

# Assessment of a Parenting Education Program: Preventing Child Abuse and Neglect in At-Risk Families through Parent Education and Support

Author: Kerry O'Rourke

Persistent link: <http://hdl.handle.net/2345/3922>

This work is posted on [eScholarship@BC](#),  
Boston College University Libraries.

---

Boston College Electronic Thesis or Dissertation, 2014

Copyright is held by the author, with all rights reserved, unless otherwise noted.

Assessment of a Parenting Education Program: Preventing Child Abuse and Neglect in At-Risk  
Families through Parent Education and Support

Kerry O'Rourke  
William F. Connell School of Nursing  
Boston College  
Senior Honors Thesis  
Faculty Advisor: Anne Wolbert Burgess, D.N.Sc., RNCS, FAAN  
May 2014

Copyright, Kerry O'Rourke

© 2014

All Rights Reserved

### Abstract

Child abuse and neglect in the United States is a highly sensitive issue. According to federal statistics, 1,640 children died from child abuse and neglect in the United States during the fiscal year 2012 (U.S. DHHS et al., 2013). There are multiple theories on how to prevent abuse and protect children from maltreatment. Experts in the field of child welfare believe a critical element in the prevention of child abuse and neglect is parenting education and support services for at-risk populations.

The twofold purpose of this study was to assess the effectiveness of a parenting education program offered at Saint Joseph Parenting Center (SJPC) in Stamford, CT in promoting positive parenting behaviors through parenting education and to assess the level of client satisfaction with the teachers, staff, and overall experience at SJPC. The study analyzed data from surveys given to SJPC clients between April 19, 2010 and February 13, 2013. The sample consisted of 63 registered clients who completed at least ten classes before February 13, 2013. All 63 clients completed the client survey after completing ten classes and 42 clients completed the same survey a second time after completing twenty classes. Results from frequency analysis of the data indicated a reported increase in positive parenting behaviors since beginning the program and a reported decrease in negative parenting behaviors. An analysis of variance failed to reveal a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the 10-class and 20-class surveys. Frequency analysis of the surveys indicated a positive review of the teachers, staff, and overall experience at SJPC by clients. Limitations of the study and suggestions for further research are discussed.

## Table of Contents

Abstract.....	iii
Table of Contents.....	iv
Part I: Purpose, Background, & Significance.....	5
Purpose.....	5
Background & Significance.....	5
Part II: Literature Review.....	8
Part III: Method.....	10
Participants.....	10
Procedures.....	11
Measures.....	12
Part IV: Results.....	13
Data Profile.....	13
Data Analysis.....	14
Part V: Discussion.....	20
Limitations.....	24
Implications for Further Research.....	26
Conclusion.....	27
References.....	29
Tables.....	31
Appendix A: SJPC Class Topics.....	34
Appendix B: SJPC Client Survey.....	35
Appendix C: Protective Factors Survey.....	38

Assessment of a Parenting Education Program: Preventing Child Abuse and Neglect in At-Risk Families through Parent Education and Support

**Part I: Purpose, Background, & Significance**

**Purpose**

The purpose of this study was to assess the effectiveness of Saint Joseph Parenting Center in promoting positive parenting behaviors through parenting education and to assess the level of client satisfaction with the overall experience at SJPC, the teachers, and the staff.

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of SJPC in providing parenting education and support to their clients, two research questions were addressed:

1. Will participants report an increase in positive parenting behaviors and a decrease in negative parenting behaviors after attending ten parenting education classes? Will the participants report improved parenting behaviors after attending twenty classes? Additionally, will there be a statistically significant difference between the mean scores from the 10-class surveys and the 20-class surveys?
2. Will participants report that their experience with SJPC classes, teachers, and staff has been positive?

**Background & Significance**

The problem of child neglect and abuse is one of the most sensitive and high profile social issues in the United States. The United States Department of Health and Human Services (U.S. DHHS) reported that, in the fiscal year 2012, there were 686,000 child victims of abuse or neglect nationally and 1,640 child fatalities from abuse or neglect nationally (U.S. DHHS et al., 2013). The estimated lifetime economic burden of child maltreatment is \$124 billion annually, when including the effects of criminal activity conducted by individuals subjected to neglect and

abuse as children and lost productivity of individuals within the criminal justice system who were subjected to neglect and abuse as children. (Fang, Brown, Florence, & Mercy, 2012). The cycle of abuse that pervades generations is difficult to break because parenting skills are, to a large extent, a learned behavior modeled within the family unit. Experts in the field of child welfare believe a critical element in the prevention of child abuse and neglect is parent education and support services for at-risk populations.

**Saint Joseph Parenting Center.** Saint Joseph Parenting Center (SJPC), founded in 2009 as a 501(c)(3) non-sectarian organization located in Stamford, CT, provides free parenting education and support for parents of at-risk families in a community-based group setting. SJPC is a replication of an original community-based parent education model for child maltreatment prevention that was founded in Akron, OH in 2002<sup>1</sup> (Saint Joseph Parenting Center, 2014).

SJPC's mission is "to strengthen families who are at risk of abusing/neglecting their children through parenting education" (SJPC, 2014). The center aims "to equip parents through education to change unhealthy parenting patterns and to foster healthy ones in an effort to decrease the incidence of child abuse and/or neglect" (SJPC, 2014). SJPC strives to provide parents of at-risk families with the knowledge and tools to become more productive individuals, caring parents, and responsible members of society in an effort to break the cycle of child abuse and neglect.

Before being accepted into the program, each client undergoes an entry interview that provides a detailed history of the client's background, including strengths, needs and any involvement with social service or court agencies. Next, parents are enrolled in an individualized parenting education program consisting of classes instructed in group settings. SJPC offers over

---

<sup>1</sup> SJPC-Akron closed in the 2000s due to lack of funding.

30 two-hour parent education classes specific to children's developmental and behavioral needs, as well as classes on life skills to assist the parent with everyday stresses of their life (See Appendix A for a list of SJPC class topics). Volunteer instructors, who are experts in their field, teach the classes. All classes are offered in English and Spanish. Additionally, the DAD (Dads Are the Difference) Program is exclusively for fathers. It promotes responsible fatherhood and positive outcomes for their children. Saint Joseph Parenting Center's model includes a series of incentives. There are two categories of incentives at SJPC: participation and achievement. Parents are given a warm meal during class and a bag of groceries to bring home to their children at the end of class as an incentive to attend class and participate. Upon completing ten classes, parents may choose a small gift for their child, such as books, an activity or game, or diapers and wipes. After completing twenty classes, the client has graduated from the parenting education program. Upon graduating the program, parents may choose a larger incentive gift for their child such as a car seat, stroller, youth bed, or desk. After completing twenty classes, the client is given an exit interview and, if appropriate, SJPC will report to the social service or court agency with which the client is involved. In addition to the free parenting education and incentive program, SJPC offers its clients free counseling and free referrals to outside resources including employment programs, legal assistance, and educational opportunities (SJPC, 2014).

