer’s background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(e.g., parents, major)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Writer’s Child Background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st writing</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd writing</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd writing</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th writing</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th writing</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th writing</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note, Blank means not be involved, O means be involved. OO means be involved strongly.
Table 27: Analysis of subject E’s reflective writing using three components.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflective Writing</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Experience</td>
<td>Writer’s qualified judgment about parenting</td>
<td>Writer’s background (e.g., parents, major)</td>
<td>Writer’s Child Background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st writing</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd writing</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>OO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd writing</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th writing</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th writing</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th writing</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note, Blank means not be involved, O means be involved, OO means be involved strongly.

Table 28: Analysis of subject F’s reflective writing using three components.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflective Writing</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Experience</td>
<td>Writer’s qualified judgment about parenting</td>
<td>Writer’s background (e.g., parents, major)</td>
<td>Writer’s Child Background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st writing</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd writing</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>OO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd writing</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th writing</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>OO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th writing</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>OO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th writing</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>OO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note, Blank means not be involved, O means be involved, OO means be involved strongly.
Table 29: Analysis of subject G’s reflective writing using three components.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflective Writing</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parenting Experience</td>
<td>Writer’s qualified judgment about parenting</td>
<td>Writer’s background (e.g., parents, major)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st writing</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd writing</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>OO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd writing</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>OO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th writing</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th writing</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>OO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th writing</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>OO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note, Blank means not be involved, O means be involved, OO means be involved strongly.

Table 30: Analysis of subject H’s reflective writing using three components.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflective Writing</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parenting Experience</td>
<td>Writer’s qualified judgment about parenting</td>
<td>Writer’s background (e.g., parents, major)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st writing</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd writing</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>OO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd writing</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>OO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th writing</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>OO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th writing</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th writing</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note, Blank means not be involved, O means be involved, OO means be involved strongly.
4.10 Summary

The combination of information including demographics, pre- and post- (PSOC and PSES) tests, and participants’ reflective writings (i.e., reflective writing of eight mothers in the experimental group) served as the data for this study. Analyses of the quantitative data were completed by the researcher, while qualitative analyses of the reflective writing were completed by the researcher with the aid of an advising professor. Quantitative data were analyzed using the SPSS program. Descriptive statistics, an individual sample $t$-test, and analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) were among statistical analyses, resulting in the following:

4.10.1 Research Question 1 and Hypothesis 1 ($H1$) - The mean maternal efficacy score of mothers who participate in a video and reflective writing parent education program is significantly different from the mean maternal efficacy scores of mothers who participate in a video with no reflective writing parent education program.

There was a statistically significant difference between the experimental and control groups after viewing six educational parenting videos for six weeks or watching the same videos and doing reflective writing in post-PSOC scores. In the case of post-PSES, however, except post-PSES-Communication scores, there were statistically significant differences between groups in post-PSES-Discipline, in post-PSES-Suitability, and in post-PSES-Personal Efficacy scores.

4.10.2 Research Question 1 and Hypotheses ($H2-1$ to $H2-5$) - The mean maternal efficacy rating (PSES) of mothers who participate in a video and reflective writing parent education program is significantly higher than the mean maternal efficacy scores of mothers who participate in a video with no reflective writing parent education program.

The intervention of reflective writings based on educational parenting videos (i.e., experimental group) is more effective than the intervention of only the same parenting videos (i.e., control group) in increasing participants’ maternal efficacy with regard to PSOC and PSES (Discipline, Suitability, Communication, and Personal Efficacy).
4.10.3 Research Question 2 and Sub-Question 1 - What themes or topics are expressed by mothers of preschool aged children in their reflective writing about each of the parenting videos?

The themes or topics related to ‘Parenting Style, The Method of Choice, Mutual respect, Logical Consequences, I Message, Four Goals of Behavior (i.e., Contact/Belonging, Power, Protection, and Withdrawal), The FLAC Method (i.e., Feelings, Limits, Alternatives, and Consequences), BANK Method (i.e., Baby steps, Acknowledge, Nudge, and Keep encouraging), Building on Strengths, and Family Meeting’ were frequently presented from reflective writings.

4.10.4 Research Question 2 and Sub-Question 2 - What are the main components of the reflective writing of mothers of preschool aged children?

Three kinds of components (i.e., Description, Analysis, and Application) emerged as results of this research. Reflective writing after watching parent education videos encouraged participants to describe their past or current parenting experiences. Next, reflective writing helped participants to analyze their prior and current parenting attitudes, feelings, knowledge, values, and/or beliefs including their childhood background, child’s background, reasons and rationales. Finally, reflective writing led participants to think and demonstrate applicable strategies for applying new lessons or interesting lessons from the videos into their lives in three ways (i.e., simple, specific, and modified).
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

5.1 General Introduction

In keeping with constructivist learning theory as well as social learning theory, this study attempted to reveal some of the assumptions concerning mothers’ reflective writing. Reflective writing is thought to help mothers reconstruct new parenting information onto their existing mental framework. Mothers can build and enhance their maternal efficacy from their own observation of parent education programs. Furthermore, it seems that maternal efficacy can be effectively improved when a parent education program includes reflective writing.

