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ABSTRACT

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF PARENT-TEACHER ATTITUDES TOWARD FAMILY LIFE EDUCATION IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Sidney J. Flynn, B.A., B.S.W.
The University of Windsor
School of Social Work, 1975

This research was designed to analyze and compare the attitudes of parents and teachers toward various aspects of family life education in public schools and to examine factors associated with significant differences in attitudes among members within each group.

A random sample of 100 parents, geographically stratified, was selected from all the parents in Kent County, Ontario with at least one child attending one of the 32 elementary schools under the Kent County Board of Education. A random sample of 107 teachers was selected from all the teachers, including principals and vice-principals, employed by the same school board at the time of the study.

The data was collected by a questionnaire developed specifically for the study and standardized for both groups. Sixty-eight percent of the parents and 63.6 percent of the teachers responded. Responses were analyzed by computer using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, sub-programs, Codebook and Crosstabs.
The attitudes of the respondents toward the whole concept of family life education in public schools were characterized by consensus rather than differences. The findings reveal that the parents and teachers in Kent County, to the extent that the sample represents the general population, recognize the importance of family life education programs and strongly support the inclusion of such programs in the curricula of public schools from kindergarten to grade 13. All of the topics presented in the survey, including those that historically have been associated with much controversy and opposition, were considered by overwhelming majorities in both groups to be appropriate for school programs about family life. In addition, most of the topics were recommended for grades 8-10 or earlier.

Issues such as family privacy, the effect of sex education on young children, and parent-teacher value conflicts did not appear to be of concern to the majority of respondents.

Examination of factors associated with the few differences in attitudes noted, revealed no association between the responses of the members within each group and the 12 classification variables tested.

The overall findings of the study suggest that little opposition would be encountered from parents and teachers if attempts were made to implement an appropriately planned,
comprehensive family life program throughout the entire public school curriculum in Kent County, provided the suggestions and recommendations of parents and teachers are incorporated in the planning of such programs.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

More than forty years ago John B. Watson, the founder of the behaviorist school of psychology, and his followers predicted that marriage and the family as Americans knew it would be dead in fifty years. Since that time other psychologists such as David Cooper in his book The Death of the Family and numerous other writers of various academic backgrounds have leveled attacks on this ancient institution branding it the primary enemy of human individuality and the cause of many of our social and emotional ills. Despite the gloomy predictions and continuing attacks "the family" writes

1 The Watson prediction was cited by Bronislaw Malinowski in a debate with Robert S. Briffault in Marriage: Past and Present, ed. Ashley Montagu (Boston: Porter Sargent, 1956).


Fuchs, "although in serious trouble is still with us (and) remains the most universal of human institutions". ¹

According to many, the family is still with us primarily because it offers services to society that no other agency is prepared or equipped to offer. Dr. Reuben Hill writes that there is:

abundant proof that there is no repudiation of the basic business of families; namely reproduction, housing, feeding, socializing and guiding children from infancy to adulthood. Indeed the family is now more of a specialized agency concentrating on personality development of its members, providing warmth, love and sanctuary from the anonymity of urban existence, services no other agency in society is prepared to offer.²

The importance of these functions and their social implications are nowhere reflected more clearly than in the ever increasing cases of children whose families are not performing these functions adequately. Such cases reveal as well the reality that other social institutions are not adequately filling in where families are failing.


The remedial or treatment approach to family difficulty, although very necessary, can have a limited impact on the increasingly high rates of interpersonal and intrapersonal stress problems and breakdowns occurring in families. Beck outlines two major reasons why this may be so:

Firstly, the incidence of breakdown is so great and the shortage of therapeutic personnel so appalling that if we were to depend exclusively on individualized help we might as well give up now. Secondly, psychologically oriented individual treatment seems least helpful for those families who need it most . . . . Not only is it extremely difficult to help these families in this manner, but even if the social worker can help, a new family sickens for each one cured since the roots of the disease are not psychological.¹

In addition, there is the reality that treatment approaches can only help those families who present themselves for treatment or who are motivated to become involved in the treatment process. Unfortunately, this prerequisite excludes large numbers of families who are in various stages of difficulty or breakdown.

However, instead of writing its epitaph, many experts regard the problems faced by the family in a society undergoing rapid cultural, moral, social and technological change as indicative of a need to reinforce the family with more planned and systematic support, aid and encouragement than was necessary a few decades ago. Hill writes:

If greater stability of the family is ever to be assured, increasing the competence of young people in interpersonal relations and selecting people for marriage who are ready for parental responsibility must be undertaken much more systematically.\(^1\)

Beck cautions that such a program cannot be left to the family alone, primarily because:

The youngsters who most need to achieve competence in interpersonal relations can least learn it from their parents. The youngsters who most need help in mate selection have the poorest models in their parents . . . this means that education for family life as well as individual guidance should be found in the schools . . . where the family fails, or is likely to fail, the school must do the job, for it is the logical social institution to take up the task.\(^2\)

That family life education is one promising avenue for helping the family unit fulfill its potential is not a new idea. According to Dr. Elizabeth Force, "This grass roots movement is about fifty years old".\(^3\) In fact one of the recommendations adopted by the Canadian Youth Commission at a meeting in Toronto, June 15, 1946 was as follows:

That specific training for marriage and parenthood be introduced as an integral part of the educational programme. The subject matter relating to family life now taught in various courses, should be integrated to form one broad course in homemaking. It should be taught by specially qualified people, be available to boys as well as girls and include attention to child development and family relations. It is in this context that sex education should be taught. When teachers qualified for this work are not to be had, the

\(^1\)Hill, "American Family", pp. 99-100.


schools should make available good literature in the field.\textsuperscript{1}

Since then numerous other provincial committees and experts in the field, such as Dr. S. R. Laycock\textsuperscript{2} and Dr. Harry H. Guest,\textsuperscript{3} have recommended the need for such programs in Canadian schools.

Despite these and other recommendations, family life education courses, even as broadly defined in the 1968-69 Vanier study,\textsuperscript{4} "are not the norm in the Canadian schools . . . Sixty-eight percent . . . do not offer any FLE"\textsuperscript{5} Ontario was the most likely province to offer such courses but even there, 62 percent of the schools responding did not include such courses in their curricula.\textsuperscript{6}

\textsuperscript{1}The Canadian Youth Commission, \textit{Youth, Marriage and the Family} (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1947), pp. 196-97.


\textsuperscript{3}Harry H. Guest, "Why Our Schools Must Teach Family Life Education", \textit{The Manitoba Teacher} 45 (September-October 1966): 4-8.

\textsuperscript{4}For the purposes of the study, the Technical Advisory Committee on Family Life Education of the Vanier Institute approved the definition as follows: "Any activity by any group or medium aimed at imparting information concerning family relationships and providing the opportunity for people to approach their present and future family relationships with greater understanding". (Frederick Elkin, Foreword to \textit{Report of Family Life Education Survey: Part II: Family Life Education in the Schools} (Ottawa: The Vanier Institute of the Family, April 1971).

\textsuperscript{5}The Vanier Institute of the Family, \textit{Report of Family Life Education Survey: Part II: Family Life Education in the Schools} (Ottawa: The Vanier Institute of the Family, April 1971), Table 2 (hereafter cited as Vanier, \textit{Survey}).

\textsuperscript{6}Vanier, \textit{Survey}, Table 2.
study concluded that even though at the time of the survey only about one-third of the schools offered family life education as defined "The trend in general has been upwards, most of the programmes having begun in the last half dozen years".\(^1\) A survey of the curriculum guidelines of provincial Departments of Education in 1973 revealed that Alberta was the only province not having a curriculum guideline containing any family life education material. The Alberta Department of Education has taken the position that each community along with its educational institution should determine the role it should play in such education.\(^2\) However, the distance between family life education material in curriculum guidelines at secondary levels such as provincial Departments of Education and actual implementation into the curricula of individual schools is obviously very great as indicated in Hepworth's recent analysis:

> The fragmentary information available about family education programs in schools suggests that they are far from widespread and not generally very adequate when they are provided.\(^3\)

It is felt that this distance may depend to a large extent on local attitudes, particularly those of parents and teachers.

---

\(^1\)Vanier, *Survey*, p. 19.

\(^2\)The Vanier Institute of the Family, "Family Life Education in the Canadian Schools", Ottawa, 1973, (Mimeographed.)

It would appear that although family life education in Canada did not generate the same fervor or turbulence among the opposition that it did in the United States, there is little evidence that it generated active support among parents or parent groups. For example, only 1.7 percent of the respondents in the Vanier survey from schools offering family life courses reported that parents' associations played the leading role in initiating such courses. In addition, 76.7 percent reported that parents did not participate in the courses either during or outside of school hours. Nevertheless, the respondents felt the problem of introducing such courses was not lack of student interest or of parent and community support but instead practical problems such as finding qualified staff, getting instructional aids and fitting the material into the curriculum.

1 The one exception occurred in Calgary in 1969 when two separate reports were published by the Calgary Public School Board which called for instruction in family life and sex education from Grades 1-12. Two protest groups organized to prevent the Board from implementing the program or else forcing some modification of it. One, Citizens for Better Schools, the more moderate of the two, were not against family life and sex education in itself but objected mainly on technical grounds. The other group, the Society for the Prevention of Sex Education in Schools bitterly opposed the program for ideological reasons, branding such education as humanistic and anti-Christian. ("Controversy Flares Up Over Calgary Proposal", School Progress 38 May 1969): 69-70.

2 Vanier, Survey, Tables 10 and 23.

3 Vanier, Survey, p. 20.
The findings of the Vanier survey and other surveys conducted on the status of sex education\(^1\) and family life and sex education\(^2\) over the past decade in Canada give rise to many questions, such as the following:

1) Does the scarcity of family life education courses in Canadian schools reflect a general lack of priority placed on such courses by parents and teachers?

2) Do parents and teachers in Canada share the views of the so-called "experts" in the field regarding the importance of such courses in today's society and their place in the curricula of public schools?

3) Do parents and teachers feel that parents should have the exclusive responsibility for providing such education to their children?

4) Are Canadian parents and teachers really concerned about issues such as family privacy, effect of sex education on young children, parent-teacher value conflicts and so on that have plagued family life education programs in the United States?

5) Does the apparent lack of active support or involvement reflect apathy or lack of interest on the part of Canadian parents toward such programs?

6) Has the lack of active opposition been misinterpreted as interest or support, or have the courses offered been so restrictive or superficial with respect to content, as a precautionary measure against negative parental reaction, that little remains for parents to oppose? If the latter is true, have these precautionary measures been realistic in view of actual parental attitudes?

---


\(^2\) Harry H. Guest, Developments in Family Life and Sex Education in Canada (Ottawa: Canadian Health Education Specialists Society, February 1968).
7) Have the experiences in the United States with respect to such courses created an unnecessary degree of paranoia among Canadian educators regarding anticipated negative reactions of parents to the more potentially controversial family life topics? Or have such anticipated reactions been used as an excuse for not tackling the reported practical problems of finding qualified staff, getting instructional aids and fitting the material into the curriculum?¹

It would seem that if schools are to take on the responsibility of developing adequate courses in family life education to supplement and complement parental efforts to prepare children and youth for life in our contemporary world, a greater and more accurate understanding of parent and teacher attitudes toward the content and issues surrounding such courses is a prerequisite. This writer was unable to find one study conducted in Canada that addressed itself to these two very important groups who have such a major influence on whether or not family life programs are offered and how effective or adequate such programs will be. An understanding of their attitudes would hopefully lead to improved communication and increased trust between the two groups and result in more active and involved support for such courses instead of indifference or mere tolerance of them. Hepworth acknowledges the need for such a "partnership" following his survey of the situation:

¹For example, the Vanier survey found that respondents from schools without family life programs perceived more serious problems than were actually experienced by those offering the courses. One hypothesis the report considered plausible was that "these schools without FLF programs anticipate more problems than in fact exist and the fact of perceiving such serious problems in itself serves as an excuse for not moving ahead. We have the makings of a self-fulfilling prophecy". (Vanier, Survey, p. 10.)
It seems axiomatic now that there should be some parent involvement in these programs, and only parental sanction and demand will ensure that the programs become both universal and integral in the school curriculum.1

This project represents an attempt to foster the degree of understanding and support that seems necessary if family life courses are to gain the priority needed for them to become an accepted and respected part of the normal school curriculum.

**Purpose of the Research**

The purpose of this project is to analyze and compare the attitudes of parents and teachers toward various aspects of family life courses in the curricula of public schools. Included in the analysis are attitudes toward such issues as the following:

1) need for such courses including factors underlying the need

2) responsibility for such education (family versus public authority)

3) content (what should be taught and when?)

4) Who should teach? (training, sex, marital status and parental status of teachers)

5) How taught? (separate courses or integration into existing courses, co-educational or segregated classes for all or selected topics, compulsory or optional courses, use of outside professionals)

6) Why schools?

7) course objectives or goals

8) value conflicts (parent versus teacher values)

---

1Hepworth, *Personal Social Services*, p. 71.
9) family privacy
10) sexuality component
11) nature and extent of parent involvement

In addition, the association between differential attitudes among the respondents in each group, toward the more controversial aspects of family life education and the following classification variables will be examined:

1) age of respondent
2) sex
3) marital status
4) ethnicity
5) number of children
6) sex of children
7) ages of children
8) socio-economic status
9) education
10) urban or rural residency

The study also includes three specific questions from the 1968-69 Vanier study,\(^1\) one dealing with marriage breakdown as grounds for divorce, one with increasing permissiveness in the sex standards of young people and one with working mothers. These questions are intended to examine the liberal-conservative dimension between the two groups and also allow for comparison with the nationwide respondents in the Vanier study.

Relevance of the Study

This study should reveal, in addition to more knowledge about Canadian parents' and teachers' attitudes toward family life courses in public schools, the degree of interest or concern they have about the concept of formal education for family life. According to Rose Somerville, a noted family life educator in the United States, "back of administrative failure often lies the assumption, sometimes correct, of community indifference to family life and sex education".\(^1\)

Benell writes in relation to such courses, "there are communities, parents and schools who cloak themselves in apathy and disinterest".\(^2\) The Vanier study found that a very insignificant number of Canadian parents took the leading role in initiating such courses in the schools or participated in them during or outside of school hours.\(^3\) If parents and teachers are indeed indifferent to the need for such programs this would have significant implications in the planning, designing and implementation of such courses in the school system.

If there is interest or concern, the study should indicate what the respondents consider acceptable or appropriate topics to be included in the content of family life education.

---


\(^3\) Vanier, Survey, Tables 10 and 23.
programs. This would also have important implications in planning such programs. For example, if the respondents are so restrictive with respect to content that superficiality results and the effectiveness of the program is threatened, this might suggest the need for parent-teacher education as a prerequisite to program implementation. If certain topics are found to be extraordinarily sensitive to a large number of respondents, withholding such topics until the basic program has been accepted and adequate trust has developed between parents and school officials might be in order.

The timing of introducing particular topics in family life courses has been a matter of concern for parents and teachers alike. The concepts of "child readiness" and "teachable moments" are frequently used but their meanings are at best extremely vague and subjective. In the Vanier study over 60 percent of the respondents (primarily principals and vice-principals) thought that sex education should be taught before Grade 7 and 24 percent thought it should be taught in Grade 7 or 8. In the case of parent-child relationships, 50 percent recommended before Grade 7 and 27 percent in Grade 7 or 8. Are these views shared by parents and teachers? A program could stand or fall depending on

1Somerville, "Turbulent Sixties", p. 19.
2Guest, "Why Our Schools", p. 4.
3Vanier, Survey, Table 20.
significant agreement or differences of opinion in this area.

It is expected that the knowledge provided by the study can be directly beneficial to the Kent County Board of Education, who at the present time do not offer family life programs but may be considering such programs for the near future; to the Kent County Separate School Board, who are currently in the pilot project stage of implementing family life programs in their school system, and to other school boards and educators who are able to apply the findings to their particular area. In addition, it is hoped the study will arouse more interest in this area, particularly among social workers, and lead to an increase in much needed research across the country.

Finally, an awareness of parent-teacher attitudes toward various aspects of family life courses, if positive, might reduce fear of parent-teacher opposition to such courses and stimulate school boards to give greater priority to comprehensive family life education programs throughout the school years, with a special emphasis on interpersonal relationships, self understanding, human growth and development, decision-making, role of family members, differential family life patterns, family-community interaction, marriage preparation and so on. Such programs would be expected to help strengthen the family, if not in this generation then in the next. They would serve as a front line preventive service for all children and families, but particularly children who
have inadequate family models at home and who, because of an inability to choose alternatives too frequently go on to produce similar situations. For example, Schlesinger writes "the parents of the multi-problem family of today often have come from families that had similar characteristics".\footnote{Benjamin Schlesinger, \textit{Families: A Canadian Perspective} (Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1972).} Education may not be as Dr. Force writes "A vaccination against sin, suffering, disappointment, grief or folly"\footnote{Force, "A Working Paper", p. 4.} but it could inject an element of choice into an individual's life by making alternative life patterns more familiar and less threatening and increasing the possibility that marriage and family life patterns can become matters of choice and not destiny.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of the literature and related research for this study focused primarily on some of the fundamental questions and issues relative to family life education in the schools. These questions and issues are:

What is family life education and what are its aims and objectives in schools?

Why is there a need for formal education for family life?

Who is responsible for such education?

Why should family life education be taught in the school?

What should be taught in family life education courses?