The program is available to any individual with children ranging in age from birth through age twelve. Clients are referred to SJPC through several channels: Connecticut's Department of Children and Families (DCF), the Connecticut Criminal Court system, community-based non-governmental organizations, and personal referrals. SJPC offers open enrollment so clients can register at any time or as the need arises. Clients are encouraged to use

the counseling and referral services any time until their children reach the age of twelve, even after completing the 20-class education program (SJPC, 2014).

## **Part II: Literature Review**

Prevention of child maltreatment is most effective when the efforts are channeled towards strengthening parents' and societies' capacities to care for children's health and well-being. There are several broad theories that explain the relationship between specific individuals or environmental conditions and child abuse. These theories can be used to shape prevention efforts. Daro and Donnelly (2002) identified four general theoretical frameworks:

1. The psychodynamic theory suggests that parents who better understand themselves and their roles as parents are less abusive;
2. The learning theory suggests that specific knowledge about how to best care for children decreases the incidence of abuse and neglect;
3. The environmental theory suggests that parents are less abusive if they have greater resources, material or social, available to them; and,
4. The ecological theory suggests that a network of services or supports that can compensate for individual, situational, and environmental shortcomings decreases the incidence of child maltreatment.

It is important to incorporate all of the above theories into an intervention program for parents at-risk of neglecting and/or abusing their children. For example, if you give parents knowledge about child development and expectations for their behavior without also providing the parents with resources to deal with life stressors, the intervention would not be as effective as another intervention that offers both services.

Efforts to enhance parents' capacities to better care for children's health and well-being fall into three broad categories: public education and awareness efforts, in-home visitation programs for new parents, and parenting education and support services for at-risk parents (Daro & Donnelly, 2002). Public education and awareness through the media aim to mobilize the public by creating awareness, improving knowledge about child maltreatment, changing attitudes, and changing behavior of those who abuse or neglect children. Home visits that provide parenting education individually to new parents have been found to produce significant and substantial impacts on parenting behavior and child health and well-being.

The third category, group- and center-based interventions, target at-risk populations and offer parenting education and support services in order to increase parental knowledge, skills, and capacity. Most group- and center-based interventions incorporate all four theoretical frameworks into the development of their program. Firstly, these programs provide specific knowledge about how to best care for children. Secondly, the programs are unique in that they allow parents the opportunity to share experiences, concerns, and solutions. Parents can explore their role as parents and better understand themselves through discussion with counselors, staff, teachers, or other parents. Lastly, group or center-based intervention programs can provide additional resources to clients; for example, employment or housing referral services.

It is important to recognize the risk factors that put individuals at risk of neglecting or abusing their children, or that put the child at risk of being neglected or abused. By identifying common risk factors, early interventions can be implemented with at-risk populations in an effort to prevent child maltreatment before it becomes an issue for that family. Almost all identified risk factors are related to the amount of stress they generate. When parents are stressed, their risk for maltreatment is significantly higher (Barth, 2009). There are external life stressors, or

environmental stressors, and internal life stressors, or parental and child risk factors. External stressors include poverty, unemployment, single parenthood, social isolation, violent communities, and a history of intergenerational corporal punishment (Bolen, McWey, & Schlee, 2008). The parental risk factors include mental illness, substance abuse, poor impulse control, and a history child abuse or neglect as a child. Child risk factors include disabilities, chronic illness, developmental delays, and difficult temperaments or misconduct problems. Additionally, infants and toddlers are more likely to suffer abuse or neglect (McCoy & Keen, 2009). While child maltreatment often occurs in families that have multiple risk factors present, that does not mean that families with one or more of these factors present always result in child maltreatment. On a similar note, child maltreatment can occur in families without any risk factors present. Child maltreatment occurs across socio-economic, religious, cultural, and ethnic groups.

Saint Joseph Parenting Center is an example of a center-based intervention that provides parenting education and additional supports to at-risk populations in group settings. The following sections will assess the effectiveness of SJPC as an intervention to enhance and strengthen parents' capacities to care for their children's health and well-being.

### **Part III: Methods**

#### **Participants.**

Out of 200 registered clients at Saint Joseph Parenting Center in Stamford, CT who had the opportunity to participate in the study between April 19, 2010 and February 13, 2013, 63 completed the study survey after completing ten classes and 42 of the 63 participants completed the same survey after attending twenty classes. Of the 200 potential participants, 137 did not complete ten classes before the survey was discontinued on February 13, 2013 and therefore could not participate in the study. Of the 63 who completed the 10-class survey, 21 did not attend

twenty classes before the survey was discontinued and therefore could not complete the 20-class survey. Reasons for not attending Saint Joseph Parenting Center classes include time conflicts with other court ordered or DCF-recommended services such as therapy, substance abuse programs, or in-home parenting services; time conflicts with jobs and/or school; difficulty finding child care; sickness; and, although rarely, incarceration (L. Goodman, personal communication, April 22, 2014).

### **Procedures.**

The Office for Research Protections (ORP) granted this study exemption from Boston College IRB Review. The study used pre-existing data in a protected database at Saint Joseph Parenting Center in Stamford, CT to assess the effectiveness of SJPC in promoting positive parenting behaviors through parenting education and to assess the level of client satisfaction. This was a minimal risk survey. The primary investigator obtained a “Letter of Access for Research” from the Executive Director of SJPC before applying for IRB exemption. ORP approved a total waiver of informed consent for this study based on the following conditions: 1. The research involves no more than “minimal risk;” 2. The waiver does not adversely affect the rights and welfare of the research participants; and, 3. The research could not practicably be carried out without the waiver.

In order to ensure subject and data confidentiality, the primary investigator signed a “Confidentiality Agreement” as required by SJPC protocol for volunteers and staff. Additionally, the primary investigator recorded the data in a way that the subjects could not be identified directly or through identifiers linked to the subject.

The primary investigator used IBM SPSS Statistics Version 21 to record and analyze the data.

**Measures.**

In 2010, the Executive Director of SJPC and several other employees including the Development Director, Finance Director, Director of Volunteers, and Case Manager developed a client survey to be distributed to clients after completing half of the parenting education program, or 10 classes, and after completing the entire program, or 20 classes (See Appendix B).

The survey consisted of three parts. The first part collected the following background information from the client: living situation, whether or not the client receives public assistance, employment status, DCF involvement, number and ages of children, and custody of the client's children.