This final chapter includes a summary and discussion of the main findings of the study. Conclusions based on the results of the study are presented and they are discussed with reference to the theoretical and empirical evidence presented in the first two chapter. Next, the study’s limitations are outlined and recommendations made for future research and for practice. The chapter closes with a summary.

It was the purpose of this study to determine the effect of a parent education video program, which included reflective writing on the maternal efficacy of mothers of young children. A related purpose was to identify and describe the nature of the mothers’ reflective writing.

The majority of the parent education programs that are in use today seem to rely on unidirectional approaches whereby the information is directly communicated to participants. This direct approach includes text, classes, as well as video programs. Such approaches are thought to be limited in that they are passive approaches that do not necessarily lead to improvements in either parenting or child outcomes. It is thought that strategies that provide an opportunity for participants to reflect on the new knowledge they receive can be more effective. It follows that reflective writing could help participants gain a deeper understanding of new knowledge, and incorporate this information into their own lives.
The study was guided by a theoretical framework that included constructivism and social learning theory.

5.2 Findings

In analyzing the demographic characteristics of the participants in the experimental and control group, it was evident that there were no significant differences between the two groups in terms of age, race, marital status, academic background, employment rate, the number of children, and the number of prior parent education admissions. In short, the two groups were essentially equivalent. However, analyses of their pre-test scores suggested that the two groups differed in terms of maternal efficacy. There were statistically significant differences in the scores obtained by the two groups on the PSOC and PSES measures.

Given these differences it was determined appropriate to use Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) to analyze the post-test data. ANCOVA is a statistical approach that can control for initial group differences by using scores on a pre-test as covariate measures. That is, the ANCOVA reduces experimental error by statistical means. Therefore, using the pre-test scores as covariate measures enabled comparing of the groups in terms of their post-test scores on each of the five measures of interest (i.e., PSOC, PSES-Discipline, Suitability, Communication, and Personal Efficacy).

The reflective writing of eight of the mothers that were in the experimental group was also analyzed. Theses analyses included an examination of the main themes or topics in their written products. Also studies were the main components of the reflective writing of the mothers.

5.2.1 Research Question 1

5.2.1.1 Hypothesis 1. The main hypothesis of interest concerned the effect of reflective writing on maternal efficacy. The results revealed that there were statistically significant differences between the groups in terms of post-PSOC and PSES measures. Although there were significant differences between the two groups in PSOC and PSES, the participants in the experimental group and control group all increased their maternal efficacy scores from pre- to post-test.

5.2.1.2 Hypotheses 2-1 to 2-5. Mothers of preschool aged children who participated in a self-reflective writing activity had higher ratings on the measures of PSOC and PSES in
comparisons to the mothers of preschool aged children who did not completed the reflective writing tasks. The findings suggest that the writing activity was instrumental in improving maternal efficacy.

5.2.2 Research Question 2

5.2.2.1 Research Sub-Question 1

The second research question concerned the themes or topics that the parents chose to write about. Analyses of the participants’ reflective writing revealed that the main themes were: parenting style, the methods of choice, mutual respect, logical consequence, I messages, four goals of behavior, the FLAC method, the BANK method, and building on strengths.

5.2.2.2 Research Sub-Question 2

The second question was answered by examining the main components of the mothers’ reflective writing. The analyses yielded the main components as follows: description, analysis, and application. The reflective writing seemed to allow the others in the experimental group to describe their past or current parenting experiences. Furthermore, reflective writing allowed the mothers to analyze their prior and current parenting practices, feelings, knowledge, values, and beliefs. The mothers tended to explore their parenting using qualities of judgment, recall of memories of their childhood, and analysis of their children’s environmental background for explaining. Finally, mothers showed different types of application strategies through reflective writing; simple, specialized, and modified application. With regard to simple application, mothers focused on a brief future plan using new parenting knowledge taken from the parent education videos. However, specialized application involved detailed and a considerable amount of planning for parenting that emphasized the particular parenting situations and disciplines. Lastly, modified applications constituted changes or adjusted application strategies based on mothers’ individual critical reasons or rationales for better parenting.