When should specific family life topics be taught in schools?

Who should teach family life education in schools?

How should such courses be taught?

What involvement should parents have in family life education programs?

This chapter provides an overview of each of these questions from the viewpoints of authorities in the field of family life education and, where possible, parents, educators and others who participated in the various studies that were reviewed.
What is Family Life Education?

Finding a definition of family life education in the literature that is concise and generally accepted by family life educators is a very difficult task. Avery and Lee surveyed 66 selected experts in the family life field in an attempt to define family life education. The definition which evolved defined family life education in terms of goals and subgoals and contained over 300 words.¹

The National Council on Family Relations described family life education as a:

fairly new educational speciality ... a multi-professional area of study which is developing its philosophy, content and methodology from direct experience with families and the collaboration of such disciplines as home economics, social work, law, psychology, sociology, anthropology, philosophy and medicine. It includes a number of specialized areas, among which are interpersonal relationships, self-understanding, human growth and development, preparation for marriage and parenthood, child-rearing, socialization of youth for adult roles, decision-making, sexuality, management of human and material resources, personal, family and community health; family-community interaction and the effects of change on cultural patterns.²

Definitions by Harry Guest are usually quoted in Canadian writings on family life education. One such definition is as follows:

Family life education is a developmental process which includes not only the teaching of facts but also the development of attitudes and values which are conducive to personal fulfillment, healthy interpersonal relationships, and successful family life. It deals with the physical, emotional, social and moral aspects of human sexuality honestly and explicitly, at the "teachable moments" which come as children grow toward adulthood. It promotes healthy concepts of masculinity and femininity and of the relationships between boys and girls, husbands and wives, parents and children. With its emphasis on responsible behavior, it is an integral part of education for human values.¹

Many agree that a broad, positive family life education program is a preventive service for families and individuals. Dr. Force writes:

It is primary prevention in the sense that it substitutes for haphazard learning and experience, a systematic preparation for real life, and fosters a reflective attitude and a maturing process. Family life education can provide learning opportunities where social and emotional growth can be encouraged and where change can take place . . . ²

Family life education is not synonymous with sex education, nor should it be used as a euphemism for sex education as has frequently been the case. Instead, sex education is one vital dimension of family life education.³,⁴ Guest has written:

Family life education is, therefore, more than sex education since the latter usually puts the emphasis on informing boys and girls about pubescent develop-

¹Guest, Developments, p. 1.
ment, human reproduction and venereal diseases—the biological facts—with a capping of injunctions against violation of the traditional rules of sexual morality and reference to the painful consequences . . . . The biological facts should be included but the main emphasis should be on human relations . . . . The positive value of a successful family is so great, to the individuals in it, and to society that inducing the kind of behavior before and after marriage which makes for family success may be considered the heart of the program and the reason for its name.¹

Often such terminology as "human relations education" or "human development education" has been suggested because of the negative connotations resulting from family life education's relationship with sex education. However, some prefer to remain with family life education as an all encompassing term because they feel the individual always carries with him the impact of his family of origin, and therefore, even if he does not enter into a family of procreation, his relationship behaviors, including sexual, can be viewed in the family life framework.²

Attempts to clear up the confusion between the two terms have obviously not been successful. A review of the literature reveals, however, that whatever the terminology used in most cases the topics dealt with under each banner have more similarities than differences. Thus, the theory and research in those areas can be applicable to both. This

¹Guest, "Why Our Schools", p. 4.

²Somerville, "Turbulent Sixties", p. 22.
is particularly true in cases where the terms are combined as family life and sex education.

Aims and Objectives of Family Life Education

The main objectives of family life education, as outlined by the National Commission on Family Life Education in 1968, are to help individuals and families learn what is known about human growth, development and behavior in the family setting throughout the life cycle; learn about the family as an institution, interacting with other institutions; learn about the process by which families and individuals cope effectively with stressful situations and pressures; develop in themselves the ability to perceive their actions and evaluate the results; and explore new ways of behaving in order to find greater satisfactions and to effect changes which are beneficial to themselves, their families and to society.¹

Dr. S. R. Laycock sees family life education as having three chief purposes that concur with the above, namely:

to develop emotionally stable children and adolescents who feel sufficiently secure and adequate to make decisions as to their conduct without being carried away by their emotions; to provide sound knowledge not only of the physical aspects of sex behavior, but also its psychological and sociological aspects, so that sexual experience will be viewed as a part of the total personality of the individual; and to develop attitudes and

standards which will ensure that young people and adults will determine their sexual and other conduct by considering its long range effects on their own personal development, the highest good of other individuals and the welfare of society as a whole. ¹

Among the basic goals of family life education in public schools according to Walters and Stinnett are:

... to contribute to favorable attitudes toward marriage and the family and to provide information concerning those factors which can contribute to individual and marital competence ... by increasing our understanding of familial roles ... eliminate in large measure the lack of understanding of men concerning women and of women concerning men, thereby dispelling myths and stereotypes which block sympathetic and meaningful communications. ²

They also point out that family life education should try to help the young person understand sex in an interpersonal relationship context integrated with and guided by many factors in marriage such as values, companionship, responsibility and aspirations.

Kay Crowe, a consultant in Family Life Education, draws awareness to the crisis of change in which the family is living in today’s society in which man has to operate at a level of adaptability never before asked of human beings. She proposes that in addition to helping individuals and families to live creatively now the focus should also be on enabling people to develop ‘sufficient inner strength to face and live with any new forms of family life that may evolve.’ ³

¹Laycock, Family Living, pp. 22-23.
Need for Family Life Education

Few people would deny the tremendous importance to the family, the community and society in general of enlightened, understanding and effective parents. However, Laycock's observations in 1946 would apply to a large extent today:

For all other jobs some training is required . . . . Parenthood has remained an unskilled trade. It has been thought that with parenthood came some God-given knowledge of how to look after children. Surely the most casual observation should convince even the ordinary person that this is not so—that parents make serious mistakes in guiding both the physical and personality development of their children.¹

More recently Walters and Stinnett have written:

Success in marriage and family life—among the most important and exacting of all interpersonal relationships—requires skill in communication and knowledge of human personality.²

They further point out that the preparation required for marital competence and successful family life is beyond that which is obtained in many families.

If only the more capable parents in the more stable marriages and families produced children maybe the need for family life education would be less intense. However, studies have indicated that the former is not the case. For example, a study of 47 multi-problem families in Ottawa in 1961, by the Welfare Council of Ottawa, revealed that these families averaged 7.2 members per family compared to the Can-


adian average of 3.5 members.\textsuperscript{1} Also, there is increasing evidence that the parents in these families often have come from families that had similar characteristics and that this trend sometimes extends through several generations.\textsuperscript{2} Consideration of the fact that such families on the average produce over twice as many potential future parents as an equal number of more capable families in Canada, and that a city the size of Vancouver, in June 1960, identified 1407 such families\textsuperscript{3} reveals further the magnitude of the problem. Efforts to aid existing families go on, as indeed they should. However, many feel that needed also are programs such as family life education in the schools which "puts priority on prevention of family malfunction in the next generation."\textsuperscript{4}

In addition to the special needs for family life education by specific segments of society such as that described above, it is generally accepted that all families are under a greater strain today in trying to cope with the increased pressures of rapid social change. Preparation of children to cope with the demands of family life in the society they will encounter as adults may be beyond the capabilities of most parents alone, particularly since the expectation of a predictable future for themselves or their

\textsuperscript{1}Schlesinger, \textit{Families}, pp. 102-03.
\textsuperscript{2}Schlesinger, \textit{Families}, p. 102.
\textsuperscript{3}Schlesinger, \textit{Families}, p. 103.
\textsuperscript{4}Beck, "School and Family", p. 41.
children appears to be vanishing. As Crowe observes:

Many feel threatened and uncertain by the acceleration of change which is invading their lives. They see youth exploring and experiencing various new "life styles".
... it would appear that youth today is looking to the future for inspiration and guidance, rather than back to the past, and from this new patterns of thinking, living and behaving are evolving ... Traditions that seemed valid for generations are being questioned, often violently, as to their present relevance.¹

Crowe recommends that programs, such as family life education, need to be developed which do not only dispense specific knowledge but also assist people to understand their own attitudes and feelings about the changes among which they are living today. She writes, "Both these ingredients, direct information and scope for emotional growth, should be inherent in programs."²

Recognition of the changing social conditions as a factor underlying the need for family life education is evident in a brief submitted to the Alberta Department of Education by a Red Deer and District Committee in March 1970.
The brief stated:

... the changing mores, the stresses of today's technological and competitive society, the inability of a great many families to communicate, the lessening of youth's contact with the churches, all indicate that benefits would accrue from society extending and complementing the teaching and training of even the well functioning parent.³

¹Crowe, "Family Life Education", p. 2.
²Crowe, "Family Life Education", p. 2.
Seventy-eight per cent of the respondents in the Vanier survey strongly supported changing social conditions as one factor underlying the need for family life education for young people. However, a slightly larger number, 80 per cent, saw failure on the part of parents to give young people the necessary background and support as being equally responsible for the need.¹

In the Canadian Education Association survey of sex education in Canadian Schools in 1964 it was found that:

> The majority of the school boards replying . . . acknowledged the need for the teaching of sex education in the face of parental failure to meet this responsibility.²

Parental failure was also indicated in a 1972 California study as a primary reason underlying the need for Human Sexuality Education in the schools. It was found that 86 per cent of the parents, 85 per cent of the students and 81 per cent of the sex education experts thought such education was necessary primarily because "the home is not doing an adequate job in this area".³

Some authorities hold that family life, including sex education, is necessary because even the best educated parent cannot handle the responsibility alone, for lack of time, knowledge and teaching skills, and perhaps above all,

¹ Vanier, Survey, p. 20.

² Canadian Education Association, "Sex Education in Schools", p. 284.

for lack of the essential component in such education, a peer group for interaction.\footnote{Somerville, "Turbulent Sixties", p. 24.} Dr. David Mace, an eminent authority on family relations in the United States, hypothesizes that any sexual element, even sincere talk of sex, in the relationship between a parent and his or her adolescent child creates a revulsion of oedipal origins which makes both parties shy away. He adds that if this is true, it may be unfair to urge parents to talk of sex with their adolescent children and better for them to delegate the formal educational task to other responsible adults. In addition to the incest taboo, he speculates that inbuilt role conflicts as well would necessitate such action.\footnote{David Mace, "Should Parents Undertake Sex Education At All?" Paper presented at the Groves Conference on Marriage and the Family, Baltimore, 1963.}

In a 1968 study of 400 university students, Shipman found that family sex education was negligible for \textit{3} of \textit{4} primary family relationships—father-son, father-daughter and mother-son. Shipman concluded that the taboo on parent-child sex behavior may be so strong that any verbalization about sex in this relationship becomes symbolic incest and also the need for privacy leads to reluctance and refusal of children to recognize the personal sexuality of their parents.\footnote{Gordon Shipman, "The Psychodynamics of Sex Education", \textit{The Family Coordinator} 17 (January 1968): 3-12.} The implications of the study were that parents are not adequately prepared or able to give their children the informa-
tion about sex that they require. A Connecticut study a year later was consistent with these findings as only 21 percent of the responding parents felt that parents are adequately prepared to provide the sex education that children require. Fifty-five percent disagreed with the adequacy of parents to provide this education and 24 percent were neutral or uncertain.\(^1\)

Dr. Milton Levine agrees that most parents shy away from the subject of sex because of their own upbringing and inhibitions. But he also points out that there are some parents who know the answers but do not have the words for an adequate explanation and still others who do not know the answers.\(^2\) Rainwater's findings that most working-class couples lack consciously usable knowledge of the fundamentals of human reproduction lends support to Dr. Levine's hypothesis.\(^3\) Harter and Parrish surveyed 144 Northern Louisanna mothers who had at least one birth or still birth during the five years prior to the study. One of the questions asked the mothers was "what happens when a couple has sexual relations that causes pregnancy?" It was revealed that despite


the fact that their mean number of completed school grades was 11.6, "almost half of the women in the sample indicated that they lack this fundamental knowledge of reproductive physiology".  

Those who call for programs of family life education or sex education often do so because of their alarm at the high rates of illegitimacy, venereal disease, delinquency, drug abuse and other forms of social maladjustment. In the Red Deer and District brief to the Alberta Department of Education, it is stated:

Although family life education should be considered mainly as having a human fulfillment mission, it cannot help but perform a preventive function of individual and societal breakdown. In the resource material there is ample verification of this, and the Alberta Department of Public Welfare approves it as such under the Preventive Social Services (with grant support).

The social ills of poorly functioning families, broken families, delinquency, illegitimacy, use of habit forming drugs, etc., have promise of some remedy, with more insight and help in understanding of their individual and family role being gained from family life education made available to the child.

One of the main findings of a survey of one-parent families in Canada in 1971 was a great need for measures to prevent families from breaking down. Included among the measures suggested was "... the development of family life education programs in the schools and other institutions

---


throughout the community". 1 In addition, the report stated:

With particular regard to the increasing number of illegitimate pregnancies among young girls, there is great need for sex education in the schools . . . 2

In another brief by the Family Life Education Council of Edmonton in 1968, a family life education program was recommended for the schools primarily "to prevent waste of human potential (learning disability, social maladjustment etc.) by a concentration on humanness, i.e. values and attitudes". 3

Studies have shown that whatever reasons given as underlying the need for family life education, many people consider it an important and necessary part of the school curricula. The Vanier survey found:

The great majority of our respondents--whether or not their schools offer FLE--thought the subject was important and deserved to be in their school curricula. 4

In a Connecticut study in 1969, McIntire found that 80 percent of the principals responding agreed with the statement: "Schools should offer planned programs of FL/Sex Ed" while less than 9 percent disagreed. 5 A study of parental attitudes

---


2 Guyatt, One-Parent Family, p. 109.


4 Vanier, Survey, p. 20.

in the same year revealed that 88 percent of the parents supported the idea that schools should offer appropriately planned programs in family life and sex education, with only 6 percent disagreeing.¹ A California study by Dearth in 1972 found that 97 percent of the parents, 96 percent of the sex education experts and 93 percent of the students responding agreed that Human Sexuality Education was needed in schools.² A 1970 Texas study found that:

a majority of public school superintendents . . . who returned a completed questionnaire perceived that the public school should assume the responsibility for educating their students about sexuality.³

Libby, in a 1970 study of parental attitudes toward high school sex education programs, defined sex education within the context of human-relationship education as an integrated part of the school curriculum and not necessarily as a separate course. He found that 82 percent of the parents approved of such education.⁴

At the conclusion of his study on personal social services in Canada, Hepworth included the following in his recommendations:

¹McIntire and Eaton, "Parental Attitudes", pp. 666-68.
²Dearth, "Viable Sex Education", pp. 190-93.
Family life education programs should be provided on a universal basis in public school systems, with the participation of parents in both the programs and the establishment of curricula.¹

In discussing the present trends and future needs in the area of birth control, family planning, abortion and family life education services, he writes:

Sound instruction at school seems likely to be the best way to ensure that young people know how to cope with the emotional pressures and temptations of adolescence and early adulthood. Only if they have the requisite knowledge are they likely to seek appropriate advice and help when needed.²

To summarize the opinions of many of the authorities and the findings of related research it would appear that a majority of authorities, parents and educators recognize the need for family life education, including its sexual component, and approve of such education in public schools, although some approve with reservations. Factors regarded as underlying the need for such education include changing social conditions; failure on the part of parents to adequately meet the responsibility; inability of parents to provide adequate education because of lack of knowledge; and increasing rates of illegitimacy, venereal disease, delinquency, and other forms of social maladjustment.

¹Hepworth, Personal Social Services, p. 81.
²Hepworth, Personal Social Services, p. 71.
Who is Responsible for Education about Family Life?

There seems to be little disagreement among the authorities that parents have the primary responsibility to prepare their children for successful family life. However, some feel that left to their own resources, many parents have a difficult time with family life education, especially with its sexual components. Because of this it is suggested that the responsibility should not be exclusive to them but shared with other social institutions. Guest writes:

Family life education ought not to be the exclusive responsibility of any one agency or institution in society today. Parents have a primary responsibility, but not all parents are well informed, and many are inhibited by their own upbringing and by feelings which they do not fully understand . . . . In conveying spiritual values to their children, parents rely on the assistance of the church. In providing for the education of their children in other respects, they rely on the school. In preparing their children for successful family life, there is no reason why parents should not call for support from institutions which are especially qualified to help.

The National Education Association in the United States acknowledges the fact that the majority of educators, physicians, clergymen, civic leaders, legislators and many others support the view that the primary responsibility for family life and sex education lies with the parents, but the Association points out that there is evidence to indicate that the family environment often does not provide this edu-

---

1 Guest, "Why Our Schools", p. 5.
cation accurately and adequately. They maintain the schools
must be involved but their role should be that of a partner-
ship with the parents in this vital educational area, not a
replacement for them.¹

In an interfaith statement on sex education, the
National Council of Churches also recognized the fact that
although ideally parents should maintain the primary respon-
sibility for educating their children about sexuality, some
desire and should receive help in this area. To quote from
the statement:

Responsibility for sex education belongs primarily to
the child's parents or guardians . . . We recognize
that some parents desire supplementary assistance from
church or synagogue and from other agencies. Each com-

munity of faith should provide resources, leadership
and opportunities as appropriate for its young people
to learn about their development into manhood and wom-

anhood, and for adults to grow in understanding of
their roles as men and women in family and society . . . ²

Dr. Sol Gordon argues that the responsibility for
sex education "must be shared by parents and social services
in the community as well as the schools".³ He suggests that
parents must be educated about sexuality so that they can
accept much of the responsibility for educating their child-
ren but that churches and social groups for youth must also

¹Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibil-
ities, National Education Association, Washington, D. C.,
"Suggestions for Defense Against Extremist Attack: Sex Edu-
cation in the Public Schools", March 1970. Reprinted in
Kieren, Readings, p. 293.

