

**Outcome Evaluation of Family Service of Milwaukee
Parenting Education Programs
Technical Report #1**

**Funded by the Helen Bader Foundation
March 1987**

Outcome Evaluation of Family Service of Milwaukee Parenting Education Programs
Technical Report - #1
Funded by the Helen Bader Foundation - March 1997

This study was conducted with a grant received from the Helen Bader Foundation in 1993. The Follow-Up Study was administered to program graduates of Family Service of Milwaukee's Parenting Education Programs (the Nurturing Program [NP] and Families and Schools Together [FAST]) between 1994 and 1996. The project was conducted, in part, to determine the long-term effects of the parenting education programs on parents and children. More specific research questions for this project centered on whether those program graduates who had gone on to become trained as facilitators for their parenting education program would have better outcomes in a variety of social, employment and educational areas than those who had not become trained facilitators.

THE SAMPLE

Completed survey results were obtained for 94 participants. This represents a return rate of 43% (217 attempts were made). See Attachment A for a complete breakdown of completed surveys and attempts by type of program (NP or FAST).

The final sample represents 77 Nurturing Program and 17 Families and Schools Together participants. Six cases were rejected because they were duplicate cases.

Program participants had completed 13-week Nurturing Program (designed to prevent child abuse and neglect) and the 8-week, school-based Families and Schools Together program (designed to address drug and alcohol abuse) between 1990 and 1995. Tables 1 through 6 present detailed demographic information of the sample.

The sample was constructed to include GRADUATES from both FAST and the NP. Representation in the sample was also partly determined by site of parenting program. The 217 people in the original attempted sample represent more than 10 Nurturing and FAST programs. Entire programs were selected for inclusion in the sample, but within programs just under half of those who we attempted to contact were surveyed.

The majority of participants interviewed had completed programs during 1990-3. Over one-quarter had completed programs at Milwaukee Christian Center, and another twenty percent completed it at Neighborhood House, near south and near west side locations. All of the sites were located in Milwaukee's central city. Based on the experience of FSM staff, many program participants are vulnerable to the stressors of poverty, crime, and drug abuse. The FAST program, by design, selects those at risk for alcohol and other drug abuse.

The sample was also constructed to include a number of parent graduates who had gone on to complete facilitator training. Just over 40% of NP, and just under one-quarter of FAST respondents were trained facilitators (See Table 10).

Just under 40% of the participants were African American, and just over 38% were White. There were slightly over 1% each of Hispanic, Asian, and Native American respondents in the sample. All of the African-American respondents had participated in the Nurturing Program, and all but one of the Hispanic participants had completed FAST. Nearly 81% of respondents were female, and just over 19% of respondents were male.

Program participants ranged in age from 20-65. Over one-third, 35.3% were 31-35 years old, another 22.4% were 26-30 years old, and just under 20% were between 36 and 40. Only 16% were over 41 and 7% were 25 or under.

Although information on the economic status of the sample was not obtained as part of the survey, data collected for other funding sources, including the United Way of Greater Milwaukee, for over (7) seven years indicates that an average of nearly 80% of program participants live below the poverty level (less than \$15,000) per year).

METHOD

Participants were contacted by telephone or in person at least six months after completion of the program, and may have been surveyed up to three years after completing the parenting programs. About one-quarter of the surveys were done in person, and the rest over the phone. All data were self-reports of parents about themselves, their lives and their families.

This heavy reliance on the telephone survey methodology likely leads to several biases, most particularly, in favor of those who have a phone. At least three attempts were made to contact each participant before excluding them from participation. The fact that an estimated 30% of program participants have moved from their original addresses introduces a bias away from including those with frequent mobility in the sample.

The survey took approximately 20 minutes to complete. Participant's responses were recorded by the interviewers on the questionnaires (See Attachment B for copies of the questionnaires). Completed surveys were returned to the Assistant Director of Parenting Education, and subsequently included in the analysis. Each was assigned a unique identification number.

The survey was administered by staff from the parenting education department. In all, five persons administered the structured interview. Four of the five were parenting education coordinators; three were graduates of the 13-week Nurturing Program and completed 24 hours of facilitator training, and one was a graduate of a 8-week FAST program and completed all three phases of FAST training. (The FAST parent graduate staff member was also trained in the Nurturing model and coordinated and facilitated Nurturing Programs.) The fifth interviewer was trained in the Nurturing Program model although she never completed the 13-week parenting education program. Four of the interviewers were either a VISTA Volunteer or Public Allie. The number of interviews completed by each interviewer

ranged from five up to nearly fifty. The effects of some variables such as the ethnic and cultural backgrounds may have influenced the data collected in systematic ways, and will be addressed in the Discussion section.