5.3 Previous Research

The present findings are consistent previous studies suggesting that if parents are taught such skills as child management, then their parenting beliefs can be changed (Chamberlain & Patterson, 1995; Tinsley & Lees, 1995). The findings are also consistent with studies indicating
that structured parenting programs (e.g., videos) coupled with additional reflective strategies (e.g., reflective writing) are more effective than lecture or written presentation in terms of facilitate participants’ reconsideration of their attitudes and perceptions about parenting (Nay, 1976; O’Dell, et al: 1979, Sanders et al., 2008). In addition, the findings are consistent with previous studies that have suggested that reflective thinking through writing empowers a learner (e.g., mother in the experimental group) so that he or she can make sense of new information, problems, and issues. Such studies note that approaches that involves directly receiving information from others (e.g., mothers in the control group) receiving answers from others (Bransford et al, 1989; Brookfield, 1987; Schön, 1991) are not as effective. The findings from the current study therefore contribute to this literature by providing new evidence concerning the effectiveness of reflective writing in parent education programs.

Research on the efficacy of reflective writing as a form of treatment or intervention for mothers of preschool aged children is still in its early stages. The results of this study indicate that reflective writing can lead to increases in mothers’ sense of competence and self-efficacy. It speculates that the private reflective writing activity provides mothers with opportunities to think about the new parenting skills they have learned, analyze their prior parenting attitudes or beliefs, and apply new skills into their parenting lives. By participating in reflection, inquiry, and action through reflective writing, mothers experienced conceptual changes in terms of maternal efficacy (Anderson & Thomas, 1992). Of the various avenues for stimulating conceptual changes, writing is considered one of the more effective (Emig, 1977). This is because writing helps mothers appreciate the actual process of reflection. In addition, writing provides an opportunity for deeper processing by allowing mothers to communicate their parenting knowledge and feeling through written language symbols. The fact that they are discussing issues concerning their own young children makes the writing even more personal and meaningful. Finally, writing can be thought of as a mechanism for encouraging other higher-order cognitive activities that can lead to or influence maternal efficacy (Kerka, 1996).

5.4 Limitations and Future Directions

As with most studies the current research had some limitation. First, due to the exploratory nature of the study, the sample size was relatively small. Furthermore, the participants were homogenous in that they were predominantly married, Caucasian, and primarily middle to high
socio-economic status. Clearly, these two aspects place limits on the generalizability of the findings. It is therefore recommended that the study be replicated with a larger sample size, and also with a more diverse group of participants. For example, future studies should include mothers from different racial backgrounds and from different socio-economic groups.

This study makes a small but important contribution (initial outcomes) to our understanding of mother’s reflective writing. The findings, however, should be interpreted with caution because the data was obtained through self-report surveys from mothers who were self-selected as participants the study. Self-selection inevitably raises concern regarding the accuracy of the self-reported data (e.g., reliability and validity). As Cook and Campbell (1979) have noted subjects tend to report what they believe the researcher expects to see, or to report what reflects positively on their own abilities, knowledge, beliefs, or opinions known as “presentation bias”. In addition, according to Schacter (1999), cognitive psychologists have questioned whether subjects are able to accurately recall past behaviors. According to these researchers human memory is fallible and thus the reliability of self-reported data is tenuous at best. Future studies should therefore consider interviewing participants instead of using surveys (e.g., one-on-one and/or focus group interviews). This is because an interview can allow the researcher to listen the participants’ voice unconstrained by perspectives from researcher’s or previous research finding.

Future research should also adopt detailed and accurate information about how mothers’ concept of themselves as good mothers is changed through reflective writing. To this end, techniques such as one-on-one interviews could be conducted. Furthermore, focus group interviews would allow researchers to obtain data and insights that would be less accessible without the interaction that is found in a group setting. Mothers are likely to hear and interact with each other in a group setting. This interaction should provide researchers with new and different information in comparison to the information that would result from individual interviews. One reason for this is that listening to others’ talk about their experiences can stimulate memories, ideas, and experiences.

Another potentially successful approach for studying reflective writing should be the use of direct observation of the participants (e.g., continuous monitoring and/or tie allocation). Observation allows the researcher to obtain ancillary information for analyzing maternal efficacy, such as parenting style, mother-children relationship, and mothers’ attitudes.
Future research should also consider the content of the parent education videos. In the current study, the topics in the parent education videos were limited to six topics concerning active parenting (i.e., parenting style, active communication, effective discipline, redirecting child’s misbehavior, building courage and self esteem, and family meetings). Possibly other topics that were not explored in this study would influence maternal efficacy (e.g., reinforcing child’s academic skills). Since there are more than 750 video titles on child care and parenting produced since the 1990’s (Bowker, 1996). It is important to consider different programs and content.

The current study did not consider the effect of parent education videos per se on maternal efficacy. Therefore, the use of another control group that is exposed to either the video program or the reflective writing activity is recommended. After all, it is plausible that for some mothers, simply watching the video could lead to improved maternal efficacy. An additional control group would likely increase the validity of the findings.