²Commission on Marriage and the Family, National
Council of Churches, New York, N. Y., "Sex Education: An

³Sol Gordon, "What Place Does Sex Education Have in
the Schools?" The Journal of School Health 44 (April 1974):
186.
recognize the contribution they can make in this area.

Armin Grams observes that studies of adolescents and college youth have consistently demonstrated that with the exception of mothers telling their daughters something about menstruation, parental sex education is judged 'very inadequate' by children. He sees this as indicating that the parental education approach to help parents never actually affects and benefits their children and its effectiveness must be questioned by the concerned educator. In addition, he states:

Our experience demonstrates consistently that only a small percentage of parents take advantage of such training opportunities when they are offered. It seems that although some parents today consistently plead their privilege and capability to provide sex education for their children, the majority evidence little interest in attending adult classes designed to help them fulfill their obligation. Those who were idealistic enough to believe that we could solve this problem through parent education simply had to come to terms with the reality of parental apathy. We know we must provide supplementary programs through community educational agencies or we shall never give the majority of children the understandings and attitudes they deserve. Such programs are actually complementary to parent endeavors. We share equally the responsibility of children's education.1

In the Harter and Parrish study almost 90 percent of the mothers in the sample stated that parents should be responsible for the sex education of their children but an equal number also indicated the schools should take some

responsibility for this education as well.\textsuperscript{1} The study concluded there was:

no indication that mothers would feel a parental function had been wrested from them if the schools were to provide children with information concerning the reproductive process.\textsuperscript{2}

Free found in a 1973 Texas study that although more administrators than parents and students believed the schools should offer appropriately planned programs of instruction in family life education, all three groups strongly supported the idea.\textsuperscript{3}

It thus appears that although most people believe that parents should have the primary responsibility for educating their children about family life and sexuality there is strong evidence that this ideal cannot be met by most parents in today's society. Because of the inability of parents to meet this responsibility alone, many, including parents, suggest that other social institutions should and must assist them in meeting this challenge. The social institution most frequently cited to share this role is the public school. The following section will examine why schools are the most pop-


ular choice to share this responsibility with parents.

**Why Schools?**

Guest summarizes two main arguments why the schools should be the logical place to teach formally family life education:

In the first place, the school is the only institution which is mobilized to reach all the children in the community. Unless the school takes a hand, those who are not attached to any religious or youth organization which deals with family life education and whose parents do not cope adequately with it, a substantial number of children will not be reached . . . . the school has the child for as many as 12 formative years, can conduct a properly developmental program and can present it in a natural way . . . .

In the second place, education for family living can best be given by people whose profession it is to educate. Teachers are expected to understand children and to possess the art of communication.\(^1\)

For these reasons, writes Guest, the schools should accept a substantial share of the responsibility for family life education, in collaboration with parents, the church, and various other professions in the community that are concerned with children and youth.\(^2\)

Rev. Lester Kinsolving agrees with Guest in his examination of the logic of schools providing sex education. He writes:

The school has opportunities in the field of sex education which are unrivalled by any other traditional character building agencies such as the church or even the home. The school by law has required attendance. All of its faculty, unlike all parents, are extensively

\(^1\)Guest, "Why Our Schools", p. 6.

\(^2\)Guest, "Family Life Education", p. 622.
trained to teach.¹

In commenting on the church's role in sex education, Kinsolving quotes Bishop Stephen Bayne:

Sexual relationship is the most profound of all human relationships, affecting other personalities more deeply than any other relationship. There is no area in human relationships where the church has done a poorer job than this.²

Kinsolving speculates that some of the causes of the church's paucity of leadership in this area are:

Some clergy are so anxious to build a successful ecclesiastical country club that on the traditional "11th Commandment" all law and all prophets be hanged: "Thou shalt not rock the boat". Some clergy are afraid to preach on this subject for fear not of mere dissension, but possible dismissal by the same type of church members who like to terrorize school boards . . . Among the number of clergy who refuse to preach on sex are those who feel that the subject is either too personal or even undignified for the pulpit.³

He suggests that what seems desperately needed before the church can be looked on to play an active part in this area of education is a "clear concept and realization of the theology of sex . . ."⁴

Church-sponsored programs, where they have existed, apparently fall short of doing an adequate job for two main reasons: Firstly, they generally adhere to a particular


⁴Kinsolving, "The Family", p. 32.
moral doctrine, and consequently they may exclude certain topics or certain approaches to particular topics; and secondly, what seems to be the most serious limitation, is that they reach a minority of children in many communities.¹

The limited population reached is a limitation on most other social agencies with respect to family life education, including the family doctor. However, in addition, other factors make the latter avenue an inadequate resource for family life and sex education. Firstly, surveys of teenagers' sources of sex information have found that hardly any boys and girls actually go to the doctor for their information. Secondly, many doctors admit they would be quite uncomfortable discussing the matter. Thirdly, they are not trained to do so since few medical schools offer a course in how to give sex education. Fourthly, a doctor's interview is unlikely to meet the need for many of the other aspects of family life education since doctors tend to emphasize the biological side and to be less cognizant and effective in dealing with the social and moral aspects. Finally, doctors have a limited arsenal of teaching methods and tend to be didactic, since their training and practice accustom them to advising, directing and prescribing. Teaching is more than 'telling' and must involve the give-and-take of genuine discussion in which the leader's role is to promote

¹Guest, "Why Our Schools?" p. 6.
the exchange of ideas and the achievement of insights in
the group with a minimum of direct intervention. Indeed,
some problems fall within the doctor's field of profession-
al competence, but family life education is felt to be a
bigger task than doctors alone should be expected to han-
dle.¹

Schlesinger suggests that although there is a role
for parents and the church in educating the young for fam-
ily living:

... the need for appreciation of home life is so press-
ing in our society that courses in family life education
should be an important part of every child's learning. To
insure that the vast majority of young people are reach-
ed by such a program it must be carried out by the organ-
ization best suited to do this. The organization in our
society which reaches the largest number of children and
their parents is the public school system.²

Although the majority of the authorities seem to a-
gree with the logic of the school taking the primary respon-
sibility among social agencies in providing formal education
for family life, there is also a concensus of opinion that
parents, religious groups, medical groups, other social a-
gencies and associations must play a part in determining the
content and methods of such programs in the school system.
It would seem that such a school-community partnership is a
prerequisite for the establishment of effective family life
education programs in the public schools.

¹Guest, "Why Our Schools", pp. 5-6.
²Schlesinger, Families, p. 142.
What Should be Taught and When?

Most of the literature reviewed appears to agree with Guest that a "comprehensive treatment of sex and family life education should include consideration of the physical, psychological, social and moral aspects". In fact the Curriculum Branch of Alberta's Department of Education states that "values, skills and conceptual knowledge, in that order, mark their relative importance to family life education". They suggest that this, along with a positive approach, should be the frame of reference when preparing or reviewing program units which might appropriately be called Family Life Education. There is also general agreement that the sexual component of family life education is very vital. Marshall states, "a course that omits sexual behavior as a part of its content is not, by definition, a family life education course".

Examination of curriculum guidelines, draft proposals for school programs, committee briefs, parent-teacher

---

1 Harry H. Guest, "Family Life Education", Winnipeg, Manitoba, 1964. (Mimeographed).


guidebooks and other literature in the family life field resulted in a list of topics that are generally considered appropriate and frequently dealt with in family life education programs, whether the method of presentation is a separate course, integration into existing courses or other approaches. Of course, how extensive the topics are dealt with at the class level depends on many factors and cannot be determined by an examination such as the above. The following list is by no means exhaustive but is intended only to illustrate the general content common to such programs that are geared to achieve the stated aims and objectives of family life education in public schools:

1) importance of the family to its members and to society

2) factors involved in successful family living (decision-making, sharing responsibility, family obligations, communication, etc.)

3) understanding different types of families, styles and patterns of family life, responsibilities of parents, etc.

4) parent-child conflict areas (choice of friends, hours, accountability, allowance, school achievement, etc.)

5) economics of family life (credit, budgetting, money management, etc.)

6) factors leading to healthy, physical, emotional and mental development of children

7) family crises (childbirth, adoption, loss of loved one, retirement, separation, divorce, sudden unemployment, etc.)

8) family problems, (alcoholism, child abuse, child neglect, poverty, physical, mental or social disability; long term unemployment, housing, etc.)

9) functions of family helping services in the community

10) developing social skills (relating to others, making friends, etc.)

11) learning to talk freely about feelings, goals, values, standards and behavior

12) human reproduction, childbirth, functions and anatomy of male/female sex organs, physical changes in boys and girls at puberty, correct terminology, etc.

13) boy-girl relationships (developing values and standards of behavior regarding choice of partner, going steady, necking, petting, premarital sex, etc.)

14) moral and spiritual implications of sex

15) factors to consider in planning marriage (age, race, religion, culture, finances, etc.)

16) common conflict areas in marriage (money, working wife, in-laws, planning children, social and recreational life, etc.)

17) factors to consider in planning children (cost, responsibility, effects on marital relationship, etc.)

18) contraception and birth control (methods and issues involved)
19) understanding common social problems such as venereal disease, abortion, homosexuality, drug abuse (extent, possible causes, issues and risks involved, etc.)

There is overwhelming agreement among authorities and others reviewed that appropriately planned programs of education about family living should be offered throughout the school years from kindergarten through the end of high school. Some even propose such programs should continue through college and university. It is also agreed that the topics should be dealt with in a progressive fashion geared to the age and maturity of the child. Eleanore Luckey writes:

From kindergarten through 12th grade, the child can be encouraged to develop a normal progression of interest in and an increasing body of information about family relationships and sex differences and functions and, in doing so, to form values and make decisions about behavior.

Dr. Levine also suggests that sex education programs should be initiated in kindergarten "when children are normally asking questions about reproduction and sex".

Dr. Elizabeth Force maintains that:

a carefully developed positive family life education program, kindergarten through grade 12, offers the most promising and practical means of assisting the home to develop sound attitudes and values toward sex, marriage,


\[2\] Red Deer, "Brief" and National Council on Family Relations, "Position Paper".


\[4\] Levine, "Sex Education", p. 32.
parenthood and family life.¹

In most cases, it would appear that the question is not what topic will be introduced at what time but how much of a particular topic will be presented at a given level. For example, in the Winnipeg school program proposal, the topic of human reproduction is introduced at the kindergarten level but is reviewed and enlarged upon in each successive grade, all the way through high school.² It seems that "child readiness", which includes both age and maturity, is a deciding factor in determining how extensive each topic will be covered at each level. However, as mentioned earlier, "child readiness" is a vague and subjective concept and apparently many parents are concerned about the ability of teachers to determine this and about the effect on their children of too much information too soon, particularly where topics relating to sex are concerned. Dearth found that only 52 percent of the parents responding in his study supported the idea of beginning human sexuality education in early elementary grades, as opposed to 99 percent of the sex education experts.³

James Maddock, Director of Family Life Education for the Association for Family Living in the United States, dis-

²Report to the Winnipeg School Board, January 1968.
³Dearth, "Viable Sex Education", p. 192.
agrees with the 'too much-too soon' concern. He gives two main reasons why there is little danger of harmfully exposing individual youngsters to sexual information before they are ready for it:

First of all, parents wishing to protect their child often tend to underestimate his readiness for such material. This is due in part to that subtle fear which adults have that sex information in itself is somehow harmful. A second factor which prevents damaging over-exposure is that children have built in screening devices. They simply ignore information they aren't ready for because they do not have the appropriate feelings or experiences to make that information meaningful.1

Ira Reiss stresses that ideally sex education should be taught at all levels in the school curriculum, K-12, because it seems best to start before emotional blocks are too strong and to treat sex as a natural part of all instructional levels. He also considers it psychologically advantageous to discuss common events like menstruation, masturbation and marriage before they occur. He states:

Children of all ages have a sexual quality to their lives and the discussion of sex is something they are "ready for". They are "mature" enough to handle it if it is presented in accord with sound educational principles.2

Most of the research reviewed in this area was limited to attitudes toward the general concept of family life or sex education programs in the curricula of public schools

---


and if and when such programs should appropriately be offered. The studies generally did not seem to take into consideration the fact that family life education is not a unitary concept—that it includes a wide variety of specific topics, and that broad generalizations may be of limited value. For example, a respondent who indicates disagreement that family life education programs should be introduced in kindergarten or early elementary levels may be, in reality, only disagreeing with the sexual component of such programs. Generally, the studies did not allow the respondent to make such a distinction in his responses and consequently he was forced into an all or none situation. One exception to this serious limitation of most of the research is the Vanier study. It sought information on four selected aspects of family life education—sex education, parent-child relationships, dating or boy-girl relationships, and engagement and marriage. The findings as to when and if these topics should be introduced are revealed in the table on the following page from the Vanier report (Table 20).

It is evident from the table that a strong majority of the principals and vice-principals thought that sex-education and parent-child relationships should be introduced into the curriculum early. Grades 7-8 was considered most appropriate for dating and boy-girl relationship topics and engagement and marriage was deemed by the majority to be clearly a high school topic. The table also
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When to introduce topic</th>
<th>Sex Education n=4020</th>
<th>Child-Parent Rel. n=3271</th>
<th>Dating, Boy/Girl Rel. n=3365</th>
<th>Engagement &amp; Marriage n=3284</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Grade 7</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 7-8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9-10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 11-13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a school responsibility</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

reveals that only a very small percentage of the respondents considered the topics outside the sphere of school responsibility or did not know when such topics should be introduced.

In addition, the respondents in the Vanier survey from schools offering family life education topics indicated that although in some cases such topics were offered at all grade levels, in 60 to 70 percent of the cases sex education, parent-child relationships and boy-girl relationships were taught in grades 9 through 12 or 13. Sex education and parent-child relationships were taught below grade 7 in only 11.4 percent and 10.3 percent of the cases.

\footnote{Vanier, Survey, Table 20.}
respectively.¹ The 1973 survey of provincial curriculum guidelines gives further evidence that family life education in Canadian schools is clearly a high school subject. The report states:

Most of the courses with Family Life Education material are designed for high school students, and in particular, senior high school students.²

Who Should Teach Family Life Education?

Training

Educators with a variety of training backgrounds are currently teaching family life education. There are many and varied opinions as to who should be qualified to teach the subject. Some educators believe that no special preparation is necessary and that all that is needed is a well-intentioned teacher who relates warmly to students and who has the time in his schedule. Others feel that the family life teacher, more than any other, needs special and comprehensive preparation in addition to being of acceptable temperament.³

The majority of the surveys of current family life education programs reviewed for this study revealed inadequate or lack of training on the part of most family life teachers. A Washington study found that more than 70 percent of the teachers responding evaluated their academic

¹Vanier, Survey, Table 13.


preparation to teach family life and sex education as inadequate and 84 percent expressed a desire for further training. A Florida study concluded that "95 percent of the teachers are untrained or only partially trained to do the job they are attempting in the classroom". The Vanier study found that only 27 percent of Canadian administrators reported their family life teachers had received "a training in family life education".

Elizabeth Force maintains that teacher preparation is a central issue and that the shortage of qualified persons is primarily responsible for the bottleneck in program development. In-service training sessions and summer workshops are essential to the continuation and development of programs as a supplementary source of training but, she points out, "they do not provide the depth and breadth of preparation necessary to serve in this field". The administrators in many of the surveys conducted listed lack of qualified staff as a major concern and reason for the lack of family life education programs.

---


3Vanier, Survey, Table 17.


5Vanier, Survey, p. 20.

Dr. Laycock's remarks regarding the teacher of sex education are typical of the views of many authorities regarding the teacher of the more comprehensive family life education:

teachers, particularly at the secondary level require the special competence that comes from specific training. They need to be as much specialists in the physiology, psychology and sociology of sex as are teachers of mathematics, science and English in their respective areas. Biological understanding alone is not enough. Nor is marital status, motherhood or fatherhood enough. Careful training for their job for teachers is vital.

... courses in health, personal development and family living have come to grief in more than one Canadian province because they were looked upon by administrators as 'joe jobs' and were assigned to the least experienced and least trained members of the teaching staff. The public realized this, reacted accordingly, and the courses were thrown out.¹

Guest points out that a program of preparation for the teachers in family life education is imperative, not only to add to their competence and assurance but also to satisfy the community that the job of educating their children in this area will be done by people with special training.²

Dearth found in a 1972 study of parents, students and sex education experts, that the parents unanimously supported the statement that Human Sexuality Education teachers should be specially trained. The experts and students sup-

¹S. R. Laycock, "The Teacher of Sex Education". Excerpt from an address delivered to the School Health Section of the Ontario Education Association, Toronto, 12 April 1966. The Manitoba Teacher 45 (September-October 1966): 7.