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

The four page survey was developed by the Assistant Director of the Parenting Education Department, and based on a tool which had been used to collect evaluation and program information about FAST Programs in Wisconsin as part of a two year federal grant from the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention. The modified form of the survey used in this project was constructed with alternate forms for the Nurturing Program and Families and Schools Together. For the FAST survey, one section focused on techniques specific to FAST program, otherwise, the surveys were identical except for where the name FAST was replaced with NP. The survey included a number of open-ended questions, as well as questions which required a number based on a rating scale or other closed-end (yes/no) response from interviewees.

Interviewers were trained and supervised by the Assistant Director of Parenting Education in the use of the interview protocol. Each interviewer received a package of information which included a script for the interview and information on the proper documentation of participant's responses.

RESULTS

The primary research questions of this project were:

- 1) to investigate and document the long-term effects of program participation on program graduates and their families, and
- 2) the question of whether those program participants who had gone on to complete facilitator training compared to those who had not been trained as facilitators would report improved outcomes in reducing their use of physical punishment, better outcomes in employment and education for themselves, better school outcomes for their children.

Analysis of the research questions will include a quantitative, statistical component and a qualitative component. The quantitative analysis includes a combination of descriptive (mostly percentages) and inferential statistics (average item scores with tests for statistical significance) in response to specific questions included on the survey. Where inferential statistics were used, the effect sizes were small. The qualitative analysis includes a content analysis of responses to open-ended questions.

1. LONG TERM EFFECTS OF PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

Many program graduates report sharing activities with other parents from the program. Table 7 provides information on the types of activities reported by program graduates. Nearly two thirds of parents report sharing advice on raising children with other parents from the respective parenting programs. Just over one-third of respondents from each program do fun things with other program participants. One-half of NP graduates and 1/3 of FAST graduates report giving each other emotional support. Many others report sharing advice on school matters, other matters, tasks and services, and babysitting.

Survey respondent's self-reports indicated that more than 35% of FAST participants and 20% of NP participants reported some type of volunteer activity (see Tables 8 & 9). Examples of volunteer activity cited by FAST program participants were school, PTO involvement and church, while volunteer activities cited by NP participants included school, program facilitation, and work with other agencies. Others reported receiving additional training such as Alzheimer Caregiver Training, training in entrepreneurial skill and coaching.

Table 8 also shows that nearly one third of survey respondents reported having gotten counseling for themselves and their children, but very few (none in FAST and only 2.7% of Nurturing respondents) had sought out AODA treatment or Alcoholics Anonymous.

Survey respondents were asked several specific questions regarding changes in the relationship with their child, whether their child was doing better in school, whether they were more involved in school activities and whether their child's and their own self esteem has improved (see Table 11). Ratings were made using a five point scale ranging from a "high" of 1 to a "low" of 5. Average scores for both FAST and NP were positive, but an interesting pattern of results emerged. Though not significant, FAST received its most positive average ratings (1.71) in the item assessing improvement in their children's school performance and in improved knowledge and awareness of the effects of drugs and alcohol. FAST received its least positive rating in the item measuring improvement in parent's own self-esteem (2.25). The Nurturing Program received its most positive rating in the item assessing improvement in the relationship with their child (1.74) and the least positive rating in increased school involvement (2.20).

Also outlined in Table 11 are average scores for survey respondents reports on an item measuring their use of physical punishment. This item is reverse-scored and thus the "highest" possible score is a "5" and the "lowest" possible score a "1". Survey respondent's from both Nurturing and FAST report their most positive scores in this area, indicating much less use of physical punishment. FAST received an overall rating of 3.91 and Nurturing an average rating of 4.43.

Qualitative Data Analysis

Additional evidence for the long term positive effects of the parenting education programs is provided by an analysis of participant responses to open-ended questions in the survey (Table 16).