The participants in the study were mothers of children who had no chronic illness, exceptionality, or behavioral problems. Mothers of such children, undoubtedly face more challenges in their parenting. Possibly parent education that includes reflective writing would not be as effective with this group. After all, it is most likely easier to parent a typically developing child and parents of children with exceptionailities will face more challenges. It is recommended that further empirical studies be conducted with mothers of children with exceptionalities. This is an important group to study because they often need additional support in their parenting.

The current study was conducted over a relatively short period of time and therefore it is not known whether the maternal efficacy effects were sustained. Longitudinal methods would allow researchers to compare experimental and control groups over a longer period of time. Such long terms studies are needed to gain a deeper understanding of how reflective strategies can enhance parent education approaches.

The participants in the study were allowed to watch the “Active parenting” series at a convenient time and they may not have immediate access to the written tip-sheet information. They could also complete their reflective writings at a convenient time. Assessing the reflective writing’s effectiveness under optimum viewing and writing conditions can be seen as the first step that needs to be taken in ascertaining whether or not the intervention (i.e., reflective writing) would be of value. Once success under optimal watching and writing
conditions has been demonstrated, additional steps can be taken to assess the reflective writing and program’s potential when under the same conditions (e.g., time and place) in future studies.

Another limitation was that this study used two kinds of instruments at pre- and post-test (i.e., PSOC and PSES) to measure participants’ maternal efficacy. Although these instruments were tested for internal reliability, test-re-test reliability was not tested. Test-retest designs may threaten the internal validity of the testing because participants could become familiar with the outcome measures and remember responses for later testing (i.e., post-test). To remedy this limitation, future studies should focus on the use of different surveys or items on the post-test from than those used during earlier testing.

A final limitation was that the researcher gave mothers structured reflective writing assignment instructions involving three major questions such as themes or topics, impressive lessons from videos, and implacable strategies. As a result, evaluating the level of mothers’ reflective writings was not as valuable or effective because most reflective writings had similar contents. This approach resulted in reflective thinking levels that were based on instructions provided by the researcher. Therefore, in order to evaluate mothers’ level of reflective writing over time, future studies should offer increased autonomy instead of structured instructions or guided reflective writing.

5.5 Implications and Conclusion

The results of the current study have several important implications for parent education programs. First, reflective writing activity based on parent education programs seems to have a positive effect on maternal efficacy. Therefore, there may be practical implications in that parent education programs should consider including reflective writing. Program coordinators or educational faculties in planning programs for parents might consider including a reflective writing activity. In addition, feedback from faculty and peer reviewing experience with other participants may be included. Regular and constructive feedback from faculty or peers may also be helpful in increasing maternal efficacy.

Second, viewing of parenting videos brought effective change in maternal efficacy. Offering self-regulated approaches such as video training to mothers as a first approach may have other potential advantages. For example, by viewing the videos prior to participating in parent education courses, or calling on professional assistance, mothers could gain a general
understanding of parenting principles, and effective parenting strategies designed to encourage their parental competence and manage difficult parenting. If further specific assistance was then required, practitioners could reconfigure mothers’ parenting knowledge and attitudes by correcting areas of misunderstanding from the series or adding profitable parenting knowledge or guidance.

In conclusion, the main goal of this study was to determine the effect of reflective writing in parent education programs on maternal efficacy. In order to arrive at a more definitive and realistic answer to this question, a follow-up longitudinal study with larger sample is needed to monitor participants’ long-term progress. However, although not a long-term study, there were noticeable outcomes indicating that the mothers’ maternal efficacy improved after the reflective writing intervention with regard to Parenting Sense of Competence (PSOC) and Parental Self-Efficacy (PSES). The outcomes of a reflective writing training in parent education programs for mothers’ maternal efficacy have not been previously studied in United State; therefore, this current study represents an initial step in exploring new methods of improving maternal efficacy (i.e., reflective writing). This study highlights the need for including reflective writing in parent education programs in order to support mothers’ understanding of new parenting knowledge. This strategy can also be used to help mother reconsider their attitudes and perceptions about parenting and maternal efficacy and apply the new knowledge. In turn, this internalizing of parenting knowledge should lead to improvements in parenting quality.

In conclusion, it is hoped that this study has made a small yet meaningful contribution to our understanding of the use of reflective writing with mothers of young children. A related expectation is that the findings provide evidence that allow developers of parenting programs and video designers to consider reflective writing as a method of encouraging mothers to consider their attitudes and perceptions about parenting.