²Guest, "Why Our Schools", p. 7.
ported the statement 96 percent and 85 percent respectively.¹

The National Council on Family Relations, in recom-
mending the preparation of specialists in family life edu-
cation, proposed that teachers have knowledge and competence in the following areas: the family in historical, social and cultural context; family interaction, marriage preparation, human development from birth to senescence, biological sci-
ences, sexuality, management of family resources, group pro-
cesses, methods and materials in family life education, prac-
tice teaching in family life and sex education, field experi-
ences, individual and family counselling, research, survey of basic laws relating to marriage and the family, and a study of the community. In addition, the Committee points out that although the criteria are addressed much more to the profes-
sional than to personal qualifications of the family life educator, it is assumed that the characteristics that make for a good teacher in any field will also apply. As well, consideration should be given to the teacher's attitudes toward the more personal and emotion-laden issues involved in family life and sex education courses to ensure that these issues will be handled as objectively as possible.²

¹Dearth, "Viable Sex Education", p. 192.

Finally, although the majority of authorities and parents agree with the need for specially trained teachers for family life education programs, this ideal is unlikely to be met in the near future. Following a survey of six states in 1970, Elizabeth Force concluded that:

Quality teacher training opportunities in the field are meager. Teacher training is not oriented toward helping teachers become aware of family life education as a vital component in their preparation to work with children and their families. There is a scarcity of "teachers of teachers" equipped to help with this kind of preparation.¹

No evidence could be found to suggest that the situation is significantly different in Canada. In 1965, no Canadian university was offering a course specifically to prepare the teacher of family life and sex education.² In 1969, 163 of 308 universities and colleges responded to a survey and 136 were found to be involved in such courses.³ However, the exact nature and extent of this involvement is unknown.

Sex and Marital Status

In the debate over who should teach family life education, the sex and marital status of teachers have been given some consideration. Many of the authorities in the


²Somerville, "Turbulent Sixties", p. 29.

³The Vanier Institute of the Family, Annual Report for Year ended 31 December 1969. ( Mimeographed.)
field do not consider either of these factors very significant. Kirkendall and Handwerk hypothesized that either male or female could teach such programs effectively and although a happy marriage would be an asset, marriage need not be essential.¹

Landis predicted that an unmarried person would be just as likely to be objective on topics relating to marriage and the family as a married person. He points out that nearly all parents are married yet the children of those parents are often inadequately informed on matters relating to marriage and family life. He maintains a single person does not have to personally experience a situation to become trained in the field.²

Francis Filas, a noted theologian in the field of family life education, also denies the importance of sex and marital status of family life and sex education teachers. He writes:

... whether the teacher is married or not does not guarantee a true concern for the student, genuine communication or sound emotional balance. Sometimes the best persons to impart respect for marriage, family life and sex are the single man and the single woman, both by their words and by their bearing.³


Studies reveal mixed reactions regarding sex and marital status as significant characteristics of family life education teachers. Juhasz questioned the directors of "twelve family life and sex education programs (which) were most frequently referred to in the literature and at professional meetings" and found that they considered the marital status, gender of teachers, and parental status relatively unimportant characteristics. Libby found that although nearly 90 percent of the parents responding in his study did not consider the sex of the teacher important, 47 percent thought the teacher of sex education should be married. McIntire found that only 48 percent of the principals were not concerned about the marital status of family life teachers. Twenty-nine percent felt such teachers should be married, while 23 percent were "uncertain or neutral". A similar study by Creel found that 48.9 percent of the Montana superintendents and school board members believed the family life teacher should be married.


Dearth found that both the sex and marital status of teachers brought mixed reactions from all three groups in his study. Forty-five percent of the parents supported the statement that there should be a male teacher for boys and a female teacher for girls. Experts and students disagreed with this arrangement (78 and 67 percent respectively). The marital status brought a similar reaction from the parents as 44 percent favored a married teacher. Experts and students were in disagreement with this requirement, however, the majority in each case was very small (55 and 45 percent respectively). A relatively large segment of the students (25 percent) was undecided.¹

It would appear that although sex and marital status are not considered significant characteristics for family life education teachers by most of the authorities, many parents and educators indicate at least a preference for a married teacher.

Parental Status

With the exception of the Juhasz² study mentioned above, which found the respondents considering parental status relatively unimportant in determining qualifications for family life teachers, none of the other studies reviewed

¹Dearth, "Viable Sex Education", p. 192.
²Juhasz, "Characteristics Essential".
examined attitudes toward this specific characteristic for such teachers. Nevertheless, it can be assumed that for the majority of authorities, educators and parents who did not regard marriage as a requisite for such teachers, parenthood would also not be required. However, there were a significant number of parents and educators who believed marriage should be required for family life teachers. Their attitudes as to whether parenthood should also be required cannot be determined.

How Should Family Life Education be Taught in Schools?

One of the fundamental questions relative to family life education in schools is that of how such education should be taught. In the debate, four main issues have been identified in this regard, and each will be examined in the following sections. These issues are:

a) separate courses or integration into existing courses
b) co-educational or segregated classes
c) compulsory or optional courses
d) use of outside speakers

Separate Courses or Integration into Existing Courses

A variety of methods has been suggested for presenting family life education in schools. Some authorities, seemingly a minority, recommend that family life education be taught as a separate course at varying grade levels. The other major group recommends that family life topics be pres-
mented as natural parts of other courses such as biology, home economics, general science, health and physical education, social sciences and so on. The pros and cons of both methods are discussed in some detail in the literature.

Dr. Mary Kehlin believes such education should be offered as a separate course above the level of grade five. She writes:

Currently, life education should stand alone as a separate course above the level of grade five. Below fifth grade the setting must be decided by individual communities with careful consideration being given to teacher attitude, parents' rights and community readiness.¹

However, she predicts the possibility that an integrated approach from kindergarten through grade twelve may be the accepted procedure in the future, but she points out that this would mean that all teachers would have to be broadly trained in human growth and development, interpersonal and sexual relationships, and family relations.

Strain recommended the drawing together of all the various aspects of family life education into a comprehensive separate subject for the upper level of the senior high school. This separate course would tie together the various

¹Mary B. Kehlin, "Selection and Training of Teachers for Family Life Education Programs", The Family Coordinator 20 (July 1971): 239.
aspects learned from the integrative and other approaches in the early grades. As the culminating part of a developmental school program it would place special emphasis on preparation for marriage, and might be called "Personal and Family Living", "Preparation for Marriage", or simply "Family Life Education".  

Lucky considers it "ideal" to have teachers of every field so well prepared in the field of human relations that there would be no necessity of singling out any one area that could be called either family life or sex education. Reiss agrees that ideally sex education should be taught in an integrated fashion with materials added to the social science units at all levels. Gordon maintains that "a separate course for sex education is not only artificial, but is unnecessary". Bibby writes:

The better the sex education in school the less obvious it will be. It will just fit in naturally and unobtrusively into the ordinary life of the school and will be conspicuous only to the degree to which it is imperfect.

---


3 Reiss, "Sex Education in Public Schools", p. 95.


Surveys have shown that the integrative or composite approach is the most common method of presentation in existing programs although some separate courses have been reported. An Illinois study revealed that 44 percent of the schools responding, incorporated family living topics in other courses.\(^1\) The 1970 Washington survey concluded that "most family life and sex education occurred incidently and briefly as a unit in the context of something else".\(^2\) In the C.E.A. survey in 1964, none of the provincial departments of education reported having a curriculum provision for treating sex education as a separate course or program.\(^3\) The Vanier survey found that family life education materials are often parts of other courses (83 percent) rather than separate courses (17 percent). Just over 10 percent classified their courses as both.\(^4\) The most recent survey by Vanier in 1973 revealed that:

Composite courses containing Family Life Education material along with other topics are found more frequently than separate Family Life Education courses, but there is an interesting number of provinces who have initiated separate courses on Family Life. British Columbia, Ont-

---


\(^3\) Canadian Education Association, "Sex Education in Schools", p. 276.

\(^4\) Vanier, Survey, p. 6.
ario, Saskatchewan and Quebec are the forerunners in their efforts to provide entire courses on the family.¹

Despite the predominance of the integrative approach in the family life field, surveys have shown that parents in particular are not in agreement with the authorities on this issue. Libby found that 73 percent of the parents who responded preferred a separate course in family life and sex education.² Dearth found that 55 percent of the parents and 63 percent of the students preferred a separate course. A significant number of the sex education experts, 40 percent were also in favor of a separate course.³

Co-educational or Segregated Classes

The issue of co-education versus segregated classes for family life courses remains an unresolved one. Although many logical, albeit hypothetical, arguments could be found in support of co-education classes, none could be found for segregated classes.

Shoel maintains that sex instructional phases of human relations and family living courses should be offered to heterogeneous classes at all levels. She explains:

If we are aiming at equipping youngsters with the understanding, skills, knowledge and attitudes that will enable them to incorporate sex in its broadest expression

¹Vanier, "Family Life Education", p. 9.
³Dearth, "Viable Sex Education", p. 191.
most responsibility into their present and future family settings, then teaching both sexes together seems imperative.¹

Dr. Alan Guttmacher considers it wrong to segregate boys and girls at any stage in sex education. He states:

I would take issue with anybody . . . It seems to me you create a kind of pornographic aura when you feel you cannot talk about these things in mixed company, that you must separate the boys from the girls . . . On all occasions sex education ought to be a co-educational discipline.²

In a similar vein, Dr. Milton Levine points out the importance of linking sex instruction with the rest of the school as naturally as possible:

It should proceed in a completely everyday manner and be free of anything suggesting the sensational. It is therefore obvious that boys and girls must be taught together, certainly until puberty.³

Among the implications of a study of child readiness for various aspects of family life education by Guest was "that the presentation of family life education to regular mixed classes of boys and girls was questionable since the sexes differed in readiness".⁴ Guest later examined the

¹Shoel, "Sex Education", p. 133.


³Levine, "Sex Education", p. 32.

logic of separating the sexes at pre-adolescence in view of
the fact that boys on the average reach puberty one to two
years later than girls. He concludes that although segre-
gating the girls for instruction on puberty, and omitting
the topic for boys until they are older and more ready for
it may seem logical:

it is likely to result in an atmosphere of mystery and
secretiveness, considerable curiosity on the part of
the boys and perhaps a clandestine exchange of inform-
ation between boys and girls in which the teacher has
no opportunity to play a constructive part. A better
alternative seems to be the presentation of the topic
to boys at the same time as to girls, in the expecta-
tion that some of it may not register with the boys
because of their incomplete readiness, and that the
topic will have to be presented to the boys again a
year or so later when it seems more relevant to them.
In the meanwhile, at least an air of healthy openness
 can be created, some curiosity alleviated, and a start
made toward the development of mutual understanding and
respect between boys and girls.¹

Despite the arguments for co-educational classes
in family life education such classes are the exception
in Canadian schools. The Vanier survey revealed that:

boys and girls . . . did not generally take the courses
together for in the majority of the schools the classes
were segregated. The greatest sex segregation, in a-
bout 80% of the schools, was for students taking sex
education; the least was for parent-child and intergener-
ational relationships, with 69%.²

Studies have shown that co-educational classes do
not receive strong support among parents and educators.

¹Harry H. Guest, "Family Living and Sex Education". From a draft being prepared for publication, Winnipeg, Manitoba, 1975. (Mimeoographed.)
²Vanier, Survey, p. 7.
Dearth found that only 42 percent of the parents supported mixed classes with 48 percent opposing. Students and experts were more supportive (76 percent and 79 percent respectively).\(^1\) Holcomb, Garner and Beaty found that "the majority of Texas superintendents feel that sex education classes should not be co-educational."\(^2\) McIntire and Eaton found that only 45 percent of Connecticut parents agreed with co-educational classes. Thirty-three percent objected and 22 percent were uncertain.\(^3\) A similar study of Connecticut principals revealed that 50 percent supported the idea of co-educational classes, with 26 percent disagreeing and a large segment, 24 percent, were uncertain.\(^4\) Libby found more support among parents for mixed classes as 66 percent approved of such classes "under most conditions" and 14 percent approved "under all conditions."\(^5\) Finally, Free found that almost 50 percent of the parents and administrators and 81 percent of the students indicated that family living courses should be co-educational.\(^6\)

1 Dearth, "Viable Sex Education", p. 191.
Compulsory or Optional Courses

The authorities reviewed gave little consideration to the issue of whether family life education courses should be compulsory or optional. It is suspected that because the overwhelming majority recommended that family life materials be integrated as parts or units of the existing courses, most students would therefore be exposed naturally without the need for compulsion.

Rev. Lester Kinsolving comments on the issue following a review of the Education Code of the State of California which requires courses of study in such areas as public safety, accident prevention, alcohol, narcotics and fire prevention in addition to such traditional subjects as English, History, Mathematics and Social Sciences. He states:

In contemplating such definite and statewide requirements, I could not help but wonder why, for the sake of public health alone, a special course in sex education is not as mandatory as these other areas of education. Do the citizens of California generally utilize algebra with anywhere near the frequency that they practice copulation? How many homes have been broken as a result of ignorance of California history or English literature—as compared with ignorance concerning sex? . . . Is there any realism in requiring instruction in social sciences while at the same time making optional any instructions in social disease? 1

The California situation referred to by Kinsolving is apparently not an exception. Studies have revealed that few schools require their students to take family life education even when they are offered as separate courses.

Bayer and Nye found that "only 1/4 of the high schools in Florida are found to offer any family life education and few schools require their students to take the courses".\(^1\)

The Washington survey found that:

- nearly all the offerings in family life and sex education were elective especially for boys. of 175 co-educational offerings in home economics, only 17 were compulsory, and in a total of 365 separated classes only 15 were compulsory.\(^2\)

A similar study in Indiana revealed:

- of all the students in family life education courses we find that it is mandatory for 30 percent of them. Considering the state of family life education in high schools today this figure sounds high, but when we consider that approximately 164,000 students were enrolled in the schools of our sample, the percentage of students who must take family life education courses is reduced to 3.6 percent.\(^3\)

Similar information on the situation in Canadian schools with respect to this issue could not be found.

Dearth found in his study that all three groups strongly supported the idea of requiring all students to take Human Sexuality Education. Both students and parents indicated the same amount of support (82 percent) while sex education experts followed close behind (76 percent).\(^4\)

\(^1\)Bayer and Nye, "Family Life Education", p. 186.
\(^4\)Dearth, "Viable Sex Education", p. 191.
Calderwood examined the views of a group of adolescents on sex education in 1965. One of the recommendations made by the group was for:

compulsory as well as elective courses in the high school curriculum beginning in the tenth grade and staffed by a specially trained team of teachers... 1

Finally, even though parents, students and administrators indicated recognition of the importance of family living courses in the public schools, Free found that all three groups in her study “agreed that a family living course should not be required of students before completing requirements for high school graduation”. 2

Use of Outside Speakers

A frequent method of presenting many of the topics in family life education programs is the use of outside speakers or "expert" resource people from the community. This approach is included in the suggestions for implementation of family life education by the Curriculum Branch of the Alberta Department of Education. The report states that many units of family life education can and should be taught by the regular classroom teacher, however:

Other units may be taught in part by the classroom


teacher with special preparation in Family Life Education, and assisted by experienced resource persons. Doctors, lawyers, ministers, sociologists, psychologists, social workers and qualified parents may be such resource persons. Parents and students should be involved in the selection of these resource persons. Expertise is a necessary but not a sufficient criterion for the choice of resource persons. In addition, relating well to others and insightful of one's own emotions and feelings are important characteristics of resource persons.¹

Questions have been raised about the effectiveness of this approach to a subject like family life education which is not limited to factual data, and whether it is good pedagogic practice, especially if used in excess. Bibby maintains that although a guest speaker, who is an expert on a topic under discussion, can make an important contribution to an ongoing program, a program limited to the use of such speakers is less than adequate because it lacks the developmental treatment and the amount of student involvement which is desirable. Such programs are usually limited to the "telling" approach which is not the same as "teaching".²

Haar states that if family life education is to be presented in an integrative approach the practice of having outside speakers should be discouraged. He sees this as one of the basic requirements upon which the success of the integrated program depends.³

¹Alberta, Department of Education, A Point of View, p. 226.
²Bibby, Sex Education, pp. 207-14.
Nevertheless, parents and students seem to strongly favor the use of experts to present certain family life topics. Dearth found that the idea of bringing in outside expert speakers to talk with the class brought very positive responses from both students and parents (99 percent and 86 percent respectively). The sex education experts were also quite supportive as 71 percent agreed with this approach.\(^1\) Whether or not this reflects a lack of trust or confidence in the ability of teachers to deal with all topics effectively has not been determined.

**Nature and Extent of Parental Involvement**

It would appear that one of the fundamental principles underlying the successful implementation of family life education programs is that of involvement of parents. The nature and extent of such involvement will depend to a large degree on the particular parents concerned, however most authorities recommend that the opportunity for parents to participate in some way if they so desire is an integral part of any program.