The second part asked the client to respond to ten behavioral statements and rate how his/her behavior has or has not changed after ten or twenty classes. Eight of the statements describe positive parenting behaviors: "Read to my children," "Play with my children," "Talk to my children," "Listen to my children," "Set limits with my children," "Have dinner with my children," "Help my children with homework," and "Visit my children." Two statements describe negative parenting behaviors: "Hit my children" and "Yell at my children." For each item, participants were given the following options: less often (1), the same (2), more often (3), or not applicable (N/A).

The third part of the survey asked the participants to rate their level of agreement with a given statement on a 5-point Likert scale from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." The survey has four statements related to the satisfaction with the overall experience at SJPC, four statements related to the satisfaction with SJPC teachers, and four statements related to satisfaction with SJPC staff.

The first 10-class survey was completed on April 19, 2010. The 10- and 20-class surveys were last used on February 13, 2013. The surveys have since been discontinued and replaced with the Protective Factors Survey (PFS), an evaluation tool developed by the FRIENDS National Resource Center and the University of Kansas.

## **Part IV: Results**

### **Data Profile**

The information gathered from the first part of the client survey regarding client living situations and background is organized in Tables 1-7. Noteworthy findings from those tables are listed below:

- 38.1% of study participants reported living independently when completing the 10-class survey, compared to 57.1% when completing the 20-class survey (Table 1).
- 30.2% of participants reported living with relatives or friends after ten classes, compared to 21.5% after twenty classes (Table 1).
- The percentage of participants who reported living in shelters decreased from 12.7% of the participants completing the 10-class survey to 9.5% of participants completing the 20-class survey (Table 1).
- 31.7% of participants reported receiving public assistance when completing the 10-class survey, compared to 23.8% of participants completing the 20-class survey (Table 2).
- 39.7% of participants reported being employed when completing the 10-class survey, compared to 52.4% of participants completing the 20-class survey (Table 3).
- On the 10-class surveys, the percentages of reported open DCF cases and closed DCF cases were 50.8% and 28.6%, respectively. On the 20-class surveys, the percentages of open and closed DCF cases were 23.8% and 42.9%, respectively (Table 5).

Information on reunification and the number of children of the participants are not displayed in Tables 1-7. Two clients reported reunification on the 20-class survey compared to zero clients reporting unification on the 10-class survey.

The aggregate number of children of study participants who completed a 10-class survey was 120 children. Four of the sixty-three participants did not report the number of children they have on the 10-class survey which indicates that 120 is an underestimate of the actual number of children of study participants.

### **Data Analysis**

**Behavior questions.** Section two of the client survey asks the client to respond to ten behavioral statements and rate how his/her behavior has or has not changed after ten or twenty classes. The frequencies of responses from the 10-class surveys are described below for each statement because the 10-class surveys have a larger sample size. The responses from the 20-class surveys are not included to avoid adding weight to the responses from the 42 participants who completed both the 10 and 20-class surveys.

***Read to my children.*** Of the 63 responses, 27 (42.9%) participants reported that they read to their children more often than before starting the program, 17 (27.0%) reported they read to their children the same amount, 1 (1.6%) client reported less often, and 18 (28.6%) claimed that it was not applicable to them.

***Play with my children.*** Of the 63 responses, 45 (71.4%) participants reported that they play with their children more often than before starting the program, 11 (17.5%) reported they play with their children the same amount, and 7 (11.1%) reported not applicable.

***Talk to my children.*** Of the 63 responses, 48 (76.2%) participants reported that they talk to their children more often than before starting the program, 8 (12.7%) reported they talk to their children the same amount, and 7 (11.1%) reported not applicable.

***Listen to my children.*** Of the 63 responses, 43 (68.3%) participants reported that they listen to their children more often than before starting the program, 11 (17.5%) reported they listen to their children the same amount, and 9 (14.3%) reported not applicable.

***Set limits with my children.*** Of the 63 responses, 36 (57.1%) participants reported that they set limits with their children more often than before starting the program, 9 (14.3%) reported they set limits with their children the same amount, 2 (3.2%) reported less often, and 16 (25.4%) reported not applicable.

***Have dinner with my children.*** Of the 62 responses, 20 (32.3%) participants reported that they have dinner with their children more often than before starting the program, 20 (32.3%) reported they have dinner with their children the same amount, 2 (3.2%) reported less often, and 20 (32.3%) reported not applicable. There was one missing response.

***Help my children with homework.*** Of the 62 responses, 16 (25.8%) participants reported that they help their children with homework more often than before starting the program, 13 (21.0%) reported they help their children with homework the same amount, 2 (3.2%) reported less often, and 31 (50.0%) reported not applicable. There was one missing response.

***Visit my children.*** Of the 63 responses, 17 (27.0%) participants reported that they visit their children more often than before starting the program, 13 (20.6%) reported they visit their children the same amount, 1 (1.6%) reported less often, and 32 (50.8%) reported not applicable.

***Hit my children.*** Of the 62 responses, 1 (1.6%) participant reported that he or she hit his or her children more often than before starting the program, 13 (21.0%) reported they hit their children less often, and 31 (50.0%) reported not applicable. There was one missing response.

***Yell at my children.*** Of the 62 responses, 3 (4.8%) participants reported they yell at their children the same amount as before starting the program, 26 (41.9%) reported they yell at their children less often, and 33 (53.2%) reported not applicable. Nobody reported more often. There was one missing response.

***Comparison between 10- and 20-class surveys.*** The mean scores and standard deviations are listed in Table 8 for the ten behavioral questions. The mean was only calculated between those who responded with “less often,” “the same,” or “more often.” Those who did not respond or who reported “not applicable” were not calculated into the mean.

All of the mean scores for the positive parenting behaviors were greater than 2.0 for both the 10-class and 20-class surveys. In other words, the majority of study participants who did not report “not applicable” reported increased positive parenting behaviors after at least ten parenting education classes. All of the mean scores for the negative parenting behaviors were less than 2.0 for both the 10-class and 20-class surveys. Therefore, the majority of study participants who did not report “not applicable” reported decreased negative parenting behaviors after at least ten parenting education classes.

In order to evaluate whether there was a significant difference between the mean scores from the 10-class surveys and the 20-class surveys, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test was performed with the data from Table 8. The null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) states that the number of classes completed does not have an effect on the mean scores. The alternative hypothesis ( $H_1$ ) states that the number of classes completed does have an effect on the mean scores.  $H_0$  cannot be

rejected. There were no statistically significant differences between the 10-class surveys and the 20-class surveys ( $p = 0.992, 0.784, 0.332, 0.465, 0.188, 0.207, 0.662, 0.831, 0.888, 0.422$ ).