Content analysis of up to three responses to three open-ended questions in the survey (the main benefit of the program, the best part of it, and what they remember most) show considerable support for some long-term positive effects gained and maintained by survey respondents. More detailed results of this analysis are included in Attachment A. It should be noted that a similar qualitative analysis of FAST survey respondents was NOT completed due to a lack of comprehensiveness and clarity in the data (at least partly due to translations from English to Spanish and back again). Thus, the following information pertains ONLY to Nurturing Program graduates.

Social. This dimension described a group environment which fostered the development of feelings of security, support, safety, respect, and trust among people who had experienced much social isolation. Items in this category were mentioned most frequently (nearly 180 times) by respondents.

Self Nurturing. Parents described improvement in their ability to meet their own needs and to believe in themselves, make positive change in their own lives and free up energy which is then available to meet their children's needs and get their lives "back on track" (59 occurrences).

Behavior Management Techniques. These techniques which offer alternatives to physical punishment and empower children to manage their own behavior (choices and consequences, conflict resolution skills)(81 occurrences).

Parent/Child Relationship. This dimension captures the importance of spending quality time with children, increased communication, and consistent use of Nurturing Techniques over time. Families demonstrated the development of creative solutions to problems, such as using a hand-signal to represent "I love you" (64 occurrences).

2. OUTCOMES FOR PROGRAM GRADUATES TRAINED AS FACILITATORS vs. THOSE NOT TRAINED

The second research question focused specifically on outcomes of surveys of parent graduates trained as facilitators vs. those not trained as facilitators for their respective programs. This data is in Tables 12 and 13.

A series of t-tests was conducted to determine if there were significant differences between facilitators and non-facilitators in items measuring school involvement, change in relationship with their children, improved school performance for their children, and increases in their own and their child's self-esteem. The Dependent Variables were mean scale scores (ranging from a high of "1" to a low of "5") and the Independent Variable was Trained Facilitator vs. Non-facilitator. Only the item measuring changes in relationship with their children was determined to be statistically significant with facilitators scoring higher (1.48) than non-facilitators (1.93), $F = 9.74 (1,72)$, $p < .003$. In general, though not statistically significant, NP facilitators received higher average ratings than non-facilitators in items

measuring changes in relationships with their children, involvement with their children's school, ratings of their own and their children's self-esteem, and knowledge and awareness of drug and alcohol abuse.

This same pattern of results was NOT evident for FAST participants. A series of t-test indicated that a statistically significant difference for facilitators vs. nonfacilitators was found only for the item measuring increased school involvement. Facilitators reported a mean score of 1.25 for facilitators compared to 2.46 for nonfacilitators, $F = 5.62 (1,16)$, $p. < .04$. Though not statistically significant trained facilitators reported LESS POSITIVE relationships with their children (2.25) compared to non-facilitators (1.91).

Physical Punishment. There was little difference between facilitators and non-facilitators in the use of physical punishment for the Nurturing Program (see Tables 13 and 14), although scores were quite positive. Analysis of the FAST data shows a pattern in which all trained facilitators reported having made a decision to NOT use physical punishment before beginning the program and therefore could not report on increased or decreased use of physical punishment.

Employment and Education. Table 13 presents information on educational and employment activities for facilitators and non-facilitators. This data were analyzed using cross tabulations and the Chi-Square test of significance.

For Nurturing, over 40% of trained facilitators report increased education while just under 30% of non-facilitators reported furthering their education. A similar pattern was reported for FAST.

For both Nurturing and FAST, many more facilitators than non facilitators reported part-time employment, 35.5% for Nurturing and 50.0% for FAST. This difference was statistically significant at $p. < .05$ (Chi-Square = 4.95).

Though not statistically significant, slightly more facilitators than non-facilitators report full-time employment in both Nurturing and FAST. However, only about 25% of facilitators from each program report full-time work.

DISCUSSION

Analysis of the data shows support for the research hypotheses that surveyed program participants and facilitators have gained and maintained some positive effects from the program and that facilitators have somewhat better outcomes in several areas than nonfacilitators, however, interpretation of the data must be made with caution.

First of all, the small sample size (particularly for FAST) makes analysis of both the numerical and qualitative analysis difficult and generalizations particularly troublesome.

Due to the way many questions were asked, direct, causal relationships between program participation and improved outcomes can NOT be inferred. For example, the question geared to employment activity asks for respondent's experience since participating in the program, but does not ask for improved employment status BECAUSE of participation in the program. Other factors may be influencing the outcome, and have occurred since program participation and facilitator training. This is true for almost all questions on the survey.