Finally, many questions remain about the role of reflective writing in parent education. It is hoped that findings from this exploratory study will help researchers design studies that will provide reliable answers to these questions.
APPENDIX A

Informed Consent Form

I, __________________________, freely and voluntarily and without element of force or coercion, consent to be a participant in the research project entitled “Parent Education, Reflective writing, and Maternal efficacy”. This research is being conducted by Sung-on Hwang, M.A., who is a doctoral student of School of Teacher Education at the Florida State University. I understand that the purpose of her research project is to better understand how mothers’ reflective writing influences their parental efficacy after having watched six video-taped parenting programs.

I understand that if I participate in the project I will be asked to do the first survey (pretest) about parental efficacy. It should not take any longer than 20 minutes to complete. Then I will be shown a series of six video-taped parenting programs, “Active Parenting Now”, for six weeks. I understand that all programs are of approximately 25-30 minutes long. If I am in the experimental group I will receive weekly emails reminding me to watch each program and to complete the reflective writing based on the programs for about 30 minutes. In contrast, if I am not in the experimental group, I will receive weekly emails reminding me to watch the programs for six weeks without reflective writing activities. Six weeks later, I will be asked to do the second survey (post-test) about parental efficacy. It should not take me any longer than 20 minutes to complete.

I understand that my survey answer will be kept by the researcher (as well as copies of my reflective writing). Both survey answers and reflective writing will be kept in a locked filing cabinet. I understand that only the researcher and her major advisor professor (Dr. Ithel Jones) will have access to these data and those data will be destroyed by December 2013.

I understand that there is minimal risk involved in this research study in terms of a potential violation of confidentiality. However, I understand that my survey answer and reflective writing will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by law and identified by a subject code number. My name will not appear on any of the results. No individual response will be reported.

I understand that this consent may be withdrawn at anytime without prejudice, penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled. I have been given the right to ask and have answered any inquiry concerning the study. Questions, if any, have been answered to my satisfaction.

I understand that if I have any questions about my rights as a subject/participant in this research, or if feel I have been placed at risk, I can contact the Human Subjects Committee, Institutional Review Board, through the office of Research at (850)644-7900.

I understand that I may contact Sung-on Hwang, Florida State University, College of Education, for answers to questions about this research or my rights. I have read and understand this consent form.

Subject’s Signature: __________________________ Date: ______________

Researcher’s Signature: __________________________ Date: ______________

APPENDIX B

Letter of Permission

To:
Coordinator of Mother of Preschooler (Killearn United Methodist Church)
2800 Shamrock St S
Tallahassee, FL 32309

Date: November 2, 2010

Dear

I am a doctoral student working under the direction of Professor, Dr. Ithel Jones, in the Department of School of Teacher Education at Florida State University. I am writing to request your permission to study some of your mother members in a research project entitled “Parent education, Reflective writing, and Maternal efficacy”. I am conducting this research project to better understand how mothers’ reflective writing influences their parental efficacy after having watched six video-taped parenting programs.

This project is designed as an experimental study. If mothers take part in this project, they will be randomly divided into two groups (i.e. control and experimental group). Before assigning groups, all participants will need to sign a consent form indicating that they understand what is involved in participating in the study and that their participation is completely voluntary.

All participants will be asked to complete a survey (pre-test) about parental efficacy. It should not take any longer than 20 minutes to complete. Then all participants will be shown a series of six videotaped parenting programs, “Active ParentingNow”, for six weeks. All programs are of approximately 25-30 minutes long. The experimental group will receive weekly emails reminding them to watch each program and to complete each reflective writing as they watch the six videos for about 30 minutes. In contrast, the control group will receive weekly emails reminding to watch the programs during the same time span without reflective writing activities. Six weeks later, all participants will be asked to complete a survey (post-test) about parental efficacy. It should not take them any longer than 20 minutes to complete. Their responses will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by law. Their participation in this research project is completely voluntary.

In conclusion, I’d like to ask your permission to study some of your mother members of Mothers of Preschoolers for this research project. I have enclosed a copy of my Human Subject Committee application for this research. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this letter or my research, please contact me at my email address or phone above. You may also want to contact Dr. Ithel Jones, major professor.

Sincerely,

_____________________________________________________
Your Signature Date

APPENDIX C

Recruitment Letter to Potential Participants

Dear ______________________,

I am a doctoral student working under the direction of Professor, Dr. Ithel Jones, in the Department of School of Teacher Education at Florida State University.

I am conducting a research project to better understand how mothers’ reflective writing influences their parental efficacy after having watched six video-taped parenting programs. I obtained your name from the director of Mothers of Preschoolers at Killearn United Methodist Church.