***Other significant findings.*** A one-way ANOVA test also determined that there was a statistically significant difference in the mean scores of “Since I came to SJPC, I visit my children...” in 10-class surveys between groups ( $F = 3.878, p = 0.033$ ). A Dunnett T3 post-hoc test revealed that clients with open DCF cases reported significantly higher scores on how often they visit their children ( $2.70 \pm 0.470, p = 0.000$ ) than clients who did not report being involved with DCF ( $2.00 \pm 0.000$ ). There were no statistically significant differences between clients who reported open DCF cases and those who reported closed DCF cases ( $p = 0.480$ ) or between clients who reported closed DCF cases and those who did not report any involvement with DCF ( $p = 0.697$ ).

***SJPC satisfaction questions.*** The third section of the client survey asked the participants to rate their level of agreement with twelve statements regarding satisfaction with the parenting center, its teachers, and its staff on a 5-point Likert scale from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.” The frequencies of responses from the 10-class surveys are described below for each statement.

***SJPC has been helpful.*** Of the 62 responses, 47 (75.8%) participants reported they strongly agree with the statement and 15 (4.2%) reported they agree. There was one missing response.

***Class topics relate to my situation.*** Of the 62 responses, 34 (54.8%) participants reported they strongly agree with the statement, 24 (38.7%) reported they agree, 3 (4.8%) reported no opinion, and 1 (1.6%) reported they disagree. There was one missing response.

***I now have more confidence as a parent.*** Of the 62 responses, 42 (67.7%) participants reported they strongly agree with the statement, 17 (27.4%) reported they agree, and 3 (4.8%) reported no opinion. There was one missing response.

***SJPC has taught me to be a better parent.*** Of the 62 responses, 42 (67.7%) participants reported they strongly agree with the statement, 18 (29.0%) reported they agree, and 2 (3.2%) reported no opinion. There was one missing response.

***SJPC teachers were caring and compassionate.*** Of the 63 responses, 45 (71.4%) participants reported they strongly agree with the statement, 17 (27.0%) reported they agree, and 1 (1.6%) reported no opinion.

***SJPC teachers were organized.*** Of the 63 responses, 46 (73%) participants reported they strongly agree with the statement and 17 (27.0%) reported they agree.

***SJPC teachers were understandable.*** Of the 62 responses, 51 (82.3%) participants reported they strongly agree with the statement, 10 (16.1%) reported they agree, and 1 (1.6%) reported no opinion. There was one missing response.

***SJPC teachers were knowledgeable in their area.*** Of the 63 responses, 51 (81.0%) participants reported they strongly agree with the statement and 12 (19%) reported they agree.

***SJPC staff was supportive.*** Of the 63 responses, 51 (81.0%) participants reported they strongly agree with the statement and 12 (19%) reported they agree.

***SJPC staff was caring and compassionate.*** Of 63 responses, 51 (81.0%) participants reported they strongly agree with the statement, 11 (17.5%) reported they agree, and 1 (1.6%) reported no opinion.

***SJPC staff was knowledgeable.*** Of 63 responses, 52 (82.5%) participants reported they strongly agree with the statement and 11 (17.5%) reported they agree.

***SJPC staff was available.*** Of the 63 responses, 51 (81.0%) participants reported they strongly agree with the statement and 12 (19%) reported they agree.

***Comparison between 10- and 20-class surveys.*** The mean scores and standard deviations are listed in Table 9 for the twelve satisfaction questions. All of the mean scores were greater than 4.5 except for one item. “Class topics relate to my situation” received a mean of score of 4.47 in the 10-class surveys and 4.38 in the 20-class surveys. The majority of study participants either agreed or strongly agreed with all of the satisfaction statements.

A one-way ANOVA test was performed with the data from Table 9. The null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) stated that the number of classes completed does not have an effect on the mean scores. The alternative hypothesis ( $H_1$ ) stated that the number of classes completed does have an effect on the mean scores.  $H_0$  cannot be rejected. There were no statistically significant differences between the 10-class surveys and the 20-class surveys ( $p = 0.696, 0.542, 0.880, 0.501, 0.087, 0.719, 0.746, 0.768, 0.335, 0.159, 0.259, 0.187$ ).

***Other significant findings.*** A one-way ANOVA test determined that there was a statistically significant difference in mean scores of agreement of the statement, “SJPC has taught me to be a better parent,” in 10-class surveys between groups ( $F = 3.012, p = 0.037$ ). A Tukey post-hoc test revealed that study participants who reported that the custody of their children was with relatives reported significantly higher score of agreement ( $4.83 \pm 0.383, p = 0.028$ ) than participants who reported that their children were in foster care ( $4.22 \pm 0.667$ ). There were no statistically significant differences between “self” and “relative” ( $p = 0.998$ ) or between “self” and “foster care” ( $p = 0.999$ ).

### **Part V: Discussion**

Overall, the results of the study indicated positive outcomes regarding the effectiveness of the parenting education program at Saint Joseph Parenting Center in promoting positive parenting behaviors and the overall satisfaction with the center, the teachers, and the staff.

When examining the data profile of the study participants and the differences in the profile between the 10-class surveys and the 20-class surveys, several important observations can be made. Firstly, the percentage of study participants living independently was greater after twenty classes than the percentage after ten classes. The percentage of participants living with family or friends or in shelters decreased between ten classes and twenty classes. Secondly, the percentage of participants who reported receiving public assistance decreased between ten classes and twenty classes. Thirdly, the percentage of study participants who reported being employed was greater after twenty classes than after ten classes. There are a couple possible explanations for the changes in the client profile. One explanation is that, during the time between completing ten and twenty classes, there was a pattern of clients finding independent housing and jobs when they previously did not have independent housing or jobs. The second explanation is that clients who live independently, don't receive public assistance, and/or are employed are more likely to stay enrolled in the parenting education program or are more likely to complete the twenty classes at a faster pace. In this case, the clients who live independently, don't receive public assistance, and/or have jobs would disproportionately affect the profile of those completing 20-class surveys in comparison to the population completing 10-class surveys. Assuming that the first explanation is true and there was a pattern of finding independent housing and jobs between ten and twenty classes, the study findings are consistent with findings from the literature review.

Among the most notable outcomes of center-based parenting education programs, Daro and Donnelly (2002) reported there was evidence of higher employment rates, less welfare dependency, and more extensive use of social supports. The findings from this study also indicated that the program at SJPC, which included parenting education and additional resources, led to increased employment rates and decreased dependence on public assistance. One contributing factor to this pattern of SJPC clients finding independent housing and jobs while attending SJPC classes is the additional counseling and referral services that SJPC offers its clients for free.

Another change in the data profile between ten and twenty classes was the current involvement with Connecticut's Department of Children and Families (DCF). The percentage of study participants who reported open DCF cases was greater at ten classes than twenty classes. The percentage of participants who reported closed DCF cases was less at ten classes than twenty classes. Furthermore, there were two reported cases of reunification among the clients completing the 20-class survey as compared to zero reported cases of reunification among the clients completing the 10-class survey. The most likely explanation for this difference is simply the increased amount of time that the clients who completed both 10- and 20-class surveys were in the program as the DCF case was simultaneously being reviewed.