Also, in response to reported level of activity, for example, does 20% of NP participants reporting volunteer activity represent an increase or a decrease? The experience of FSM staff leads us to believe that this represents an increase from volunteer activity prior to the program, but without baseline data, no direct inferences can be made.

There are other factors which may have influenced the data gathering in systematic ways, and makes interpretation of the data difficult and generalizing results unwise. The linguistic abilities and cultural backgrounds of the interviewers may also be of interest in interpretation all of the Hispanic (FAST) participants were interviewed by a bicultural, bilingual FAST trained parent graduate and a FSM staff person. The survey, though constructed in English, was translated to spoken Spanish by the interviewer. Respondents presumably answered in Spanish and then the interviewer recorded them in English. This resulted in confusion around the meaning of specific questions (i.e. physical punishment) and clearly influenced the quality and clarity of the FAST data gathered in the form of open ended questions.

All of the interviewers for Nurturing Program graduates were African-American. Over one-third of respondents were African-American and another one-third were White. The effects of this on the results are unknown, and these results must be interpreted in light of this.

One of the lessons learned in this process is the value of conducting a small pilot study prior to administration. Due to some of the cultural and language differences mentioned above, some of the data may be difficult to interpret. Feedback received by the interviewers indicates that some of the questions are open to interpretation, and some of the responses may not be clear. The implementers of the study would also do more structured training of interviewers; in how the questions were asked, and in eliciting thorough responses from interviewees.

LONG-TERM PROGRAM EFFECTS

Based on the analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data it appears that program participants have found much of value from the program and continue to use it after the parenting program itself is over.

For Nurturing Program participants responses to the open ended questions indicate that clearly there have been great strides forward in peoples lives in reducing social isolation, providing support and acceptance, providing useful techniques to modify and manage behavior and greater understanding and improved relationships between parents and children.

This qualitative data demonstrated increased awareness of respondents own needs and provides evidence of increased skill development in a number of areas. It is also of note that the responses to the open ended questions resembles the dimensions used in the behavioral-based assessment tool, the Parent Learning Profile, or PLP administered multiple times during and after program participation. The PLP measures communication, self-nurturing and parent child relationships. The dimensions occurring in respondents answers to the open-ended questions were those of Social, Self Nurturing, Behavior Management Techniques and Parent/Child Relationships. Of these, the Social dimension is perhaps most interesting because it describes the environment and tone (supporting and accepting) which exists as part of the class but not part of the curriculum or the assessment tool.

Many survey respondents reported high levels of activity with other parents they met in the program. A surprisingly high number of respondents reported seeking out counseling for themselves and their children. In contrast, none of the FAST respondents and only a few of the Nurturing Program respondents reported getting help with alcohol and other drug abuse problems. The reason for this is not clear. However, both FAST and Nurturing respondents gave positive ratings on the information received about alcohol and drug abuse from the program but written comments frequently indicated that respondents already knew that information.

In general, survey respondents reported positive change in their relationships with their children, increased involvement with schools, improved school performance of their children, increased self-esteem for themselves and their children and a decreased use in physical punishment. Again, although direct, causal inferences between program participation and these outcomes is not possible, it is clear that nearly all respondents experienced some positive outcomes since program participation.

OUTCOMES FOR FACILITATORS vs. NON-FACILITATORS

The analysis of outcomes for facilitators vs. non-facilitators indicate that facilitators did significantly better than non-facilitators in part-time employment. However, due to the way the question was asked, a causal inference between becoming trained and increased employment cannot be made. Respondents who were facilitators also reported gains in furthering their educations and in gaining full-time employment compared to non-facilitators, but this difference was not significant.

Although these results are promising, additional research needs to be conducted in this area to fully understand the dynamic responsible for this. Some of the written comments made by respondents suggest they gain renewed energy for tackling such issues as outside employment (getting their lives "back on track"), as well as some skills necessary for more smooth functioning in their lives. It also suggests that this process is ongoing for many respondents.

Additional analysis of Trained Facilitators vs. Non-facilitators shows a pattern consistent with the design of the two parenting education programs. Nurturing Program facilitators showed a significant improvement in the relationships with their children than did non-facilitators. This likely reflects the emphasis the Nurturing Program has on the use of alternatives to physical punishment, increased communication and behavior management techniques.