I am asking you to participate. If you participate in the project, you will be asked to do the first survey (pre-test) about parental efficacy. It should not take any longer than 20 minutes to complete. Then you will be shown a series of six video-taped parenting programs, “Active Parenting Now”, for six weeks. All programs are of approximately 25-30 minutes long. If you are in the experimental group you will receive weekly emails reminding you to watch each program and to complete the reflective writing based on the programs for about 30 minutes. In contrast, if you are not in the experimental group, you will receive weekly emails reminding to watch the programs for six weeks without reflective writing activities. Six weeks later, you will be asked to do the second survey (post-test) about parental efficacy. It should not take me any longer than 20 minutes to complete.

Your data will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by law. Your participation in this research project is completely voluntary. There will be no consequences to you whatsoever if you choose not to participate.

If you have any questions concerning the research project, please contact me. Return of the recruitment letter with your signature and date will be considered your consent to participate.

Participant’s Signature: ____________________________ Date: ____________

Sincerely,

Sung-on Hwang

Dr. Ithel Jones

School of Teacher Education (STE)
Early Childhood Education
Florida State University

APPENDIX D

Demographics

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

1. **Age:** _____
2. **Race/Ethnicity:**
   - White/Caucasian _____
   - Black/African American _____
   - Hispanic/Latina _____
   - Asian American _____
   - Other* _____ (*If other, please specify) _______

3. **Marital Status:**
   - Married ____
   - Widowed ____
   - Partnered ____
   - Single _____
   - Divorced _____

4. **If married, for how long:** ______

5. **Highest grade completed:** _____________________

6. **Employed:**
   - Yes ___ (If yes, how many hours do you work per week ______)
   - No ___

7. **Please list the gender and ages of your children.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. **Have you ever participated in other parenting training or parenting classes:**
   - Yes___ If yes, what type of training (group/individual, # of sessions): _______
   - What was most helpful: ___________________
   - No ___

*Thank you for your cooperation!*

**APPENDIX E**

**Parenting Sense of Competence Scale (PSOC)**

Listed below are a number of statements about being a parent. Please respond to each item, indicating your agreement or disagreements with each statement by writing the appropriate number in the space to the right of the item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The problems of taking care of a child are easy to solve once you know how your actions affect your child, an understanding I have acquired.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Even thought being a parent could be rewarding, I am frustrated now while my child is at his/her present age. (Specify age of child ______)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I go to bed the same way I wake up in the morning, feeling I have not accomplished a whole lot.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I do not know why it is, but sometimes when I’m supposed to be in control, I feel more like the one being manipulated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My mother/father was better prepared to be a good mother/ father than I am.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I would make a fine model for a new mother to follow in order to learn what she need to know in order to be a good parent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Being a parent is manageable, and any problems are easily solved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. A difficult problem in being a parent is not knowing whether you’re doing a good job or a bad one.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sometimes I feel like I’m not getting anything done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I meet my own personal expectations for expertise in caring for my child.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>If anyone can find the answer to what is troubling my child, I am the one.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>My talents and interests are in other areas, not in being a parent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Considering how long I’ve been a mother, I feel thoroughly familiar with this role.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>If being a mother of a child were only more interesting, I would be motivated to do a better job as a parent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I honestly believe I have all the skills necessary to be a good mother to my child.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Being a parent makes me tense and anxious.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Being a good mother is a reward in itself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX F

#### The Parental Self-Efficacy Scale (PSES)

Listed below are a number of statements about being a parent. Please respond to each item, indicating your agreement or disagreements with each statement by writing the appropriate number in the space to the right of the item.

1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Mildly disagree, 4= Mildly agree, 5 = Agree, and 6 = Strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISCIPLINE</th>
<th>(1) AT HOME</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Get my child to understand verbal commands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Get my child to obey verbal commands the 1st time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Control my child’s behavior with verbal praise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Control my child’s behavior with physical praise (touch, hug, kiss, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Verbally control my child’s behavior without yelling.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISCIPLINE</th>
<th>(2) IN THE CAR</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Get my child to understand verbal commands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Get my child to obey verbal commands the 1st time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Control my child’s behavior with verbal praise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Control my child’s behavior with physical praise (touch, hug, kiss, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Verbally control my child’s behavior without yelling.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### In a Store