The analysis of the second part of the client survey regarding parenting behaviors revealed a reported increase in positive parenting behaviors and a reported decrease in negative parenting behaviors. The majority of study participants who did not report "not applicable" to the behavior items reported increased positive parenting behaviors after at least ten parenting education classes. Additionally, the majority of study participants who did not report "not applicable" to the two negative parenting behavior items reported decreased negative parenting

behaviors after at least ten parenting education classes. These findings are consistent with other research findings.

In the literature, there are several studies that evaluate the effectiveness of parenting education-focused interventions for at-risk populations by measuring the change in parenting behaviors after completion of the program. One study evaluated the effectiveness of a parenting program for low-income parents of children one to five years old offered through community-based family resource centers. The parenting program consisted of four segments. The first segment addressed how young children influence parents' thoughts and feelings. The second segment concentrated on parents' expectations of their children. The third and fourth segments focused on how the parent will respond to the child. Seventy-one mothers completed the program and showed significant decreases in their use of verbal and corporal punishment along with increases in nurturing behaviors (Nicholson, Brenner, & Fox, 1999).

Another study evaluated the effect of the American Psychological Association's ACT Raising Safe Kids (RSK) program on parenting outcomes. The parents participating in the program were trained in effective parenting including nonviolent discipline, child development, anger management, social problem-solving skills, and effects of media on children. The topics of the parent training in the ACT Raising Safe Kids program are similar to the class topics at Saint Joseph Parenting Center. Results of the study indicated improved nurturing and positive parenting behavior and lower rates of aggressive behavior towards children (Knox, Burkhart, & Cromly, 2013).

The positive parenting behavior statements that received the lowest mean scores were "I read to my children," "I have dinner with my children," "I help my children with homework," and "I visit my children." These items also had the highest percentages of "not applicable"

responses. Many clients may have responded “not applicable” to “Read to my children” and “Help my children with homework” due to illiteracy, which was not measured by this survey. Many clients’ children are under the custody of relatives or foster care, 27 out of 63 clients, which might explain why so many participants responded “not applicable” to “Have dinner with my children” and “Help my children with homework.” On the contrary, the high number of “not applicable” responses to “Visit my children” might be explained by the 24 of 63 clients who reported having custody of their children and therefore wouldn’t visit their children. The items with the highest percentages of “not applicable” responses were the two negative parenting behavior statements: “I hit my children” and “I yell at my children.” There are two possible explanations for this finding. First, study participants may have chosen not to provide an answer to these items because they are highly sensitive statements. Secondly, study participants may have chosen “not applicable” because they never participated in these negative behaviors before starting the parenting education program.

The data analysis of the third section of the survey revealed an overwhelming level of client satisfaction with the overall experience, staff, and teachers at SJPC. The item with the lowest mean score and to which one study participant responded “disagree” was “Class topics relate to my situation.” Saint Joseph Parenting Center believes in a holistic approach and offers a wide variety of classes with a range of topics from child development, to understanding substance abuse, to budget management. It is understandable that clients would feel that at least one class does not pertain to them. The staff and teachers at SJPC stress the idea of preventable situations. Knowledge on certain topics, such as sexual assault, might prove beneficial to the client in the future even if the client feels it is not applicable to them at the moment.

One of the most important findings from the third section of the client survey was that 60 of the 63 study participants responding to 10-class survey reported agreement with the statement “SJPC has taught me to be a better parent.” The goal of Saint Joseph Parenting Center’s parenting education program was “to equip parents through education to change unhealthy parenting patterns and to foster healthy ones in an effort to decrease the incidence of child abuse and/or neglect” (SJPC, 2014). According to the clients who self-reported that they agreed that SJPC has taught them to be a better parent, the parenting education program has met its goal.

### **Limitations of the Study**

There are several limitations to this study that must be discussed. This study was a pilot study started by the SJPC staff in 2010 because the staff recognized the need to evaluate the parenting education program. The client survey tool developed by SJPC employees in 2010 was not standardized or tested for psychometrics. The study lacked a baseline measurement from the client before the client started attending classes. Instead, the survey asked the clients to subjectively determine if they think they have changed their behaviors since enrolling in the program. Because SJPC employees collected the surveys anonymously to protect client confidentiality, it was impossible to match a client’s 20-class survey with his or her 10-class survey. This was a disadvantage to the study because the change from 10-class surveys to 20-class surveys could not be measured. If the surveys were collected in a way that surveys completed by the same person could be identified with each other, then paired samples t-tests could have been performed to measure the change in responses from the 10-class survey to the 20-class survey. The study had a small sample size of 63 participants with a 68.5% attrition rate from the 200 potential study participants. The research findings from this study cannot be applied to the general population.

The pilot surveys were discontinued on February 13, 2013 and replaced with the Protective Factors Survey (PFS), a standardized survey tool developed by the FRIENDS National Resource Center and the University of Kansas (See Appendix C). In a published, peer-reviewed study, the content validity, construct validity, and criterion validity were examined and evidence indicated that the PFS is a valid measure of multiple protective factors against child maltreatment (Counts, 2010). The staff at SJPC is currently distributing the PFS at intake, after completion of ten classes, and after graduating the program at twenty classes. The staff protects client confidentiality by assigning each client a number with which the surveys can be matched to each other but the client cannot be identified.

This study did not evaluate a link between Saint Joseph Parenting Center's parenting education program and the prevention of child maltreatment occurrence or recurrence. This limitation is not unique to this study. Johnson et al. (2008) synthesized outcome data from 58 parenting programs with families at-risk of child maltreatment. The review found that while the majority of studies describe some positive outcomes for participants in regards to parenting behavior, the link between parent education programs and the effective prevention of child maltreatment occurrence or recurrence is less well understood. Most studies, including this study, do not monitor these outcomes due to limitations in gathering data on the occurrence or recurrence of child maltreatment during or after the intervention. Despite these limitations, the positive outcomes for participants in the majority of these studies do suggest that parenting programs may be important mechanisms for preventing child abuse and neglect through changing aspects of the caregiving environment that can often lead to child maltreatment. The evidence base for parent education programs for at-risk families continues to grow and more recommendations can be made about promising programs.

**Implications for further research**

In order to better evaluate the parenting education program at Saint Joseph Parenting Center in its effectiveness in achieving its mission of strengthening families who are at risk of abusing and/or neglecting their children through parenting education and support, an analysis of the data collected from the Protective Factors Survey should be performed after generating an appropriate sample size. Since the PFS is an industry standard for assessing the risk for potential abuse/neglect, it is a reasonable measurement of outcome for the SJPC program.