One of the more frequent suggestions for parental involvement is that of keeping parents fully aware of what is being taught to their children in family life courses and allowing them the opportunity to discuss or review teaching

\(^{1}\) Dearth, "Viable Sex Education", p. 193.
materials (literature, films, etc.), if they so desire, before they are used in class. Guest suggests that this can be done by:

inviting all the parents of the children concerned, before any substantial section of family life education is to be presented at school, to a special meeting to see the films, examine the materials, and hear from the teacher about the program. Then when the unit has been presented to the children and they come home, their parents have an easy opening for discussing the subject further.¹

Another suggestion has been adult family life education courses in the evenings, offered by the schools at the same time that programs are offered to the children. Frasier suggests that such programs can help parents develop an understanding of the content of various aspects of a family life education program. She writes:

As parents learn they become aware of what they do not know; they recognize they have some limitations in their own teaching role . . . . When parents become aware of the nature of family life education, they are likely to encourage rather than oppose curriculum development.²

McIntire and Eaton found strong support, even perhaps a request, for concurrent programs in family life education for the parents and the community in general. Seventy-four percent of the responding parents agreed that such programs should be offered to the community. The possible implica-

¹Guest, "Family Life Education", p. 625.

tions of this response are that parents are generally un-
prepared to do sex education themselves and are perhaps
seeking to broaden their understanding of aspects of their
own interpersonal relationships as well as those of their
children, and also that parents want to be informed of what
is being done by the school in the family life education
area.\(^1\) In a study by Ready, 73 percent of the teachers in
the sample agreed that "schools should offer appropriately
planned programs in sex education to interested parents of
the community."\(^2\)

With respect to parental involvement in family life
education programs, the Curriculum Branch of the Alberta
Department of Education takes the position:

As value positions underlying Family Life Education are
many and varied, parents should be properly informed
about the planning, initiation, and presentation of a
program in the schools. Interested parents should be
involved in the selection of materials and instructors
for the program in cases where sensitivity to values
is highly important. This parent involvement should
be encouraged and welcomed at all levels of schooling.\(^3\)

\(^1\) McIntire and Eaton, "Parental Attitudes", p. 667.

\(^2\) Jerry L. Ready, "The Current Status of Family Life
and Sex Education in the Public Schools of Illinois", The

\(^3\) Alberta Department of Education, A Point of View,
p. 226.
Summary

This review of the literature has focused primarily on some of the fundamental questions and issues relative to family life education in the schools. It revealed that family life education is a developmental process which includes not only the teaching of facts but also the development of attitudes and values which are conducive to personal fulfillment, healthy interpersonal relationships, and successful family life. It is not synonymous with sex education. Instead, sex education is one vital dimension of family life education.

Family life education is considered necessary because of (1) changing social conditions and (2) failure on the part of parents to adequately meet the responsibility for lack of time, knowledge, teaching skills, a peer group for interaction or even because of incest taboos and/or role conflicts. The school is considered the most logical social institution to supplement parental efforts because it reaches all the children in the community and it has trained educators to do the job.

It is generally agreed that a comprehensive program in family life education from kindergarten to the end of school would help strengthen and stabilize future families and represent a very significant frontline attack against many of the social problems that plague contemporary marriage and family life.

Included in the review is a list of topics common to
courses about family life education. There was general agreement among the experts in the field that topics such as sex education should be initiated in kindergarten and enlarged upon in subsequent grades. Canadian educators recommended that sex education should be introduced in the curriculum early, however, surveys have shown such is not the case in Canadian schools. It has been found that courses with family life material are generally designed for high school students, particularly senior high.

There was general agreement that the teacher of family life education should be specially trained to teach such courses. The sex and marital status were not considered important by the experts but significant numbers of parents and educators surveyed indicated preference for a married teacher. The desirability of parenthood was not examined in the parent-educator surveys reviewed.

Experts in the field generally favored the integration of family life topics into existing courses, as naturally as possible and presenting them to co-educational classes. Although this is the most common method of presentation, surveys of parents have revealed a strong preference for separate courses with visiting professional speakers and a relatively large number have favored sex-segregated classes. There has been mixed reaction regarding making such courses compulsory.

Finally, most authorities reviewed agreed that the opportunity for parents to participate in some way in family life education programs, if they so desire, is an integral part of such programs.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Classification of the Research

Tripodi et al identify three major types of research: experimental, quantitative-descriptive and exploratory. This research project appears to fall within the definition of quantitative-descriptive studies which they describe as:

empirical research investigations which have as their major purpose the delineation or assessment of characteristics of phenomena, program evaluation or the isolation of key variables ... All of these studies use quantitative devices for systematically collecting data from populations, programs or samples of populations or programs. They employ personal interviews, mailed questionnaires, and/or other rigorous data gathering devices and survey sampling procedures.¹

Quantitative-descriptive studies are further classified into four sub-types according to the major purpose of the investigation or the methods used. The sub-type, population description studies, seems most applicable to this study. Population description studies are described as:

... those quantitative-descriptive studies which have as their primary function the accurate description of quantitative characteristics of selected populations, organizations, or other collectivities. These studies

frequently use survey procedures. They usually employ sampling methods to claim representativeness, and they contain a large number of variables. Some of these studies are descriptive of characteristics of designated populations such as roles, functions, needs, attitudes and opinions.¹

This study, therefore, may be classified as follows:

Major type—Quantitative-descriptive, Sub-type—Population description.

Location of the Study

This study was conducted in Kent County which, with Lambton and Essex, comprise Southwestern Ontario's tri-county region. Kent County has a population of just over 100,000. Approximately 35 percent of the population live in the city of Chatham, the county's only urban centre. Another 28 percent live in the 6 towns (populations ranging from 800 to 10,000) and 5 villages (populations ranging from 250 to 1700) located throughout the county in a concentric fashion with Chatham at the centre. The remaining 37 percent live in the country, in the county's 10 townships. The county is located mid-way between the two large industrial centres of London, 60 miles to the east and Windsor-Detroit, 50 miles to the south-west.

Kent County is rich in ethnic heritage with over 16 different ethnic groups represented. Included are North

¹Tripodi et al, Assessment, p. 42.
American Indian, German, Dutch, Scottish, Czechoslovakian, Irish, Polish, Afro-American, Italian, Ukranian, Japanese, Chinese, French and English.

Kent County is one of Canada's richest agricultural areas. Its half million acres of farmland produce an annual gross return of one hundred million dollars. The average farm size is 75 to 100 acres with some ranging as large as 1600 acres. In addition to farming, the other major occupations include trades, manufacturing, manual labor and service work.

Two educational systems meet the educational needs of the county's children and youth. The smaller of the two, The Roman Catholic Separate School Board, has schools located throughout the county and its bus services make these schools accessible to every Catholic family who chooses to use that system. About one-third of the students in Kent County attend the separate school system.

The Kent County Board of Education is the public school system in Kent County and it provides services to the remainder of the county's students. It operates 44 schools, also geographically located with bus services so that they are accessible to every student in the county who wishes to use the public school system. Thirty-two of the schools are elementary schools with a total population of
The 44 public schools are divided, for administrative purposes, into 7 families which are intended to meet the educational needs of specific geographic areas. Each family consists of a number of elementary schools and one or more secondary schools as required to handle the elementary school graduates in each family.

Kent County was chosen for the study for a number of reasons:

1) Its proximity to the university

2) Convenience, since the writer has resided in Kent County for the past four years.

3) It has adequate representation of urban and rural populations including various sizes of towns.

4) It is traditionally a strong conservative area that appears to have maintained its identity despite its proximity to the industrial centres mentioned previously and the bombardment of media exposure from the United States.

The Kent County Board of Education was chosen for the following reasons:

1) It provides educational services to over two-thirds of the families in Kent County of every religion

2) It does not have a family life program at present and has no immediate plans for such a program

3) It saw the study as being potentially valuable to any plans it might have in the family life area in the future and consequently expressed an active willingness to co-operate

4) The Kent County Roman Catholic Separate School Board is currently in the pilot project stage of implementing a family life program and expressed a reluctance to be involved for fear the question-
naire would be misunderstood by parents and disrupt its current efforts to implement the program.

Population

The parent population for this study consisted of all the parents in Kent County with at least one child attending one of the 32 elementary schools under the Kent County Board of Education. The parent population was limited to those parents with a child in the elementary school system primarily because they were considered to have greater personal concern about family life programs since the introduction of such programs at any level in the school curriculum would undoubtedly involve their children, either at present or in the near future.

The teacher population consisted of all the teachers, full-time and part-time, including principals and vice-principals, employed by the Kent County Board of Education at the time of the study. This population numbered 1,059 and were provided on computer cards by the school board. The decision not to restrict the teacher population to elementary school teachers was made for the following reasons:

1) any family life program in the school system would impinge, to some extent, on all teachers, especially if integrated into existing courses

2) the attitudes of teachers regarding the place of family life programs in the public school system was expected to reflect, in large part, professional opinions based on whatever philosophy of education
the individual teacher might adhere to. Professional opinions from elementary school teachers only, may not be representative of public school educators in general, and therefore would be less than adequate for a comparative study of attitudes such as this project. Elementary school parents, on the other hand, may also be parents of high school students at present, or will be in the near future; therefore, their opinions were expected to be representative of all parents in Kent County.

Sample

A parent sample of 100 was chosen from the total population by a stratified random sampling procedure. Class lists were obtained from all 32 elementary schools and grouped according to the family of schools in which they appeared. Next, 100 students were randomly selected from the 12,345 elementary school population as shown in Table 3.1.

### TABLE 3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family of Schools</th>
<th>Elementary Student Population</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Elementary Population</th>
<th>Number of Students Chosen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Chatham</td>
<td>2521</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Chatham</td>
<td>2569</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallaceburg</td>
<td>1704</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dresden</td>
<td>1395</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgetown</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blenheim</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilbury</td>
<td>1325</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,345</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The number of students in a given family of schools determined the number of students selected from that family. From left to right in Table 3.1, column 1 lists the 7 families of schools. Column 2 lists the total elementary school population in each family. Column 3 lists the population in each family expressed as a percentage of the total elementary school population. Column 4 lists the corresponding number of students selected from the total in each family. A table of random numbers was used to select the required number of students from each family of schools and the parents of these students comprised the parent sample. In the event that two students from the same family were selected, one was dropped and the next random number was taken. The same procedure was used in cases where the family of a selected student had moved from the area since the class lists were made.

The rationale for stratifying the random sampling procedure in this manner for the parent group was to insure geographic representation throughout the county and to control for over-representation on the part of the city of Chatham, which comprises 41 percent of the students in the elementary school system.

The teacher sample was selected from the 1,059 names which appeared on the computer cards provided by the Kent County Board of Education. A random sample of 127 was selected by computer at the University of Windsor.
Method of Data Collection

The data for this study was collected by the use of a questionnaire developed primarily from the literature but specifically using several items from the Vanier, Free, and McIntire studies. The questionnaire differed from those used in most other studies in the following respects:

1) No formal name such as Family Life Education or Sex Education was used to refer to family life courses. This was intended to control for possible reaction by the respondents to the name alone as opposed to the actual content of such courses.

2) The questionnaire did not contain a formal definition of family life education. Parent-teacher attitudes toward specific topics, that generally comprise the content of family life programs, was considered to be more meaningful and of more practical value than attitudes toward a definition which may not adequately represent the concept of family life education in schools. Also, because family life education is not a unitary concept, definitions tend to force the respondent into an all or none situation, whereas in reality he may agree strongly with some aspects of such programs and disagree equally strongly with others. The questionnaire designed for this study attempted to allow the respondent to make this distinction in expressing his opinions. In addition, definitions of family life education tend to be lengthy, clumsy, not universally accepted and more often than not less than adequate.

---

1 See Appendix
2 Vanier, Survey.
3 Free, "Attitudes".
4 McIntire and Eaton, "Parental Attitudes".
5 McIntire, "Attitudes of Principals".
Instead of offering a definition of family life education, the first part of the questionnaire contained 22 topics common to courses about family life, whatever the name or definition given to such courses. The respondent was asked to respond to each topic by indicating if and when the topic should be offered in school. By completing this initial exercise, the respondent revealed what, in his opinion, should be the content of family life courses and what should be taught at different levels in the school curriculum. At the same time, the exercise familiarized him with what is specifically involved in family life programs thus giving him the necessary background and understanding with which to approach the remainder of the questionnaire. This method of introducing the respondent to the concept of family life education was considered to be more effective than offering a definition.

In selecting the questionnaire as the instrument for data collection, it was recognized that many factors influence the rate of return. Among the most important were:

1) the sponsorship of the questionnaire
2) the attractiveness of the questionnaire format
3) the length of the questionnaire
4) the nature of the accompanying letter requesting co-operation
5) the ease of filling out the questionnaire and mailing it back
6) the inducements offered to reply

7) the nature of the people to whom the question-
naire is sent.

In consideration of these factors, the following meas-
ures were taken in an attempt to increase the rate of return:

1) the covering letter used the University of Windsor
letterhead; it included a quote from the school
board's letter authorizing the study; it stressed
the importance of the respondents' attitudes and
their possible effects on future school programming;
it pointed out the ease in filling out the question-
aire because of check answers, and tried to counter-
act the lengthy appearance by giving an estimated com-
pletion time of 20 minutes; it stressed the fact that
identity was not required and in fact asked that name
or address not be written anywhere on the question-
aire.

2) a self-addressed, stamped envelope was enclosed for
convenience.

3) the return address on questionnaire envelopes was
to a credible, non-threatening local social agency,
Chatham-Kent Community and Family Services, instead
of to the writer's private address.

4) the respondents were given the opportunity to get
feedback for their efforts. The covering letter
suggested that if a card were sent to the writer
after September 1, 1975 a summary of the results
would be sent to the respondent or friends of the
respondent. Friends were included to further pro-
tect their anonymity in that those requesting re-
results may not necessarily be those who participated
in the study.

---

1 Selltiz et al., Research Methods in Social Rela-
tions, rev. ed. in 1 vol. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and

2 See Appendix
5) two methods of delivery were used in an attempt to control for the possibility that parents would be less apt to participate than teachers, especially in view of the size of the questionnaire. Questionnaires were mailed to the teachers but were brought home to the parents from school by the child chosen in the random sampling. This involvement by the school was expected to give further credibility to the study and have a positive influence on returns, particularly from less educated respondents.

The respondents were identified by using blue trimmed mailing labels for parents and plain white mailing labels for teachers.

One follow-up letter¹ was mailed to the teachers and delivered to the parents in the same manner as the questionnaire 10 days after the questionnaire delivery date. Six weeks was chosen as the time period in which returns would be counted. Any questionnaires received after that period were not included in the analysis.

Method of Data Analysis

The data analysis for this study was done by computer using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, subprograms Codebook and Crosstabs.² All questionnaires received within the predetermined survey period were checked and coded and cards for the computer programs were punched and verified.

The analysis primarily involved determining frequencies and percentages and examining the similarities and differences between the responses of each group toward the topics and issues presented in the questionnaire.

¹See Appendix

A secondary purpose of the study was to examine significantly different attitudes among the members in each group toward the more controversial topics and issues to determine possible factors associated with these attitudes, such as age, sex, education, social class, sex of children et cetera. The Crosstabs subprogram was used to carry out this operation using the chi-square statistic ($X^2$) to identify association and the contingency coefficient ($C$) to provide an index of the strength of that association. However, after perusal of the data from this program it was decided to exclude it from the analysis. The rationale for this decision is presented in the data analysis chapter of this report.

Guttman's coefficient of predictability was applied in a number of cases to determine the existence of relationships between certain pairs of variables.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

In this chapter the data will be analyzed in three major sections. The first section will present the rate of response and examine the characteristics of the respondents under the following headings:

1) sex
2) marital status
3) age
4) age at marriage
5) spouse's age at marriage
6) education
7) spouse's education
8) residence
9) ethnicity
10) social class
11) number of children
12) sex of children
13) age of children

Frequency of observations and their related percentages will be examined under each heading.

The second section will analyze and compare the re-
responses of both groups to specific topics and issues in the family life field as surveyed by the questionnaire.

The final section will examine the findings regarding the association between differential attitudes among respondents within the same group toward specific aspects of family life education and classification variables such as those presented in the first section of this chapter.

Characteristics of the Sample

Rate of Response

Of the 100 questionnaires delivered to the parent group, 67 were returned completed and one was returned unmarked within the predetermined survey period. This represents a rate of return for the parent group of 68.0 percent. The unmarked questionnaire was excluded from the analysis.

Sixty-eight of the 107 questionnaires mailed to the teacher group were returned. This represents a return rate of 63.6 percent.

Sex

Although no particular parent was designated to complete the questionnaire, mothers were the most frequent parent responding. The parent group consisted of 74.6 percent female and 25.4 percent male.

The teacher group was more evenly balanced between male and female with 54.4 percent and 46.6 percent respectively.
Marital Status

Fifty-nine (88.0 percent) of the parents responding were married at the time of the survey. Of the remaining 12 percent, 6.0 percent (4) were separated, 4.5 percent (3) were divorced and 1.5 percent (1) were living in a common-law union. Among the teacher group, 79.4 percent (54) were married, 2.9 percent (2) were widowed, 4.4 percent (3) were separated, and 13.2 percent (9) were unmarried.

Age

Only 25.7 percent (17) of the parents were under 30 years of age compared to 45.3 percent (29) of the teachers. The reverse was true in the 30 to less than 40 age range with 43.9 percent (29) of the parents and only 25.4 percent (17) of the teachers falling into this category. Both parent and teacher groups had almost equal representation in the 40 or more age range with 30.3 percent (20) and 31.3 percent (21) respectively.

Age at Marriage

Teenage marriages were most common among the parent group as 42.4 percent (28) were under 20 years of age at the time of marriage compared to only 3.4 percent (2) of the teachers. The age range of 20-25 years was most popular for both groups with 51.5 percent (34) of the parents and 71.2 percent (42) of the teachers marrying within
this range. Only 1.5 percent (1) of the parents and 3.4 percent (2) of the teachers were over 30 years of age at the time of marriage.