For FAST, trained facilitators reported significantly more school involvement than non-facilitators. This likely reflects the fact that FAST is a school-based program whose primary goal is to improve children's school performance through increased parental involvement in their education.

Though not statistically significant, trained facilitators in general reported better outcomes than non-facilitators in a number of other areas (children's school performance, their own and their children's self esteem). It should be noted that non-facilitators also reported positive gains in these areas as well.

SUMMARY

The results of this outcome study, though not definitive, provide considerable support for the long-term and positive effects gained through program participation. There is also support for the notion that continued involvement and skill building through becoming trained as facilitators for parenting education program enhances this effect. However, additional research is required to determine the existence of causal relationships between training and subsequent employment and educational activities.

Technical Report #1 was prepared by Dawn Voigt, Ph.D. with assistance from Jean Moreland, Associate Director of the Family Nurturing Center of Milwaukee and Eastern Wisconsin.

Table 1: Parenting Education Program Type

Program Type	#	%
FAST Program (Families and Schools Together)	17	18.1
Nurturing Program	77	81.9
TOTAL	94	100

Table 2: Sex of Survey Respondent

Sex	FAST Program		Nurturing Program		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Male	1	5.9	17	22.1	18	19.1
Female	16	94.1	60	77.9	76	89.9
TOTAL	17	100	77	100	94	100

Table 3: Age of Survey Respondent

Age	FAST Program		Nurturing Program		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Under 20	-	-	2	2.9	2	2.4
21 - 25	-	-	4	5.7	4	4.7
26 - 30	6	40.0	13	18.6	19	22.4
31 - 35	7	46.7	23	32.8	30	35.3
36 - 40	1	6.7	15	21.4	16	18.8
41 - 45	-	-	7	10.0	7	8.2
over 46	1	6.7	6	8.6	7	8.2
TOTAL	15	100.1	70	100.0	85	100.0
Missing Cases	2	-	7	-	9	-

Range - 20 years to 65 years

Table 4: Race of Survey Respondent

Race	FAST Program		Nurturing Program		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
African-American	0	0	36	48.0	36	39.1
White	0	0	35	46.7	35	38.0
Hispanic	16	94.1	1	1.3	17	18.5
Native American	0	0	1	1.3	1	1.1
Asian American	0	0	1	1.3	1	1.1
Other	1	5.9	1	1.3	2	2.2
TOTAL	17	100.0	75	99.9	92	100.0
Missing Cases	2	-	-	-	-	-

Table 5: Sites of Nurturing Programs

Nurturing Program Site	#	%
Family Service of Milwaukee	5	6.6
Neighborhood House	16	21.1
YWCA	3	3.9
Lady Pitts	7	9.2
Clarke Street School	11	14.5
Oliver Wendell Holmes	7	9.2
Milwaukee Christian Center	20	26.3
Children's Outing Association	6	7.9
Homebased	1	1.3
TOTAL	76	100.0
Missing Cases	1	

Table 6: Sites of FAST Programs

FAST Program Site	#	%
AllenField School	6	35.3
Kagel School	11	64.7
TOTAL	17	100.0

Table 7: Survey Respondent's Report of Activity with Other Parents

When you are in touch with other (Nurturing Program or FAST Program) parents, what kinds of things do you do together? (Please check all that apply.)	FAST Program % Indicating Yes	Nurturing Program % Indicating Yes
Share advice about school matters	64.7	42.1
Share advice about raising children	64.7	60.5
Share advice about other matters	47.1	51.3
Help each other with tasks, errands, services	41.2	25.0
Baby-sitting	23.5	13.2
Give each other emotional support	35.3	50.0
Do fun things together	35.3	38.1
Other	17.6	14.5

Table 8: Survey Respondent's Report of Own Activities

Have you gotten involved in any of the following activities? (Please check all that apply.)	FAST Program % Indicating Yes	Nurturing Program % Indicating Yes
A part-time job	11.8	22.7
A full-time job	11.8	22.7
Volunteer organization	47.1	37.3
Further education (G.E.D., M.A.T.C., training, and so on)	29.4	34.7
Community center activities	29.4	17.3
Church involvement	47.1	29.3
Counseling for you or your children	35.3	26.7
AODA Treatment/Alcoholics Anonymous	0	2.7
Parent/Teacher Organization	11.8	16.0
Other Activity	5.9	22.7