The Protective Factors Survey is an evaluation tool developed by FRIENDS National Resource Center and the University of Kansas that assesses multiple protective factors against child abuse and neglect. The Strengthening Families Initiative, an initiative within the Center for the Study of Social Policy (CSSP), has identified five Protective Factors that decrease the likelihood of abuse and neglect and create healthy environments for the optimal development of all children:

1. Parental Resilience is the ability to cope and bounce back from all types of challenges;
2. Social Connections are friends, family members, neighbors, and other members of a community who provide emotional support and concrete assistance to parents;
3. Knowledge of Parenting and Child Development is accurate information about raising young children and appropriate expectations for their behavior;
4. Concrete Support in Times of Need is financial security to cover day-to-day expenses and unexpected costs that come up from time to time, access to formal supports like Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and Medicaid, and informal support from social networks; and,

5. Children's Social and Emotional Development is the ability to interact positively with others and communicate his or her emotions effectively (Counts, Buffington, Chang-Rios, Rasmussen, & Preacher, 2010).

The Protective Factors Survey measures four of the five protective factors. It does not measure the social and emotional competence of children. However, it does measure the parent's nurturing and attachment to their children, which is not included in the CSSP model of Protective Factors.

The Protective Factors Survey begins with a demographics section, which contains questions about the individual completing the survey, family composition, employment status, level of education, and any involvement with social services. Participants are then asked to respond to a series of twenty statements about their family using a seven-point frequency or agreement scale (Counts et al., 2010). Currently, SJPC is implementing the survey tool with a pre-post test design.

### **Conclusion**

The purpose of this study was to assess the effectiveness of the parenting education program at Saint Joseph Parenting Center in Stamford, CT in promoting positive parenting behaviors through parenting education and to assess the level of client satisfaction with the program. The results of the pilot study indicated a client-reported increase in positive parenting behaviors and a client-reported decrease in negative parenting behaviors after attending at least ten classes at SJPC. The results also indicated a high level of client satisfaction with the program. Since the conclusion of the pilot study, SJPC has adopted a new survey tool, the Protective Factors Survey, to continue to evaluate the effectiveness of the parenting education program in promoting protective factors in parents at-risk of abusing or neglecting their children.

Child maltreatment is preventable. Much can be done to prevent child abuse and neglect and the fatalities that result from child abuse and neglect. One way to reduce the harm done to children as a result of maltreatment is to provide parenting education and support to parents at-risk of abusing or neglecting their children. Saint Joseph Parenting Center strives to decrease the incidence of child abuse and/or neglect in Fairfield County, CT by strengthening the families who are at risk through parent education and support.

## References

- Barth, R. P. (2009). Preventing child abuse and neglect with parent training: evidence and opportunities. *The Future of Children, 19*(2), 95-118.
- Bolen, M. G., McWey, L. M., & Schlee, B. M. (2008). Are at-risk parents getting what they need? Perspectives of parents involved with child protective services. *Clinical Social Work Journal 36*, 341-354. doi: 10.1007/s10615-008-0173-1
- Counts, J. M. (2010). *A reliability and validity study of the protective factors survey to assess protective factors in families* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest LLC. (UMI 3390934)
- Counts, J. M., Buffington, E. S., Chang-Rios, K., Rasmussen, H. N., & Preacher, K. J. (2010). The development and validation of the protective factors survey: a self-report measure of protective factors against child maltreatment. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 34*(10), 762-722. doi: 10.1016/j.chiabu.2010.03.003
- Daro, D., & Donnelly, A. C. (2002). Child abuse prevention: accomplishments and challenges. In Briere et al. (Eds.), *The APSAC handbook on child maltreatment* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) (pp. 431-445). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Fang, X., Brown, D. S., Florence, C. S., & Mercy, J. A. (2012). The economic burden of child maltreatment in the United States and implications for prevention. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 36*(2), 156-165. doi: 10.1016/j.chiabu.2011.10.006
- Johnson, M. A., Stone, S., Lou, C., Ling, J., Ciaassen, J., & Austin, M. J. (2008). Assessing parent education programs for families involved with child welfare services. *Journal of Evidence-Based Social Work, 5*(1-2), 191-236. doi: 10.1300/J394v05n01\_08

- Knox, M., Burkhart, K., & Cromly, A. (2013). Supporting positive parenting in community health centers: the ACT Raising Safe Kids program. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 41(4), 395-407. doi: 10.1002/jcop.21543
- McCoy, M. L., Keen, S. M. (2009). Risk factors for child maltreatment. In *Child Abuse and Neglect* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) (pp. 19-29). Philadelphia, PA: Taylor and Francis Group, LLC.
- Nicholson, B. C., Brenner, V., & Fox, R. A. (1999). A community-based parenting program with low-income mothers of young children. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Human Services*, May-June 1999, 247-253.
- Saint Joseph Parenting Center. (2014). *Home page*. Retrieved from <http://www.sjpcenter.org/index.html>
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Administration on Children, Youth and Families, & Children's Bureau. (2013). *Child maltreatment 2012*. Retrieved from <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cb/resource/child-maltreatment-2012>

## Tables

Table 1.

<b>Living Situation</b>	10-Class Survey: Frequency (Percent)	20-Class Survey: Frequency (Percent)
Independent	24 (38.1%)	24 (57.1%)
Relatives	16 (25.4%)	7 (16.7%)
Friends	3 (4.8%)	2 (4.8%)
Shelter	8 (12.7%)	4 (9.5%)
Government Housing	5 (7.9%)	4 (9.5%)
Other	7 (11.1%)	1 (2.4%)
Total	63 (100%)	42 (100%)

Table 2.

<b>Receiving Public Assistance</b>	10-Class Survey: Frequency (Percent)	20-Class Survey: Frequency (Percent)
Yes	20 (31.7%)	10 (23.8%)
No OR Unanswered	43 (68.3%)	32 (76.2%)
Total	63 (100%)	42 (100%)

Table 3.

<b>Employment Status</b>	10-Class Survey: Frequency (Percent)	20-Class Survey: Frequency (Percent)
Yes	25 (39.7%)	22 (52.4%)
No OR Unanswered	38 (60.3%)	20 (47.6%)
Total	63 (100%)	42 (100%)

Table 4.

<b>In School</b>	10-Class Survey: Frequency (Percent)	20-Class Survey: Frequency (Percent)
High School	2 (3.2%)	1 (2.4%)
GED Program	2 (3.2%)	2 (4.8%)
College	5 (7.9%)	7 (16.7%)
Vocational School	1 (1.6%)	0 (0%)
Not in School OR Unanswered	53 (84.1%)	32 (76.2%)
Total	63 (100%)	42 (100%)

Table 5.