Spouse's Age at Marriage

Teenage marriages were less common among the spouses of the parent respondents with only 25.4 percent (17) being under 20 years of age at the time of marriage. An even smaller number of teacher spouses, 10.2 percent (6), were teenagers at the time of marriage. The majority of the spouses in both the parent and teacher groups were married within the age range of 20 to 25 years, 53.7 percent (36) and 61.0 percent (36) respectively. Only one parent spouse and 5 teacher spouses were over 30 years of age at the time of marriage. The remaining spouses in both groups were in the 26-30 year age range when married.

Education

The majority of the parents, 59.6 percent (40), had not completed high school. Of the remaining parent respondents, 26.9 percent (18) had graduated from high school or trade school, 9.0 percent (6) had 1-3 years of college or university, and 4.5 percent (3) had graduate professional training. Almost all of the teacher group, 95.6 percent (65), had at least one year of university or college education. Table 4.1 illustrates the educational characteristics of both groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 6 or less</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 7-9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 10-11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High/trade school graduate</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 yrs. university/college</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate professional training</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spouse's Education

The majority of the spouses of the parent group, 67.1 percent (45), had not completed high school. Almost 40 percent (22) had grade 9 education or less. Twelve of the remaining 22 parent spouses (17.9 percent) had completed high school or trade school, 4.5 percent (3) had 1-3 years of college or university, 4.5 percent (3) had undergraduate degrees and 6.0 percent (4) had graduate professional training. Sixteen percent (9) of the teacher spouses had not completed high school, 19.6 percent (11) had completed high or trade school, and 64.4 percent (36) had at least
one year of college or university. Table 4.2 illustrates the educational characteristics of the spouses of both groups.

**TABLE 4.2**

EDUCATION OF SPOUSES OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spouse's Education</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 6 or less</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 7-9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 10-11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High/Trade school graduate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years university/college</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate professional training</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>N/A**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*M* will be used hereafter in the percentage column of tables to indicate that percentages are adjusted to exclude missing values.

**N/A** will be used hereafter in the percentage column to indicate that the values are not applicable and percentages are adjusted to exclude them.
Residence

All three major geographic areas, city, town and country, were adequately represented in the returns. Table 4.3 illustrates the residential location of respondents in both groups.

TABLE 4.3
RESIDENCE OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatham</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ethnicity

The vast majority of the respondents in both parent and teacher groups were English Canadian, 72.7 percent (48) and 67.1 percent (45) respectively. Thirteen other ethnic groups were represented among the respondents. Table 4.4 illustrates the various ethnic groups that comprised the research sample.
TABLE 4.4
ETHNICITY OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Canadian</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Canadian</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The "other" category consisted of a Ukranian, Belgian, Afro-Canadian, American, Italian and a Norwegian respondent.

Social Class

Hollingshead's Two Factor Index of Social Position was used to compute social class. This index uses education and occupation of the main wage earner to determine social position. Table 4.5 shows the social class of the parent and teacher respondents as computed by Hollingshead's index.

1August B. Hollingshead, Two Factor Index of Social Position (New Haven, Connecticut: By the Author, 1965 Yale Station, 1957).
### Table 4.5

**Social Class of Parents and Teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Class</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (upper)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II (upper middle)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III (middle)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV (lower middle)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V (lower)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The one teacher in the lower social class reported her husband as the main wage-earner in the family. His grade 10-11 education and occupation as an assembly line worker gave the family a lower class score.

**Number of Children**

All of the parents in the parent group had two or more children. In 23.9 percent (16) of the cases there were 2 children and in 32.8 percent (22), there were three children. In the teacher group, 35.2 percent (24) were without children. This figure includes the 9 teachers who were unmarried. Table 4.6 illustrates the composition of the families for both groups.
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS WITH EACH NUMBER OF CHILDREN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than Seven</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sex of Children

Fifty-four of the parents (80.6 percent) had both male and female children in their families, 11.9 percent (8) had male only, and 7.5 percent (5) had female only. In the teacher group, 33.8 percent (23), or over half of those with children, had both male and female children, 14.7 percent (10) had male only and 16.2 percent (11) had female only.

In the parent group, 88.1 percent (59) had at least one female child in their family. Eighteen (26.9 percent) of
the respondents had 2, 16.4 percent (11) had 3, and 7.5 percent (5) had 4 female children in their family. One-half (50.0 percent) of the teacher group, or 77.3 percent (34) of those teachers with children, had at least one female child in their families. Only 6 percent (4) of the parent respondents, compared with 16.2 percent (11) of the teachers, had no male children in their families.

The youngest child in the families of the parent group was almost evenly split between male and female, with 49.3 percent (33) and 50.7 percent (34) respectively. For those teachers with children, the youngest child was male in 56.8 percent (25) and female in 43.2 percent (19) of the cases.

The oldest child tended to be male in the parent group and female in the teacher group with 64.2 percent (43) and 54.5 percent (24) respectively.

Age of Children

In the parent group, the youngest child was 10 years of age or less in 77.6 percent (52) of the cases with 38.8 percent falling in each of the 1-5 year and 6-10 year categories. In the remaining 22.4 percent (15) of the parent cases, the youngest child was 11-13 years of age. Of the 44 teachers with children, the youngest child was 10 years of age or less in 65.9 percent (44) of the cases with 47.4 percent (21) falling in the 1-5 year range and 18.5 percent (8) in the 6-10 year range. In 88.6 percent (39) of the teacher
cases with children, the youngest child was under 16 years of age. The youngest child of 5 of the teacher respondents was over 19 years of age.

Forty-nine (73.1 percent) of the parent respondents had teenage children in their families compared to 54.3 percent (24) of the teachers. The oldest child was in the 6-10 year range in 25.4 percent (17) of the parent cases, in the 11-13 year range in 22.4 percent (15) of the parent cases, and in the 16-19 year range in 22.4 percent (15) of the parent cases. Also, 17.9 percent (12) of the parent respondents had a child over 19 years of age. In 29.1 percent (13) of the cases of teachers with children, the oldest child was in the 1-5 year category and one-quarter of the teachers had a child over 19 years of age. Table 4.7 illustrates the age categories for the youngest and oldest children in both parent and teacher families.

In the parent group, 62.7 percent (42) of the cases had a female child 10 years of age or less and 82.1 percent (55) had at least one female child under 16 years of age. Nineteen (43.1 percent) of the teachers with children had a female child 10 years of age or less and in 27.2 percent of the cases the female child was in the age range of 1-5 years. In addition, 56.8 percent (25) of the teachers had at least one female child under 16 years of age.
### TABLE 4.7
AGE OF YOUNGEST AND OLDEST CHILD
IN PARENT AND TEACHER GROUPS

| Age of Child | Parents | | | Teachers | | |
|--------------|---------|--------|---------|----------|--------|
|              | Youngest | Oldest | Youngest | Oldest | |
|              | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| 1-5 years    | 26 | 38.8 | 1 | 1.5 | 21 | 47.4 | 13 | 29.4 |
| 6-10 years   | 26 | 38.8 | 17 | 25.4 | 8 | 18.4 | 7 | 15.9 |
| 11-13 years  | 15 | 22.4 | 15 | 22.4 | 6 | 13.6 | 7 | 15.9 |
| 14-15 years  | 0 | 0.0 | 7 | 10.4 | 2 | 4.6 | 2 | 4.6 |
| 16-19 years  | 0 | 0.0 | 15 | 22.4 | 2 | 4.6 | 4 | 9.2 |
| Over 19 years | 0 | 0.0 | 12 | 17.9 | 5 | 11.4 | 11 | 25.0 |
| No children  | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 24 | N/A | 24 | N/A |
| Total        | 67 | 100.0 | 67 | 100.0 | 68 | 100.0 | 68 | 100.0 |

Comparative Analysis of Findings

Need for Family Life Education

The review of the literature for this study revealed that the two major factors commonly regarded as underlying the need for formal education for family life are changing social conditions and failure on the part of parents to provide their children with the necessary education in this area. (See pp. 23-25 above) The majority of parents and teachers in this study, 77.2 percent (51) and 83.9 percent (57) respectively, were in agreement with changing social
conditions as a factor underlying the need for such education (Table 4.8). However, the parent group was significantly less willing than the teacher group to put the blame on parental failure. Only 49.3 percent (32) of the parents agreed with parental failure as a factor underlying the need, compared to 72.1 percent (49) of the teachers (Table 4.9).

| TABLE 4.8 |
| CHANGING SOCIAL CONDITIONS AS A FACTOR UNDERLYING THE NEED FOR FAMILY LIFE EDUCATION |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Formal education for family life is needed, according to many authorities, because parents are not adequately prepared to give their children information about reproduction, child development, marriage, as well as other aspects of family relationships (see pp. 25-28 above). Teachers
overwhelmingly agreed with the authorities on this issue, 88.2 percent (60) compared to a smaller majority of the parents, 59.0 percent (38). A significant number of parents, 33.4 percent (22), felt parents were adequately prepared to give such information but many qualified their responses by pointing out the difference between being prepared to give such information and actually giving it. The implication drawn from the various comments was that most parents have the information but many are not communicating it to their children. Table 4.10 illustrates comparatively the nature of the responses in both groups.

**TABLE 4.9**

PARENTAL FAILURE AS A FACTOR UNDERLYING THE NEED FOR FAMILY LIFE EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4.10

MOST PARENTS ARE ADEQUATELY PREPARED TO GIVE THEIR CHILDREN INFORMATION ABOUT REPRODUCTION, CHILD DEVELOPMENT, MARRIAGE AS WELL AS OTHER ASPECTS OF FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responsibility for Family Life Education

There appeared to be a consensus of opinions among the authorities that parents should have the primary responsibility for educating their children about family life and sexuality, but that this ideal cannot be met by most parents in today's society. Because of this, many people, including parents, have suggested that other social institutions should and must assist parents in meeting this challenge (see pp. 32-35 above). The parents and teachers in this study were queried as to which group or groups they thought should have the primary responsibility for teaching children about family life.
Only 7.5 percent (5) of the parents and 8.8 percent (6) of the teachers felt that such education was the exclusive responsibility of parents. The majority in both groups, 64.1 percent (43) of the parents and 60.3 percent (41) of the teachers, considered that parents, schools and religious bodies should share the primary responsibility for such education. A comparative picture of their responses is presented in Table 4.11.

**TABLE 4.11**

*Which group or groups do you think should have the primary responsibility for teaching children about family life*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents, schools and religious bodies</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and religious bodies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and schools</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents alone</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools alone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why Schools?

Authorities in the field have presented two main arguments why schools are the logical place to teach for-
mally education about family life (see pp. 36-37 above). Both arguments were summarized in the following statement on the questionnaire:

The school is the logical place to teach formally education about family life because it is the only institution that reaches all the children in the community and such education can best be given by professional educators.

Parents and teachers were asked to respond to the statement on a Likert-type scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The majority in both groups agreed or strongly agreed with the authorities with respect to the two arguments, 78.8 percent (52) of the parents and 73.5 percent (50) of the teachers. An almost equal number agreed strongly, 25.8 percent (17) and 22.1 percent (15) respectively. Slightly more of the teachers than the parents disagreed with the statement, 14.7 percent (10) and 10.6 percent (7) respectively. Table 4.12 illustrates the responses of both groups.

**TABLE 4.12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What Should be Taught and When?

There was overwhelming agreement among authorities and others reviewed for this study that appropriately planned programs of education about family living should be offered throughout the school years from kindergarten through the end of high school (see pp. 43-44 above). Nevertheless, a recent report stated that in Canadian schools:

Most of the courses with Family Life Education material are designed for high school students, and in particular, senior high school students.¹

In view of this, the parents and teachers in this study were queried as to their general opinions on this issue. Table 4.13 presents a comparative view of their responses.

### TABLE 4.13

**WHEN SHOULD SCHOOLS OFFER APPROPRIATELY PLANNED PROGRAMS OF EDUCATION ABOUT FAMILY LIFE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary only (K-8)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school only (G9-13)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten - 13</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 5-13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 6-13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 7-13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a school responsibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary only (K-8)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school only (G9-13)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten - 13</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 5-13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 6-13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 7-13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a school responsibility</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Vanier, "Family Life Education", p. 9.
Table 4.13 reveals that both parents and teachers overwhelmingly agreed with the authorities, 77.6 percent (52) and 85.3 percent (58) respectively, that appropriately planned family life education programs should be offered from kindergarten to the end of high school.

In addition to obtaining parent and teacher attitudes as to when family life programs should be offered in schools, the questionnaire surveyed their opinions as to what kinds of topics were appropriate for such programs and at what grade level should specific topics be presented. Part I of the questionnaire contained 22 topics common to courses about family life.\(^1\) Respondents were asked to choose only one grade category and in cases where more than one were checked the lowest grade category was accepted. This latter decision was based on the assumption that if a topic were considered appropriate for early grade levels, it is unlikely it would be objected to at later levels in the school curriculum. A comparative analysis of the responses of parents and teachers to each specific topic follows.

The importance of the family to its members and to society

Both parents and teachers were almost unanimous in endorsing the appropriateness of the above topic for family life education programs, 97.0 percent (64) and 98.5 percent (65) respectively. The majority of parents, 60.7 percent (40), and teachers, 65.2 percent (43), suggested grades 1-4 as the

\(^1\)See Appendix
appropriate time to introduce the topic. Only 2 parents and one teacher thought the topic was outside the sphere of school responsibility. Table 4.14 illustrates the responses of both groups.

**TABLE 4.14**

**THE IMPORTANCE OF THE FAMILY TO ITS MEMBERS AND TO SOCIETY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 1-4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 5-7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 8-10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 11-13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be offered; do not know when</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should not be offered! Not a school responsibility</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factors involved in happy family living (decision-making, sharing responsibility, family obligations, communication, etc.)

Parents and teachers were in almost unanimous agreement with the inclusion of the above topic in family life education programs, 95.5 percent (64) and 98.5 percent (65) respectively. Grades 1-4 was the most popular choice for
parents, 49.2 percent (33). For the teachers, grades 5-7
was slightly more popular than grades 1-4, 39.4 percent (26)
and 36.4 percent respectively. Based on the assumption given
above (see p. 102), 77.5 percent (52) of the parents and 75.8
percent (50) of the teachers would approve of this topic for
grades 5-7. Only 4.5 percent (3) of the parents and none of
the teachers felt the topic was not a school responsibility.
Detailed responses for both groups are illustrated in Table
4.15.

TABLE 4.15

FACTORS INVOLVED IN HAPPY FAMILY LIVING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 1-4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 5-7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 8-10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 11-13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be offered; do not know when</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should not be offered! Not a school responsibility</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Understanding different types of families, styles and patterns of family life, responsibilities of parents, etc.

Sixty-four of the parents, 95.5 percent, and 64 of the teachers, 98.5 percent, overwhelmingly agreed that the above topic was appropriate for family life education programs. The majority of parents, 40.2 percent (27) thought grades 5-7 was the most suitable grade level to present the topic, however a substantial number, 26.9 percent (18), were in favor of grades 1-4. Most of the teachers were split almost evenly between grades 5-7 and grades 8-10 as the level to present the topic, 30.8 percent (20) and 32.3 percent (21) respectively. Again, based on the earlier assumption (see p. 102), 67.1 percent (45) of the parents would approve of grades 5-7 compared to 40.0 percent (26) of the teachers. The majority of teachers, 72.3 percent, would approve of grades 8-10 for this topic. Table 4.16 illustrates the responses of both groups.

Parent-child conflict areas, (choice of friends, hours, accountability, allowance, school achievement, etc.)

A substantial majority of parents and teachers considered this topic to be appropriate for family life education programs, 87.9 percent (58) and 98.5 percent (65) respectively. Grades 1-4 was the most frequently chosen grade level to present the topic by parents, 30.3 percent (20), with an almost equal number, 28.8 percent (19), choosing grades 5-7.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 1-4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 5-7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 8-10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 11-13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be offered, do not know when</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should not be offered! Not a school responsibility</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grades 5-7 was the most frequently recommended grade level by teachers, 43.9 percent (29) with a significant number, 36.4 percent (24), suggesting grades 8-10. Based on the previous assumption (see p. 102), 59.1 percent (39) of the parents and 54.5 percent (36) of the teachers would approve of this topic being taught in grades 5-7. A larger majority, 78.8 percent (52) of the parents and 90.9 percent (60) of the teachers would approve of grades 8-10 for this topic. Table 4.17 illustrates the responses in both groups.
### TABLE 4.17

**PARENT-CHILD CONFLICT AREAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 1–4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 5–7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 8–10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 11–13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be offered; do not know when</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should not be offered; Not a school responsibility</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Economics of family life (credit, budgeting, money management, etc.)*

Parents and teachers almost unanimously endorsed this topic as being appropriate for family life education programs. Grades 8–10 was the most popular grade level for both parent and teacher groups, 44.8 percent (30) and 53.9 percent (35) respectively. Again based on the previous assumptions (see p. 102), 73.2 percent (49) of the parents and 61.4 percent (40) of the teachers would approve of this topic being presented in grades 8–10. Only 7 parents and one teacher considered the topic outside the responsibility of the school.
Table 4.18 illustrates the responses of both groups.