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Get my child to understand verbal commands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Get my child to obey verbal commands the 1st time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Control my child’s behavior with verbal praise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Control my child’s behavior with physical praise (touch, hug, kiss, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Verbally control my child’s behavior without yelling.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### With Company at Home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Get my child to understand verbal commands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Get my child to obey verbal commands the 1st time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Control my child’s behavior with verbal praise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Control my child’s behavior with physical praise (touch, hug, kiss, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Verbally control my child’s behavior without yelling.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### In the Presence of Siblings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Get my child to understand verbal commands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Get my child to obey verbal commands the 1st time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Control my child’s behavior with verbal praise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Control my child’s behavior with physical praise (touch, hug, kiss, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Verbally control my child’s behavior without yelling.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### (6) IN THE PRESENCE OF PARENT’S FRIENDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Get my child to understand verbal commands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Get my child to obey verbal commands the 1st time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Control my child’s behavior with verbal praise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Control my child’s behavior with physical praise (touch, hug, kiss, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Verbally control my child’s behavior without yelling.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (7) ALONE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Get my child to understand verbal commands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Get my child to obey verbal commands the 1st time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Control my child’s behavior with verbal praise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Control my child’s behavior with physical praise (touch, hug, kiss, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Verbally control my child’s behavior without yelling.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SUITABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) AT HOME</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Organize my daily activities very well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Includes my child in my daily activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Feel good about what I’ve done at the end of the day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Plan enjoyable activities for my child each day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Find time to be alone with my child each day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Schedule a regular time to be alone with my child each day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Anticipate my child’s needs before they arise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Enjoy the time I spend with my child each day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Recognize when I make a mistake with my child.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Make my child understand a mistake that he/she makes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMUNICATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) AT HOME</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Understand my child’s desires with little or no problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Make my child understand my desires with little or no problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Maintain my child’s attention as long as necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Respond favorably to my child’s appropriate behavior.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Respond effectively to my child’s inappropriate behavior.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Make my child understand what I approve of with little or no difficulty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Make my child understand what I disapprove of with little or no problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Easily respond to my child’s show of affection.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Easily show my affection for my child.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Terminate an interaction with my child without any problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PERSONAL EFFICACY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) AT HOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Perform my duties and responsibilities as a parent without fear of making a mistake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Perform my duties and responsibilities as a spouse without fear of making a mistake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Perform my duties and responsibilities as a spouse and parents even if I’m having “a bad day”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Resolve the problems I face as a parent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Resolve the problems I face as a spouse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Take full credit for the good behavior of my child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Take full responsibility for the bad behavior of my child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Take full credit for my own accomplishments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Take full responsibility for my own failures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Be sure that no one could be a better parent to my child than I am.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Make new friends easily.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Be sure that my responses to the preceding questions are entirely accurate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

Writing Assignment Instructions

*Name: (printed name)_________________________
*Date: _______________________
*Resource: Please mark (√) the video program you watched in this week.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARK(√)</th>
<th>video</th>
<th>T I T L E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Parenting in the 21st century: What’s your style and how does it influence your child?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Active Communication: How to win cooperation with your child?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Effective Discipline: How to raise a responsible child</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sidestepping the Power Struggles: Redirection your child’s misbehavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Building Character: Courage and self-esteem in your child</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The Magic of Family Meeting: Teaching program solving and positive values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**** Writing Assignment Instructions

1. While watching the video, keep record three to five themes or topics.

2. Reflect on your own parenting experiences in connection with the video, then write down your response or reaction to the video (minimum of one paragraph). Be sure to express your opinions and/or feelings in your response

3. Next, write a minimum of one paragraph highlighting the most impressive lesson or advice given in the video and your plans for applying the lesson or advice to your life.

APPENDIX H

Reminder Email (The First Week)

Dear _________________,

Hello. I am Sung-on Hwang.
This is just a quick email to remind you that the first week’s watching (and reflective writing) for *Active Parenting Now- Parenting in the 21st century: What’s your style and how does it influence your child?* is due on Jan 25, 2011.
I would be grateful if you could let me know if you foresee any difficulty completing the task by this deadline.

Please note that if you can’t watch (and do reflective writing) by this deadline, give the researcher a call [Sung-on Hwang, ] or an email [ ].

Thank you for your assistance in watching (and reflective writing) for the research project, “Parent Education, Reflective writing, and Maternal efficacy”.

With best wishes,

Sung-on Hwang

School of Teacher Education (STE)
Early Childhood Education
Florida State University

APPENDIX I

Reminder Email (The Second Week)

Dear ________________,

Hello. I am Sung-on Hwang. This is just a quick email to remind you that the first week’s watching (and reflective writing) for *Active Parenting Now- Active Communication: How to win cooperation with your child?* is due on Feb 1, 2011.

I would be grateful if you could let me know if you foresee any difficulty by this deadline. Please note that if you can’t watch (and do reflective writing) by this deadline, give the researcher a call [Sung-on Hwang,      ] or an email [            ].

Thank you for your assistance in watching (and reflective writing) for the research project, “Parent Education, Reflective writing, and Maternal efficacy”.

With best wishes,

Sung-on Hwang

School of Teacher Education (STE)
Early Childhood Education
Florida State University

Dear __________________ ,

Hello. I am Sung-on Hwang. This is just a quick email to remind you that the first week’s watching (and reflective writing) for *Active Parenting Now- Effective Discipline: How to raise a responsible child*, is due on Feb 8, 2011.