Table 9: Survey Respondent's Report of Volunteer Activity

Type of Volunteer Organization	FAST Program % Indicating Yes	Nurturing Program % Indicating Yes
None	64.7	81.8
Church	5.9	0
MATC	5.9	0
PTO	5.9	0
School	17.6	2.6
Alzheimer's Caregiver Training	0	1.3
Entrepreneur Program	0	1.3
Coach	0	1.3
Continuation Group	0	1.3
Had a job	0	1.3
Family concerns	0	2.6
Nurturing Program Facilitator	0	1.3
Other agency	0	1.3
Support Group	0	2.6
Talk on phone	0	1.3
Still do	0	1.3

Table 10: Survey Respondent's Report on Training and Facilitation Activities

	FAST Program % Indicating Yes	Nurturing Program % Indicating Yes	TOTAL % Indicating Yes
Have you attended Facilitator Training?	23.5	40.3	37.2
If you answered "No" above, would you like to be trained?	25.0	25.4	25.3
Have you facilitated Parenting Program?	18.7	32.5	30.1
Have you been a Lead Facilitator in the Nurturing Program?	N/A	10.5	9.7
Facilitated Adult Group	11.8	6.6	7.5
Facilitated Children's Group	0.0	25.0	20.4
Have you attended Nurturing Program Facilitator Training a second time as Leadership Development?	N/A	11.8	10.8

N/A - Not Applicable

Table 11: Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Survey Respondent's Report on Themselves, Children and Family

		FAST Program	Nurturing Program
Has your relationship with your child(ren) changed?	Mean	2.00	1.74
	SD	.93	.64
Are you more involved with your child(ren)'s school?	Mean	2.18	2.20
	SD	1.01	.84
Is your child(ren) doing better in school?	Mean	1.71	2.03
	SD	.47	.73
Do you feel your child(ren) has higher self-esteem?	Mean	2.19	2.00
	SD	.83	.66
Do you feel your own self-esteem is higher?	Mean	2.25	1.97
	SD	1.00	.75
*Do you use physical punishment more or less with your child(ren)?	Mean	3.91	4.43
	SD	1.14	.89
Do you have a better knowledge and awareness of the negative effects of alcohol and drug abuse on children?	Mean	1.81	2.18
	SD	.65	.85

***This item Reverse Scored**

Note: Mean is the average score across all respondents. Scores can range from a "high" of 1 to a "low" of 5. The exception to this scoring pattern is physical punishment item where reverse scoring was used. Physical Punishment scores can range from a "high" of 5 to a "low" of 1.

Table 12: Means Scores and Standard Deviations for Survey Respondent's Effect of Facilitator Training on Self-Reports on Themselves, Children and Families

		FAST Program		Nurturing Program	
		Yes Facilitator	No Facilitator	Yes Facilitator	No Facilitator
Has your relationship with your child(ren) changed?	Mean	2.25	1.91	1.48	1.93*
	SD	1.25	.83	.69	.55
Are you more involved with your child(ren)'s school?	Mean	1.25	2.46**	2.03	2.31
	SD	.5	.97	.91	.77
Is your child(ren) doing better in school?	Mean	1.75	1.69	1.86	2.13
	SD	.5	.48	.75	.70
Do you feel your child(ren) has higher self-esteem?	Mean	1.67	2.31	1.93	2.05
	SD	.58	.85	.65	.68
Do you feel your own self-esteem is higher?	Mean	1.67	2.38	1.80	2.09
	SD	.58	1.04	.80	.70
Do you use physical punishment more or less with your child(ren)? <i>NOTE: Reversed Scored</i>	Mean	N/A	3.91	4.42	4.45
	SD	N/A	1.13	.97	.82
Do you have a better knowledge and awareness of the negative effects of alcohol and drug abuse on children?	Mean	1.33	1.92	1.87	2.39
	SD	.58	.64	.86	.78

*Significant $p < .01$

**Significant $p < .05$

Note: Mean is the average score across all respondents. Scores can range from a "high" of 1 to a "low" of 5. The exception to this scoring pattern is physical punishment item where reverse scoring was used. Physical Punishment scores can range from a "high" of 5 to a "low" of 1.