**TABLE 4.18**

**ECONOMICS OF FAMILY LIFE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 1-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 5-7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 8-10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 11-13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be offered; do not know when</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should not be offered! Not a school responsibility</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factors leading to healthy physical, emotional and mental development of children

The above topic was considered appropriate for family life education programs by 92.4 percent (61) of the parents and 98.5 percent (65) of the teachers. Although no particular grade level received overwhelming popularity in either group, the grade category chosen by most respondents in each group were at opposite ends of the curriculum continuum. In
the parent group, 34.8 percent (23) chose grades 1-4 while 31.9 percent (21) of the teachers chose grades 11-13. Based on the previous assumption (see p. 102), a small majority of parents, 51.5 percent (34) would approve of grade 5-7 for this topic and a larger majority, 72.7 percent (48) would approve of grades 8-10. By the same assumption, a majority of teachers, 62.1 percent (41), would also approve of grades 8-10 as a suitable level to present this topic. Table 4.19 illustrates the frequencies and percentages of responses in both groups.

**TABLE 4.19**

**FACTORS LEADING TO HEALTHY PHYSICAL, EMOTIONAL AND MENTAL DEVELOPMENT OF CHILDREN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 1-4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 5-7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 8-10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 11-13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be offered; do not know when</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should not be offered! Not a school responsibility</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Family crises (childbirth, adoption, loss of loved one, retirement, separation, divorce, sudden unemployment)

More teachers than parents considered this topic appropriate for family life education programs, 95.5 percent (65) and 84.8 percent (56) respectively. The grade categories in which the topic should be presented most frequently chosen were grades 5-7 by the parents, 22.7 percent (15), and grades 11-13 by the teachers, 36.4 percent (24). Using the previous assumption (see p. 102), 62.1 percent (41) of the parents and 57.6 percent (38) of the teachers would approve of this topic being taught in grades 8-10. Ten parents (15.2 percent) and only 3 teachers (4.5 percent) felt the topic should not be offered in school. Table 4.20 illustrates the responses in both groups.

**TABLE 4.20**

FAMILY CRISIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 1-4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 5-7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 8-10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 11-13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be offered, do not know when</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should not be offered! Not a school responsibility</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Family problems (alcoholism, child abuse, child neglect, poverty, physical/mental/social disability, long term unemployment, housing etc.)

Both parent and teacher groups were almost unanimous in agreeing that the above topic should be offered in school, 91.0 percent (61) and 97.0 percent (64) respectively. The most frequently chosen grade category in which the topic should be offered was grades 5-7 for the parents, 23.9 percent (16), and grades 11-13 for the teachers, 42.4 percent (28). Based on the previous assumption (see p. 102) the majority of parents, 59.7 percent (40), would approve of this topic being taught in grades 8-10, compared to 48.5 percent (32) of the teachers who would present it before grade 11. Table 4.21 illustrates the responses in both groups.

TABLE 4.21
FAMILY PROBLEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 1-4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 5-7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 8-10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 11-13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be offered; do not know when</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should not be offered! Not a school responsibility</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Functions of family helping services in the community

A substantial majority of parents and teachers, 83.6 percent (56) and 93.9 percent (62) respectively, felt the schools should offer the above topic in family life education programs. The category, grades 11-13, was most frequently chosen by the teacher group, 40.9 percent (27), and grades 5-7 by the parents, 22.4 percent (15). Using the previous assumption (see p. 102), this topic would probably have to be offered in grades 11-13 to get the approval of the majority of parents and teachers as to when it should be presented. Eleven parents (16.4 percent) felt the topic was beyond the responsibility of the school compared to only 4 teachers (6.1 percent). Table 4.22 presents the responses of both groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 1-4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 5-7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 8-10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 11-13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be offered; do not know when</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should not be offered! Not a school responsibility</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Developing social skills (relating to others, making friends, etc.)

There was almost unanimous agreement among parents and teachers, 95.5 percent (64) and 98.5 percent (66) respectively, that this topic should be taught in family life education programs. The grade category most frequently chosen by respondents in both groups was grades 1-4, 55.1 percent (37) and 58.1 percent (39) respectively. Only 3 parents and one teacher felt the topic should not be taught in school. Table 4.23 illustrates the specific responses in each group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 1-4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 5-7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 8-10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 11-13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be offered; do not know when</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should not be offered! Not a school responsibility</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parents and teachers almost unanimously supported this topic as appropriate for family life education programs, 96.9 percent (62) and 98.5 percent (67) respectively. Grades 1-4 was the most frequently chosen category in which the topic should be taught, 51.6 percent (33) of the parents and 38.2 percent (26) of the teachers. Based on the previous assumption (see p. 102), this would be approved for grades 5-7 by 81.3 percent (52) of the parents and 73.5 percent (50) of the teachers. Only 2 parents and one teacher felt the topic was not a responsibility of the school and therefore should not be offered. Table 4.24 provides a comparative picture of the responses in both groups.

**TABLE 4.24**

LEARNING TO TALK FREELY ABOUT FEELINGS, GOALS VALUES, STANDARDS AND BEHAVIOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 1-4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 5-7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 8-10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 11-13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be offered; do not know when</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should not be offered! Not a school responsibility</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Human reproduction, childbirth, functions and anatomy of male/female sex organs, physical changes in boys and girls at puberty, correct terminology, etc.

Although this is one of the more potentially controversial topics, it received almost unanimous approval from both parents and teachers as an appropriate topic for family life education programs, 95.5 percent (64) and 97.1 percent (66) respectively. Grades 5-7 was the category most frequently chosen by both parents and teachers, 40.3 percent (27) and 44.1 percent (30) respectively. Based on the previous assumption (see p. 102) the majority of teachers would approve of this topic being offered in grades 5-7, 55.9 percent (38), whereas grades 8-10 would be necessary to meet the approval of the majority of parents, 79.1 percent (53). A substantial majority of teachers, 86.8 percent (59) would approve of grades 8-10. Only 3 parents (4.5 percent) and 2 teachers (2.9 percent) indicated the topic was not a school responsibility. Table 4.25 illustrates the frequencies and percentages of responses in both groups.

Boy-girl relationships (developing values and standards of behavior regarding choice of partner, going steady, necking, petting, sex before marriage, etc.)

Parents and teachers overwhelmingly supported this topic as appropriate for family life education programs, 90.9 percent (60) and 95.6 percent (65) respectively. The major—
TABLE 4.25
HUMAN REPRODUCTION, CHILDBIRTH, FUNCTIONS AND
ANATOMY OF MALE/FEMALE SEX ORGANS, PHYSICAL
CHANGES IN BOYS AND GIRLS AT PUBERTY,
CORRECT TERMINOLOGY, ETC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 1-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 5-7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 8-10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 11-13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be offered; do not know when</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should not be offered! Not a school responsibility</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ity in both groups chose grades 8-10 as the appropriate level to present the topic, 56.1 percent (37) of the parents and 67.7 percent (46) of the teachers. Over 1/4 of the parents, 25.7 percent (17), approved of presenting the topic before grade 8, particularly in grades 5-7 (22.7 percent). Six parents (9.1 percent) and 3 teachers (4.4 percent) considered the topic outside the responsibility of the school. The specific responses for both groups are illustrated in Table 4.26.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 1-4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 5-7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 8-10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 11-13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be offered; do not know when</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should not be offered! Not a school responsibility</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Moral and spiritual implications of sex**

A substantial majority of parents and teachers approved of this controversial topic as appropriate for family life education programs, 81.8 percent (53) and 83.3 percent (55) respectively. However, a significant number in each group, 18.2 percent (12) of the parents and 16.7 percent (11) of the teachers, felt the topic was not a school responsibility and should not be offered. Of those who agreed with
the topic being offered in school the most frequently recommended category to present it was grades 8-10, by 43.9 percent (29) of the parents and 47.0 percent (31) of the teachers. Based on the previous assumption (see p. 102), the majority of parents and teachers, 69.7 percent (46) and 56.1 percent (37) respectively, would approve of the topic being presented in grades 8-10. Table 4.27 illustrates the responses in both groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 1-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 5-7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 8-10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 11-13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be offered; do not know when</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should not be offered! Not a school responsibility</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factors to consider in planning marriage (age, race, religion, culture, finances, etc.)

The above topic also received substantial support from parents and teachers as an appropriate topic to be taught in schools in family life education programs, 86.4 percent (57) and 95.5 percent (64) respectively. The majority of teachers, 65.6 percent (44), felt the topic should be dealt with in grades 11-13 with 25.4 percent (17) recommending grades 8-10. The majority of the parents, who felt the topic should be offered in school, chose grades 8-10 as the appropriate level, 45.5 percent (30), with 28.8 percent (19) recommending grades 11-13. Based on the previous assumption (see p. 102), a small majority of parents, 51.5 percent (34), would approve of grades 8-10 for this topic compared to 28.4 percent (19) of the teachers. Nine parents (13.6 percent) and 3 teachers (4.5 percent) felt the topic was not a school responsibility. Frequencies and percentages of responses in both groups are presented in Table 4.28.

Common conflict areas in marriage (money, working wife, in-laws, planning children, social/recreational life, etc.)

A strong majority of parents and teachers, 88.1 percent (59) and 91.2 percent (62) respectively, felt the above topic should be offered in school programs about family life. The category most frequently chosen by parents, as the one
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>Parents #</th>
<th>Parents %</th>
<th>Teachers #</th>
<th>Teachers %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be offered; do not know when</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should not be offered! Not a school responsibility</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

in which the topic should be taught was grades 8-10, 41.8 percent (28), with 34.3 percent (23) suggesting grades 11-13. The teacher group was more in favor of teaching the topic in grades 11-13, 67.7 percent (46) compared to 17.6 percent (12) recommending grades 8-10. Based on the previous assumption (see p. 102), grades 11-13 would have to be the choice to gain the approval of the majority in both groups. Eight parents (11.9 percent) and 6 teachers (8.8 percent) felt the topic should not be offered. Table 4.29 illustrates the responses of both groups.
TABLE 4.29
COMMON CONFLICT AREAS IN MARRIAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 1-4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 5-7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 8-10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 11-13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be offered;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do not know when</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should not be</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offered! Not a school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factors to consider in planning children (cost, responsibility, effects on marital relationships, etc.)

This topic was considered appropriate for family life programs by 85.1 percent (57) of the parents and 90.9 percent (60) of the teachers. The majority of teachers, 63.7 percent (42), considered the grade category 11-13 most suitable for schools to present the topic, whereas a significant number, 19.7 percent (13), recommended grades 8-10. Grades 11-13 was also the most frequently recommended grade category to present the topic by parents, 41.7 percent (28), however, over one-quarter of the parents, 28.4 percent (19), suggested grades 8-10. Based on the previous assumption (see p. 102), this topic would have to be taught in grades 11-13
to meet with the approval of the majority in both groups. Ten parents (14.9 percent) and 6 teachers (9.1 percent) were opposed to the topic being offered in school. Table 4.30 illustrates the responses in both groups.

TABLE 4.30
FACTORS TO CONSIDER IN PLANNING CHILDREN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 1-4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 5-7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 8-10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 11-13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be offered; do not know when</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should not be offered! Not a school responsibility</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contraception and birth control (methods and issues involved, etc.)

This is also one of the more potentially controversial topics included in family life education programs. Both parents and teachers, in this study, supported, with substantial majorities, the inclusion of contraception and birth control education in family life education programs, 83.6 percent (56) and 89.2 percent (58) respectively. Only 16.4 percent (11)
of the parents and 10.8 percent (7) of the teachers felt the topic was not a school responsibility and should not be offered. Grades 8-10 was the most frequently recommended grade category to present the topic by both parents and teachers, 43.2 percent (29) and 41.5 percent (27) respectively. Almost equal numbers of parents and teachers, 29.9 percent (20) and 32.3 percent (21) respectively, felt grades 11-13 was most appropriate. Using the previous assumption (see p. 102), a slight majority of parents, 50.7 percent (34), would approve of the topic being taught in grades 8-10, however, it appears grades 11-13 would be the choice to get substantial majority approval in both groups. Table 4.31 illustrates the responses in both groups.

**TABLE 4.31**

**CONTRACEPTION AND BIRTH CONTROL (METHODS AND ISSUES INVOLVED, ETC.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 1-4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 5-7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 8-10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 11-13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be offered; do not know when</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should not be offered! Not a school responsibility</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Understanding common social problems (extent, possible causes, issues and risks involved, etc.)

Under this topic, four social problems were presented to elicit specific parent-teacher responses to each as to its appropriateness for school programs about family life. The four problems were venereal disease, abortion, homosexuality and drug abuse. Parent-teacher responses to each problem will be examined and compared in the following paragraphs.

Venereal disease

Both parent and teacher groups almost unanimously approved of education about venereal disease in school, 94.0 percent (61) and 97.1 percent (66) respectively. Only 4 parents (6.0 percent) and 2 teachers (2.9 percent) disapproved of such education being offered in school. Grades 8-10 was the most frequently recommended category to present this specific topic, 43.2 percent (29) of the parents and 61.8 percent (42) of the teachers. Almost equal numbers of parents and teachers, 25.4 percent (17) and 22.1 percent (15) respectively, suggested grades 11-13. Again using the assumption that those approving a topic at an earlier grade level would not object at later levels (see p. 102), it is found that the majority of parents and teachers, 56.6 percent (40) and 72.1 percent (49) respectively, would approve of this topic being presented in grades 8-10. Table 4.32 illustrates the responses of both groups.
TABLE 4.32
VENEREAL DISEASE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 1-4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 5-7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 8-10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 11-13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be offered; do not know when</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should not be offered! Not a school responsibility</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abortion

The inclusion of education about abortion in programs of family life education in schools was overwhelmingly approved of by parents and teachers, 91.0 percent (61) and 87.9 percent (58) respectively. Grades 8-10 was the most frequently recommended category to teach the topic by parents, 37.3 percent (25), whereas most teachers suggested grades 11-13, 42.5 percent (28). A substantial number of teachers, 34.8 percent (23), recommended grades 8-10. Based on the previous assumption, (see p. 102 above) this topic would have to be presented in grades 11-13 to gain majority approval in both groups. Six parents (9.0 percent) and 8 teachers (12.1
percent) felt the topic was not a school responsibility and should not be offered. Table 4.33 illustrates the responses in both groups.

**TABLE 4.33**

**ABORTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 1-4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 5-7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 8-10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 11-13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be offered; do not know when</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should not be offered! Not a school responsibility</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Homosexuality**

A strong majority of parents and teachers, 93.9 percent (62) and 90.6 percent (58) respectively, felt the school should teach about homosexuality in its programs of family life education. Only 4 parents (6.1 percent) and 6 teachers (9.4 percent) felt the topic was not a school responsibility and should not be offered. The most frequent choice of when
to present the topic was split almost evenly in each group between grades 8-10 and grades 11-13. Grades 8-10 was recommended by 33.3 percent (22) of the parents and grades 11-13 was recommended by 31.8 percent (21). In the teacher group, 35.9 percent (23) recommended grades 8-10 and 37.4 percent (24) recommended grades 11-13. Based on the previous assumption, (see p. 102) grades 11-13 would have to be the choice to meet with majority approval in both groups. Table 4.34 illustrates the responses in each group.

**Table 4.34**

**HOMOSEXUALITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 1-4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 5-7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 8-10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 11-13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be offered; do not know when</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should not be offered! Not a school responsibility</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Drug abuse

Only 3 parents (4.5 percent) and 3 teachers (5.4 percent) considered education about drug abuse outside the sphere of school responsibility and therefore should not be offered in school. The overwhelming majority of parents and teachers, 95.5 percent (64) and 95.5 percent (63) respectively, approved of the topic for programs of family life education. Grades 8-10 was the category most frequently chosen by teachers to present the topic, 47.0 percent (31), and grades 5-7 was most frequently recommended by parents, 35.8 percent (24). Grades 8-10 was suggested by 31.3 percent (21) of the parents and grades 5-7 was the choice of 28.8 percent (19) of the teachers. Combining the responses in the first three categories reveals that 74.6 percent (50) of the parents and 81.9 percent (54) of the teachers felt the topic should be presented before grade 11. Based on the previous assumption (see p. 102), 74.6 percent (50) of the parents and 81.9 percent (54) of the teachers would approve of drug abuse being taught in grades 8-10. Table 4.35 illustrates the responses in both groups.

Who Should Teach Family Life Education?

Few people would dispute the requirement that family life education teachers should possess the characteristics that make for a good teacher in any field as well as attitudes and personal attributes that would allow the more personal and emotion-laden issues involved in family life education to be examined as objectively as possible. However,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grades 1-4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 5-7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 8-10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 11-13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be offered; do not know when</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should not be offered! Not a school responsibility</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The same consensus of opinion is not found with respect to such issues as the training, marital status, parental status and sex of family life education teachers (see pp. 48-56 above). Two questions were included in this study to elicit the attitudes of parents and teachers toward these four issues. Table 4.36 and Table 4.37 present the responses of the two groups.

Table 4.36 reveals that a large majority of respondents in both parent and teacher groups, 92.5 percent (61) and 88.2 percent (60) respectively, included special university training among the desired characteristics for family
### Table 4.36

**Desired Characteristics of Teachers of Family-Life Education (Training/Marital Status/Parental Status)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married and a parent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special university training</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special university training and married</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special university training, married and a parent</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special training, not necessarily university</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent, not necessarily married</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Life teachers. Almost three-quarters of the parents, 74.2 percent (49), and 63.2 percent (43) of the teachers included marriage as a desired characteristic for such teachers and a slightly lesser majority, 69.6 percent (46) and 60.3 percent (41) respectively, considered parenthood also desirable. Ranking the responses toward these three characteristics it
TABLE 4.37
SEX PREFERENCE FOR TEACHERS OF FAMILY LIFE EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male-boys; female-girls</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex does not matter</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team teachers-male and</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

is found that respondents in both groups considered special university training most important, marriage second, and parenthood the least important of the three. The majority of respondents in both groups, 63.6 percent (42) of the parents and 57.3 percent (39) of the teachers, considered as most favorable a teacher of family life education who is (1) specially trained at university to teach such courses, (2) married, and (3) a parent.