<b>DCF Involvement</b>	10-Class Survey: Frequency (Percent)	20-Class Survey: Frequency (Percent)
Open	32 (50.8%)	10 (23.8%)
Closed	18 (28.6%)	18 (42.9%)
Non-DCF OR Unanswered	13 (20.6%)	14 (33.3%)
Total	63 (100%)	42 (100%)

Table 6.

<b>Custody of Children: Beginning the Program</b>	10-Class Survey: Frequency (Percent)	20-Class Survey: Frequency (Percent)
Self	11 (17.5%)	17 (40.5%)
Relative	3 (4.8%)	13 (31.0%)
Foster Care	5 (7.9%)	5 (11.9%)
Unanswered	44 (69.8%)	7 (16.7%)
Total	63 (100%)	42 (100%)

Table 7.

<b>Custody of Children: Currently</b>	10-Class Survey: Frequency (Percent)	20-Class Survey: Frequency (Percent)
Self	24 (38.1%)	16 (38.1%)
Relative	18 (28.6%)	6 (14.3%)
Foster Care	9 (14.3%)	2 (4.8%)
Unanswered	12 (19.0%)	18 (42.9%)
Total	63 (100%)	42 (100%)

Table 8.

	10-Class Surveys		20-Class Surveys	
	N	Mean (Standard Deviation)	N	Mean (Standard Deviation)
<b>Since I Came To SJPC I...</b>				
Read to my children.	45	2.58 (0.543)	38	2.58 (0.552)
Play with my children.	56	2.80 (0.401)	41	2.78 (0.419)
Talk to my children.	56	2.86 (0.353)	41	2.78 (0.419)
Listen to my children.	54	2.80 (0.407)	41	2.73 (0.449)
Set limits with my children.	47	2.72 (0.540)	38	2.55 (0.645)
Have dinner with my children.	42	2.43 (0.590)	32	2.59 (0.499)
Help my children with homework.	31	2.45 (0.624)	23	2.52 (0.511)
Visit my children.	31	2.52 (0.570)	29	2.48 (0.634)
Hit my children.	11	1.18 (0.603)	9	1.22 (0.667)
Yell at my children.	29	1.10 (0.310)	20	1.20 (0.523)

Table 9.

	10-Class Surveys		20-Class Surveys	
	N	Mean (Standard Deviation)	N	Mean (Standard Deviation)
SJPC has been helpful.	62	4.76 (0.432)	42	4.71 (0.708)
Class topics relate to my situation.	62	4.47 (0.671)	42	4.38 (0.764)
I now have more confidence as a parent.	62	4.63 (0.579)	41	4.61 (0.703)
SJPC has taught me to be a better parent.	62	4.65 (0.546)	42	4.71 (0.457)
<b>SJPC Teachers were:</b>				
Caring and Compassionate.	63	4.70 (0.496)	41	4.85 (0.358)
Organized.	63	4.73 (0.447)	42	4.76 (0.431)
Understandable.	62	4.81 (0.438)	42	4.83 (0.377)
Knowledgeable in their area.	63	4.81 (0.396)	42	4.79 (0.415)
<b>SJPC Staff was:</b>				
Supportive.	63	4.81 (0.396)	42	4.88 (0.328)
Caring and Compassionate.	63	4.79 (0.446)	42	4.90 (0.297)
Knowledgeable.	63	4.83 (0.383)	42	4.90 (0.297)
Available.	61	4.81 (0.396)	40	4.90 (0.297)

## Appendix A: SJPC Class Topics



Strengthening Families Through Parent Education

### **Parenting Class Topics**

1. Parenting: Behavior & Discipline - Lesson #1 (ages 5-12)
2. Parenting: Behavior & Discipline - Lesson #2 (ages 5-12)
3. Parenting: Behavior & Discipline - Lesson #3 (ages 5-12)
4. Parenting: Behavior & Discipline - Lesson #4 (ages 5-12)
5. Parenting: Behavior & Discipline - Lesson #5 (ages 5-12)
6. Parenting: Behavior & Discipline - Lesson #6 (ages 5-12)
7. Parenting: Behavior & Discipline - Lesson #1 (ages 1-4)
8. Parenting: Behavior & Discipline - Lesson #2 (ages 1-4)
9. Parenting: Behavior & Discipline - Lesson #3 (ages 1-4)
10. Anger Management #1
11. Anger Management #2
12. Anger Management #3
13. Reading & Literacy: The Effects of Media on Children
14. Reading & Literacy: Reading & Creative Play
15. Bonding With Your Child & Shaken Baby Syndrome
16. Abuse and Violence in the Home: The Effect on Children
17. Understanding Substance Abuse
18. The Importance of Fathers
19. Health & First Aid: Child
20. Civic Responsibility - Child Safety - Home Safety
21. Budget & Time Management
22. Legal Issues
23. Effective Communication #1: Family, Workplace, Community
24. Effective Communication #2
25. Child Development
26. Nutrition and Healthy Living
27. Single Parenting and Blended Families
28. Self Esteem and Successful Parenting
29. Overview of Learning Differences
30. Understanding Sexual Abuse/Assault

## Appendix B: SJPC Client Survey



**Twenty Classes: Date \_\_\_\_\_**

**Great News! You have completed twenty of SJPC's classes! Please help us by answering the following questions. (Check one)**

**Living Situation**

Independent \_\_\_\_\_ Relatives \_\_\_\_\_ Friends \_\_\_\_\_ Shelter \_\_\_\_\_  
 Government Housing \_\_\_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_

**Employment/School**

Are you employed? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ Do you receive public assistance? Yes \_\_\_\_\_  
 Are you in school? High School \_\_\_\_\_ GED program \_\_\_\_\_ College \_\_\_\_\_ Vocational \_\_\_\_\_

**DCF Involvement**

Open Case \_\_\_\_\_ Closed Case \_\_\_\_\_ Reunified \_\_\_\_\_  
 Custody of Children at start of program: Self \_\_\_\_\_ Relative \_\_\_\_\_ Foster Care \_\_\_\_\_  
 Custody of Children now: Self \_\_\_\_\_ Relative \_\_\_\_\_ Foster Care \_\_\_\_\_  
 Number of children: \_\_\_\_\_ Ages: \_\_\_\_\_

**Favorite Class: \_\_\_\_\_ Favorite Instructor: \_\_\_\_\_**

**Directions:** Think about each statement and how your behavior may or may not have changed AFTER 20 classes. Circle the appropriate numbers or N/A if not applicable.