Table 13: Effect of Facilitator Training on Survey Respondent's Self-Report on Education and Employment

		FAST Program (N = 17)		Nurturing Program (N = 77)	
		Yes Facilitator	No Facilitator	Yes Facilitator	No Facilitator
Further Education	Response - Yes	50.0%	23.6%	41.9%	29.5%
	Response - No	50.0%	76.9%	58.1%	70.5%
*Part-Time Employment	Response - Yes	50.0%	0%	35.5%	13.6%
	Response - No	50.0%	100.0%	64.5%	86.4%
Full-Time Employment	Response - Yes	25.0%	7.7%	25.8%	20.5%
	Response - No	75.0%	92.3%	74.2%	79.5%

*Significant Chi Square test at $p < .05$ for FAST and Nurturing Program

Table 14: Effect of Facilitator Training on Survey Respondent's Self-Report on Decision Not To Use Physical Punishment

I had already made the decision prior to the Nurturing Program not to use physical punishment with my child(ren).	FAST Program (N = 17)		Nurturing Program (N = 77)	
	Yes Facilitator	No Facilitator	Yes Facilitator	No Facilitator
Response - Yes	100.0%	30.8%	35.5%	37.0%
Response - No	0%	69.2%	64.5%	63.0%

*Significant Chi Square test at $p < .05$ for FAST only

Table 15

***FAMILY NURTURING CENTER OF MILWAUKEE AND EASTERN WISCONSIN
FAMILY SERVICE OF MILWAUKEE***

NURTURING PROGRAM

Helen Bader Foundation Follow-up Survey Grant

Total Number of Parent Graduates in Follow-up Survey Grant: 217

English-Speaking Nurturing Program Parent Graduates

Number of Completed Surveys, prior to July 1, 1995 40

Number of No Responses to Contact, prior to July 1, 1995 29

Number of Completed Surveys, since July 1, 1995 22

Number of No Responses to Contact, since to July 1, 1995 13*

*We were successful in obtaining two surveys from this group through suggestions made by Mr. Pietrykowski.

Total Number of Parent Graduates in Process 59

Spanish and English-Speaking FT Parent Graduates

Number of Completed Surveys, prior to July 1, 1995 4

Number of No Responses to Contact, prior to July 1, 1995 0

Number of Completed Surveys, since to July 1, 1995 11

Number of No Responses to Contact, since to July 1, 1995 0

Total Number of Parent Graduates in Process 37

Note: A number of methods (telephone calls, letters, home-visits, etc.) for surveying the parent graduates are attempted before they are deemed *No Response to Contact*.

Table 16

Each written response was coded and then sorted into similar categories. The results of this analysis found responses fell into the following categories (listed in order of decreasing emphasis, based upon the number of times it appeared).

Social

The group environment fosters the development of feelings of security, safety, respect, support, trust, comfort, etc. for parents who are often socially isolated, live in poverty and are victims of society.

The parents expressed feelings of trust and comfort that their children were well cared for and were learning Nurturing Program concepts.

Examples:

"More than a parenting program."

"The Nurturing Program didn't judge me."

"Knowing that parents share the same struggles."

"Being with people who care about children."

Self-Nurturing Skills

Improvement of parents ability to believe in themselves and to use their self-awareness to meet their own needs (social, physical, intellectual, creative, emotional and spiritual) in positive ways. This process enables parents to free up positive energy to meet the needs of their children.

Examples:

"The Nurturing Program helped me to shape my children's future in positive ways."

"Learned how to be able to get back on track."

"Fortunate to have children in my home."

"I believe in myself."

"I am not so different from other parents."

"Taught me how to have a better relationship with my son than I did with my father."

"I am more comfortable as a person and parent."

Behavior Management Techniques

Techniques that parent can use to replace hitting and yelling their children and empower their children manage their own behavior.

Examples

"Child now knows how to take a time-out."

"Hitting a child only lasts while pain is present and the behavior returns to misbehaving."

"Increase awareness about son's feelings about being hit."

"Kids don't understand why they are being whooped."

"Now I don't use physical punishment at all."

"There are many ways to handle conflict."

"I realize that kids have feelings too."

Parent/Child Relationship

Parents reported increase quality time spent with their children, improved communication between family members and consistent use of Nurturing Program techniques.

Examples:

"We developed a hand signal for I love you."

"Our family is closer because of the Nurturing Program."

"We need to talk to each other, we are not mind readers."

"Now we talk as a family."

"Kids still talk about Nurturing."

"When kids see parents at school they feel stronger."