I would be grateful if you could let me know if you foresee any difficulty by this deadline. Please note that if you can’t watch (and do reflective writing) by this deadline, give the researcher a call [Sung-on Hwang, ] or an email [ ].

Thank you for your assistance in watching (and reflective writing) for the research project, “Parent Education, Reflective writing, and Maternal efficacy”.

With best wishes,

Sung-on Hwang

School of Teacher Education (STE)
Early Childhood Education
Florida State University

Dear __________________ ,

Hello. I am Sung-on Hwang.
This is just a quick email to remind you that the first week’s watching (and reflective writing) for
Active Parenting Now- Sidestepping the power struggle: Redirecting your child’s misbehavior is
due on Feb 15, 2011.

I would be grateful if you could let me know if you foresee any difficulty by this deadline. Please note
that if you can’t watch (and do reflective writing) by this deadline, give the researcher a call [Sung-on Hwang, ] or an email [ ].

Thank you for your assistance in watching (and reflective writing) for the research project, “Parent Education, Reflective writing, and Maternal efficacy”.

With best wishes,

Sung-on Hwang

School of Teacher Education (STE)
Early Childhood Education
Florida State University

Dear __________________ ,

Hello. I am Sung-on Hwang.
This is just a quick email to remind you that the first week’s watching (and reflective writing) for 
*Active Parenting Now- Building Courage character, and self-esteem in your child* is due on Feb 22, 2011.

I would be grateful if you could let me know if you foresee any difficulty by this deadline. Please note that if you can’t watch (and do reflective writing) by this deadline, give the researcher a call [Sung-on Hwang,  ] or an email [            ].

Thank you for your assistance in watching (and reflective writing) for the research project, “Parent Education, Reflective writing, and Maternal efficacy”.

With best wishes,

Sung-on Hwang

School of Teacher Education (STE)
Early Childhood Education
Florida State University

APPENDIX M

Reminder Email (The Sixth Week)

Dear __________________ ,

Hello. I am Sung-on Hwang.
This is just a quick email to remind you that the first week’s watching (and reflective writing) for Active Parenting Now- The magic of family meetings: Teaching problem-solving and positive values is due on Mar 1, 2011.

I would be grateful if you could let me know if you foresee any difficulty by this deadline. Please note that if you can’t watch (and do reflective writing) by this deadline, give the researcher a call [Sung-on Hwang, ] or an email [ ].

Thank you for your assistance in watching (and reflective writing) for the research project, “Parent Education, Reflective writing, and Maternal efficacy”.

With best wishes,

Sung-on Hwang

School of Teacher Education (STE)
Early Childhood Education
Florida State University

Office of the Vice President For Research  
Human Subjects Committee  
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2742  
(850) 644-8673 · FAX (850) 644-4392

APPROVAL MEMORANDUM

Date: 12/1/2010

To: Sung-on Hwang

Address: [REDACTED]  
Dept.: EDUCATION

From: Thomas L. Jacobson, Chair

Re: Use of Human Subjects in Research  
The effect of preschool mother's self-reflective writing based on video-taped parenting programs on parental efficacy

The application that you submitted to this office in regard to the use of human subjects in the proposal referenced above have been reviewed by the Secretary, the Chair, and two members of the Human Subjects Committee. Your project is determined to be Expedited per 45 CFR § 46.110(7) and has been approved by an expedited review process.

The Human Subjects Committee has not evaluated your proposal for scientific merit, except to weigh the risk to the human participants and the aspects of the proposal related to potential risk and benefit. This approval does not replace any departmental or other approvals, which may be required.

If you submitted a proposed consent form with your application, the approved stamped consent form is attached to this approval notice. Only the stamped version of the consent form may be used in recruiting research subjects.

If the project has not been completed by 11/29/2011 you must request a
renewal of approval for continuation of the project. As a courtesy, a renewal notice will be sent to you prior to your expiration date; however, it is your responsibility as the Principal Investigator to timely request renewal of your approval from the Committee.

You are advised that any change in protocol for this project must be reviewed and approved by the Committee prior to implementation of the proposed change in the protocol. A protocol change/amendment form is required to be submitted for approval by the Committee. In addition, federal regulations require that the Principal Investigator promptly report, in writing any unanticipated problems or adverse events involving risks to research subjects or others.

By copy of this memorandum, the Chair of your department and/or your major professor is reminded that he/she is responsible for being informed concerning research projects involving human subjects in the department, and should review protocols as often as needed to insure that the project is being conducted in compliance with our institution and with DHHS regulations.

This institution has an Assurance on file with the Office for Human Research Protection. The Assurance Number is IRB00000446.

Cc: Ithel Jones, Advisor
HSC No. 2010.4947
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