Since I Came To SJPC I...	<u>AFTER 20 classes at the Parenting Center</u>			
	Less	The Same	More Often	Not Applicable
1. Read to my children	1	2	3	n/a
2. Play with my children.	1	2	3	n/a
3. Talk to my children.	1	2	3	n/a
4. Listen to my children	1	2	3	n/a
5. Set limits with my children	1	2	3	n/a
6. Have dinner with my children	1	2	3	n/a
7. Help my children with homework	1	2	3	n/a
8. Visit my children	1	2	3	n/a
9. Hit my children	1	2	3	n/a
10. Yell at my children	1	2	3	n/a

How would you rate your level of agreement with the following:	My Overall Experience				
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
SJPC has been helpful	1	2	3	4	5
Class topics relate to my situation	1	2	3	4	5
I now have more confidence as a parent	1	2	3	4	5
SJPC has taught me to be a better parent	1	2	3	4	5
<b>SJPC teachers were:</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>No Opinion</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
Caring and Compassionate	1	2	3	4	5
Organized	1	2	3	4	5
Understandable	1	2	3	4	5
Knowledgeable in their area	1	2	3	4	5
<b>SJPC Staff was:</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>No Opinion</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
Supportive	1	2	3	4	5
Caring and Compassionate	1	2	3	4	5
Knowledgeable	1	2	3	4	5
Available	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix C: Protective Factors Survey

SJPC PROTECTIVE FACTORS INTAKE FORM



Name: \_\_\_\_\_ ID#: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Address: \_\_\_\_\_ Apt#: \_\_\_\_\_  
 City: \_\_\_\_\_ State: \_\_\_\_\_ Zip: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Email: \_\_\_\_\_ Home Phone: \_\_\_\_\_ Cell Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

**SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION**

Date survey completed: \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_ Pre Test Post Test

1. How was the survey completed?  
 Completed in face to face interview  
 Completed by participant with program staff available to explain items as needed  
 Completed by participant without program staff present

2. Has the participant had any involvement with Child Protective Services?  
 No Yes Not Sure

3. Date participant began program (completed for pretest) \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_

4. Date participant completed program (complete at posttest) \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_

5. Type of Services: Select services that most accurately describe what the participant is receiving.  
 Parent Education  
 Fatherhood Program

6. Participant's Attendance: (Estimate if necessary)  
 a. Answer at Present: Number of hours of service offered to the consumer: \_\_\_\_\_  
 b. Answer at Post-test: Number of hours of service received by the consumer: \_\_\_\_\_

7. Link#: \_\_\_\_\_

8. Referred by: DCF CSF Malta Other: \_\_\_\_\_

9. Billable: DCF CSF

**SECTION II: DEMOGRAPHICS**

Date survey completed: \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_ Client ID#: \_\_\_\_\_

1. Sex: Male Female 2. Date of Birth: \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_

3. Race/Ethnicity: (Please choose the ONE that best describes what you consider yourself to be)  
 A Native American or Alaskan Native B Asian C African American  
 D African Nationals/Caribbean Islanders E Hispanic or Latino F Middle Eastern  
 G Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders H White (Non Hispanic/European American) I Multi-racial  
 J Other:

4. Marital Status:  
 A Married B Partnered C Single D Divorced E Widowed F Separated

5. Family Housing:  
 A Own B Rent C Shared housing with relatives/friends D Temporary\* E Homeless  
 [\* Temporary refers to shelter, temporary with friends/relatives]

6. Employment Status:  
 A Employed Full-Time B Employed Part-Time  
 C Unemployed, receiving unemployment benefits D Unemployed; no unemployment benefits

**SJPC PROTECTIVE FACTORS INTAKE FORM**

7. Please tell us about the number of persons in household and annual income.

Persons in Household	ANNUAL INCOME								
	Under \$11,490	\$11,490-\$15,510	\$15,511-\$19,530	\$19,531-\$23,550	\$23,551-\$27,570	\$27,571-\$31,590	\$31,591-\$35,610	\$35,611-\$43,650	More than \$43,650
1									
2									
3									
4									
5									
6									
7									
8									

8. Highest Level of Education:

- A Elementary or junior high school
- B Some high school
- C High school diploma or GED
- D Trade/Vocational Training
- E Some college
- F 2-year college degree (Associate's)
- G 4-year college degree (Bachelor's)
- H Master's degree

9. Which, if any, of the following do you currently receive? (Check all that apply)

- A Food Stamps/SNAP
- B Medicaid
- C WIC
- D Earned Income Tax Credit
- E SSI/Disability
- F HUSKY
- G Head Start/Early Head Start Services
- H Unemployment
- I None of the above
- J Other:

10. Please tell us who has custody of the children.

CHILDREN	GENDER		DOB	CUSTODY				
	M	F		A-Mother	B-Father	C-Grandparent	D-Foster parent	E-Other
1-								
2-								
3-								
4-								
5-								

11. Please tell us about the children living in your household.

	YOUR RELATIONSHIP TO CHILD (Check one)							Parent/Partner Name
	A-Birth parent	B-Adoptive parent	C-Grandparent	D-Sibling	E-Other relative	F-Foster parent	E-Other	
Child 1								
Child 2								
Child 3								
Child 4								
Child 5								

**SECTION III: PROTECTIVE FACTORS**

**PART A:** Please circle the number that describes how often the statements are true for you or your family. The numbers represent a scale from 1 to 7 where each of the numbers represents a different amount of time. The number 4 means that the statement is true about half the time.

	Never	Very Rarely	Rarely	About Half the Time	Frequently	Very Frequently	Always
1. In my family, we talk about problems.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. When we argue, my family listens to "both sides of the story."	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. In my family, we take time to listen to each other.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. My family pulls together when things are stressful.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. My family is able to solve our problems.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

**SJPC PROTECTIVE FACTORS INTAKE FORM**

**PART B:** Please circle the number that best describes how much you agree or disagree with the statement.

	Strongly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Mostly Agree	Strongly Agree
6. I have others who will listen when I need to talk about my problems.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. When I am lonely, there are several people I can talk to.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. I would have no idea where to turn if my family needed food or housing.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. I wouldn't know where to go for help if I had trouble making ends meet.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. If there is a crisis, I have others I can talk to.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. If I needed help finding a job, I wouldn't know where to go for help.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

**SECTION IV: CHILDREN**

**PART C:** This part of the survey asks about parenting and your relationship with your child. For this section, please focus on the child that you hope will benefit most from your participation in our services. Please write the child's age or date of birth and then answer questions with this child in mind.

Child's Age \_\_\_\_\_

DOB \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

	Strongly Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Mostly Agree	Strongly Agree
12. There are many times when I don't know what to do as a parent.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. I know how to help my child learn.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. My child misbehaves just to upset me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

**PART D:** Please tell us how often each of the following happens in your family.

	Never	Very Rarely	Rarely	About Half the Time	Frequently	Very Frequently	Always
15. I praise my child when he/she behaves well.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. When I discipline my child, I lose control.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. I am happy being with my child.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. My child and I are very close to each other.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. I am able to soothe my child when he/she is upset.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. I spend time with my child doing what he/she likes to do.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7