Table 4.37 illustrates that for the majority of parents and teachers, 56.1 percent (37) and 73.5 percent (50) respectively, the sex of the family life education teacher was not important. However, a substantial number of parents,
39.4 percent (26), and 19.1 percent (13) of the teachers were not in agreement with the majority and recommended that the teachers be male for boys and female for girls. Five teachers (7.4 percent) and one parent recommended team teaching comprised of male and female teachers for all students. One teacher respondent recommended that teams be comprised of married couples who are professionally trained teachers.

How Should Family Life Education Be Taught in Schools

The review of the literature revealed four main issues with regard to how family life education should be taught in schools. These issues were:

a) separate courses or integration into existing courses
b) co-educational or segregated classes
c) compulsory or optional courses,
d) use of outside speakers (see pp. 56.68 above)

Three questions on the questionnaire concerned themselves with these issues. The responses of parents and teachers to each will be examined and compared in the following paragraphs.

Separate courses or integration into existing courses (including the use of outside speakers)

The majority of parents and teachers, 65.2 percent (43) and 57.5 percent (39) respectively, felt that family life education in schools should be offered as separate courses with visiting professional people from the community to discuss certain topics. Visiting professional people ap-
peared to be a favorable aspect since only 6.0 percent (4) of the parents and 2.9 percent (2) of the teachers recommended separate courses alone. A significant number of parents and teachers, 25.8 percent (17) and 26.5 percent (16) respectively, favored integrating family life material into existing courses. Table 4.38 illustrates the responses of both groups.

**TABLE 4.38**

**HOW SHOULD EDUCATION ABOUT FAMILY LIFE BE OFFERED IN SCHOOLS?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate courses</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated into existing courses</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate course with visiting professional people</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated with visiting professional people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate and integrated with visiting professional people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Co-educational or segregated classes

The majority of respondents in both parent and teacher groups, 62.1 percent (41) and 67.6 percent (46) respectively, felt that classes should be organized so that boys and girls are separated only when certain topics are discussed. Only 5 parents (7.6 percent) and one teacher (1.5 percent) recommended separate family life education classes for boys and girls all the time. About one-quarter of the parents and teachers, 25.8 percent (17) and 25.0 percent (17) respectively, favored co-educational classes for all topics. Table 4.39 illustrates the responses in both groups.

**TABLE 4.39**

**HOW DO YOU THINK CLASSES ABOUT FAMILY LIFE SHOULD BE ORGANIZED?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-educational all the time</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate all the time</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate for certain topics</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary-separate; high-co-educational</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Compulsory or Optional Courses

The respondents in the study were asked whether courses about family life should be required of all students before completing requirements for high school graduation. The majority of teachers, 60.3 percent (41), either agreed or strongly agreed that family life courses should be compulsory. The parent group were split almost evenly on the issue with 47.7 percent (31) favoring compulsory courses and 40.0 percent (26) opposing. Eight parents (12.3 percent) and 6 teachers (8.8 percent) were undecided on the issue. Table 4.40 illustrates the responses of both groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objectives of Family Life Education

The review of the literature revealed that those who call for family life education or sex education often do so because of their alarm at the high rates of illegitimacy, venereal disease, delinquency, drug abuse and other forms of social maladjustment (see pp. 28-29 above). Many see such education as a preventive service for children and families and feel it would result in stronger and more stable families in future generations (see pp. 3-4 above). This study obtained responses from parents and teachers regarding their opinions toward both these expectations or objectives of family life education programs.

A substantial majority of parents and teachers, 81.8 percent (54) and 77.9 percent (53) respectively, either agreed or strongly agreed that family life education in schools would help students become more capable and responsible parents later in their lives and result in more stable families. Only 4 parents and 4 teachers disagreed with the statement. Table 4.41 illustrates the responses of both groups.

An equally strong majority of parents and teachers, 78.8 percent (52) and 76.4 percent (52) respectively, agreed or strongly agreed that family life education would help prevent such problems as unplanned pregnancies, abortion, venereal disease, child neglect and abuse, marital breakdown, and so on. Eight parents (12.1 percent) and 5 teachers (7.4 percent)
TABLE 4.41

FORMAL EDUCATION ABOUT FAMILY LIFE WOULD HELP STUDENTS BECOME MORE CAPABLE AND RESPONSIBLE PARENTS LATER IN THEIR LIVES AND RESULT IN MORE STABLE FAMILIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

disagreed with the statement. Table 4.42 illustrates the responses in both groups.

Parental Involvement in Family Life Education Programs

There appeared to be a consensus of opinion among the authorities in the field and others reviewed for this study that parental involvement, or at least the opportunity for involvement, is an integral part of any family life education program. Some authorities have suggested that parents be kept aware of what is being taught in family life education classes and have the opportunity to discuss or review teaching materials, if they so desire, before they are used in class. Others
TABLE 4.42

FORMAL EDUCATION ABOUT FAMILY LIFE WOULD HELP PREVENT SUCH PROBLEMS AS UNPLANNED PREGNANCIES, ABORTION, VENEREAL DISEASES, CHILD NEGLECT AND ABUSE, MARITAL BREAKDOWN, AND SO ON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

have suggested that the school offer evening family life courses simultaneously to parents and other interested adults in the community (see pp. 68-70 above).

The parents and teachers in this study were queried as to their attitudes toward both those suggestions. In the first instance, they were asked whether they agreed that parents should be involved to the extent implied in the first suggestion above, and secondly, they were asked what their reaction would be if the schools offered evening family life courses for parents and other adults at the same time that the programs were being presented in the school curriculum.
A substantial majority of parents and teachers, 81.6 percent (53) and 86.7 percent (59) respectively, agreed or strongly agreed that parents should be kept fully aware of the content of family life courses and have the opportunity to discuss and review the teaching materials, if they so desire, before they are used in class. Nine parents (13.8 percent) and 8 teachers (11.8 percent) disagreed with the statement. Table 4.43 illustrates the responses in both groups.

TABLE 4.43

PARENTS SHOULD BE KEPT FULLY AWARE OF WHAT IS BEING TAUGHT TO THEIR CHILDREN IN FAMILY LIFE COURSES AND HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO DISCUSS OR REVIEW TEACHING MATERIALS, IF THEY SO DESIRE, BEFORE THEY ARE USED IN CLASS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With respect to evening courses for parents and other adults, the majority of parents, 56.1 percent (37), stated they would attend such courses compared to 40.3 percent (27)
of the teachers. A substantial number in both parent and teacher groups were undecided, 28.8 percent (19) and 34.3 percent (23) respectively. Nine parents (13.6 percent) and 16 teachers (23.9 percent) stated they would not attend such courses. Table 4.44 illustrates the responses of both groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not attend</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depend on courses offered</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community Reaction to Family Life Education in Schools

It has been suggested that one of the major obstacles to the implementation of family life education programs in public schools is anticipated negative reaction from the community, particularly parents, students and teachers. The respondents in this study were asked to predict the reactions of each of these three groups and report their own reactions
if their schools were to introduce such programs.

The majority of the respondents in both parent and teacher groups, 67.1 percent (43) and 66.2 percent (45) respectively, predicted that if their school attempted to introduce a family life education program, most parents and teachers would support it. Table 4.45 illustrates the responses of both groups.

**TABLE 4.45**

**IF YOUR SCHOOL ATTEMPTED TO INTRODUCE A FAMILY LIFE PROGRAM, INCLUDING TOPICS SUCH AS YOU HAVE SEEN IN PART I OF THIS QUESTIONNAIRE, WHAT IN YOUR OPINION WOULD BE THE REACTION OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most parents and teachers would support it</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most parents and teachers would not support it</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most parents would support it; most teachers would not</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most teachers would support it; most parents would not.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With respect to student reaction to such courses, the majority of parents and teachers, 68.2 percent (45) and 74.6 percent (50) respectively, predicted that students would be interested in such courses. A significant number of respondents, 27.3 percent (18) of the parents and 19.4 percent (13) of the teachers, anticipated indifference on the part of students toward such courses. The responses of both groups are illustrated in Table 4.46.

**TABLE 4.46**

**WHAT DO YOU THINK WOULD BE THE REACTION OF STUDENTS TO SUCH COURSES?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not interested</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depends on how presented</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents in both parent and teacher groups indicated that they would strongly support a family life education program in their school, 88.0 percent (58) and 82.3 percent (56) respectively. Only 2 parents (3.0 percent) and one teacher (1.5 percent) reported they would not support
such a program. Table 4.47 illustrates the specific responses in both groups.

**TABLE 4.47**

**WHAT WOULD BE YOUR PERSONAL REACTION TO SUCH COURSES?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not support</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support some; Not support others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, the majority of parents and teachers would support a family life education program in their schools, and they predict a favorable reaction from other parents and teachers as well as students.

**Parent-Teacher Value Conflicts in Family Life Education**

One of the concerns parents have expressed during the controversy over family life education is that teachers would pass on their own value system to their students and that this value system might be very different from that of
the parents. The parents and teachers in this study were asked to respond to the statement:

One of the problems with family life programs in schools is that teachers would probably pass on to their students values that are different from those of the parents. The respondents in both groups had mixed reactions to the statement, with 38.5 percent (25) of the parents and 47.1 percent (32) of the teachers agreeing or strongly agreeing with it whereas 29.2 percent (19) of the parents and 26.4 percent (18) of the teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with it. A substantial number, 32.3 percent (21) of the parents and 26.5 percent (18) of the teachers, were undecided. The various comments written by the question indicated that whereas many respondents agreed a different value system might be passed on to the students they disagreed that this was a problem. In fact, a few respondents in both groups wrote "hopefully" by the statement. Table 4.46 illustrates the responses of both groups.

Family Privacy and Family Life Education

Another concern expressed by parents during the controversy over family life education was that their children might reveal in class private information about their own families. Both parents and teachers were asked if they would have such concerns if their child or children were taking such courses. An almost equal majority in both groups, 72.8 percent (48) of the parents and 73.5 percent (50) of the teachers, indicated they would not have such a concern.
TABLE 4.48

ONE OF THE PROBLEMS WITH FAMILY LIFE PROGRAMS IN SCHOOLS IS THAT TEACHERS WOULD PROBABLY PASS ON TO THEIR STUDENTS VALUES THAT ARE DIFFERENT FROM THOSE OF THE PARENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three parents (4.5 percent) and 7 teachers (10.3 percent) reported they would be concerned and 22.7 percent (15) of the parents and 16.2 percent (11) of the teachers were unsure. Table 4.49 illustrates the responses of both groups.

Sexual Component of Family Life Education

The aspect of family life education programs that has probably been responsible for most of the controversy in the United States in the past decade is the sexual component. Parents and others have expressed grave concern as to the possible effects of sex education on young children while experts in the field maintained there was little dan-
TABLE 4.49

One of the concerns some parents have about family life courses is that their children may reveal, in class, private information about their own family. Would you have such concerns if your child or children were taking such courses?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>72.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...ger of harmfully exposing individual youngsters to sexual information before they are ready for it (see pp. 44-45 above). A question was included on the questionnaire to determine whether Canadian parents and teachers shared the concerns of their counterparts in the United States regarding this issue. The responses of both groups are presented in Table 4.50.

Table 4.50 reveals that the majority of parents and teachers, 65.5 percent (43) and 77.6 percent (52) respectively, disagree that education about sex and sexuality should not be a part of family life education programs. Only 10 parents (15.1 percent) and 7 teachers (10.5 percent) agreed with the statement. A significant number of parents, 19.7
TABLE 4.50

EDUCATION ABOUT SEX AND SEXUALITY SHOULD NOT BE PART OF A PROGRAM ABOUT FAMILY LIFE BECAUSE SEXUAL DISCUSSIONS BETWEEN BOYS AND GIRLS AT SUCH EARLY AGES COULD LEAD TO EARLY SEX PLAY AND LATER PROMISCUITY OR SEXUAL PROBLEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

percent (13) and a comparatively lesser number of teachers, 11.9 percent (8) were undecided on the issue. The majorities in both groups on this issue were not as substantial as the majorities in favor of the sex and reproduction topic examined earlier which consisted of 83.6 percent for the parents and 97.1 percent for the teachers (see p. 115 above). The reason for this apparent discrepancy could not be determined in the course of the analysis. One possible explanation might be the broader scope implied in the sex and reproduction topic and the vagueness of the term "at such ear-
ly ages" which might have been confusing to more than the one respondent who drew attention to the point in a written comment on the questionnaire.

**Liberalism-Conservatism**

The questionnaire included three questions from the 1968-69 Vanier study, one dealing with marriage breakdown as grounds for divorce, one with increasing permissiveness in the sex standards of young people and one with working mothers. These questions were intended to study the liberal-conservative dimension between the two groups and allow for comparison with the nationwide respondents in the Vanier study. In analyzing the responses of both groups the criterion used in the Vanier study was applied, namely, the response upholding the more traditional pattern was considered conservative whereas the response which suggested greater receptiveness to the specified change was considered liberal. As was the case in the Vanier study, no judgement is applied on the desirability of the specific change noted.

**Divorce**

The majority of parents and teachers in the study, 57.5 percent (38) and 64.7 percent (44) respectively, agreed that marriage breakdown in itself, without reference to the innocence or guilt of the parties concerned, should be sufficient grounds for divorce. These majorities would indi-

---

cate that the respondents are decidedly liberal. However, in making this analysis a number of points have to be borne in mind. First, the parent majority of 57.5 percent is almost equal to the nationwide majority in the Vanier study, 57.0 percent, which was conducted almost 7 years ago. Secondly, the teacher majority of 64.7 percent, is only 2.7 percent higher than the 62.0 percent majority of Ontario principals and vice-principals who approved of marriage breakdown as sufficient grounds for divorce in the Vanier study. Finally, divorce laws have changed significantly since the Vanier survey particularly in that marriage breakdown is now regarded by law as sufficient grounds for divorce, provided a specified period of separation is met. With the change in divorce laws and the increase in divorces since the change one would expect greater acceptance of marriage breakdown as sufficient grounds for divorce. This increased acceptance was not evident among the parents and teachers in this study as 34.8 percent (23) and 27.9 percent (19) respectively, were opposed, giving "no" or qualified "no" responses. Table 4.51 illustrates the responses in both groups.

Sex permissiveness

The majority of respondents in the parent and teacher groups, 71.2 percent (47) and 53.0 percent (36) respectively, considered the increased permissiveness in the sex standards of young people to be a regrettable development. In the Vanier study, 72.0 percent of the nationwide respondents and 73.0 per-
TABLE 4.51

IN GENERAL DO YOU THINK THAT MARRIAGE BREAKDOWN IN ITSELF, WITHOUT REFERENCE TO THE INNOCENCE OR GUILT OF THE PARTIES CONCERNED, SHOULD BE SUFFICIENT GROUNDS FOR DIVORCE?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, qualified</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, qualified</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 percent of the Ontario respondents considered the sex trend regrettable. The teacher group in this study, although conservative in the majority, is significantly more liberal on this issue than the parent group and more liberal than the nationwide and Ontario respondents in the Vanier study. Twenty-four teachers, 35.3 percent, considered the trend acceptable with qualifications compared to 21.2 percent (14) of the parents and 19.0 percent and 18.0 percent respectively for the nationwide and Ontario respondents in the Vanier

1Vanier, Survey, Table 25.
survey.¹ Parent and teacher responses are illustrated in Table 4.52.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable, qualified</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regrettable, qualified</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regrettable</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Working Mothers

The questions from the Vanier study regarding the issue of working mothers sought "to eliminate economic considerations as such, and stress implicitly the balance between parental obligation and the non-economic gratifications of the job." Differentiation was made in the questioning among working mothers of pre-school age children, elemen-

¹Vanier, Survey, Table 25.
²Vanier, Survey, p. 15.
tary school children and secondary or high school children. Since in recent years more mothers have been taking jobs, the acceptance of the trend would be considered the "liberal" position, and a rejection of the trend, "conservative".

In general, the parent and teacher respondents were similar to the respondents in the Vanier survey in that they believed the older the children the more acceptable it is for mothers to take jobs. However, whereas the majority of the respondents in the Vanier study disapproved of mothers of elementary school children working, the majority of parents and teachers, 61.2 percent (41) and 66.2 percent (45) respectively, found this trend acceptable or acceptable with qualifications. Substantial majorities in both groups, 77.7 percent (52) of the parents and 87.8 percent (59) of the teachers, approved of mother of secondary or high school students taking jobs. In the Vanier study, the nationwide and Ontario respondents rejected, almost unanimously (90.0 percent), the idea of mothers working when they have pre-school age children. ¹ Both parents and teachers in this study also found this trend unacceptable but with significantly lesser majorities, 68.6 percent (46) and 72.0 percent (49) respectively. A significant proportion in each group, 31.4 percent (21) of the parents and 26.5 percent (18) of the teachers, found it acceptable or acceptable with qualifications for mothers with pre-school age children to work. In the Vanier study, only 8 percent shared this view. Table 4.53 illustrates parent-teacher responses in all three cate-

¹Vanier, Survey, Table 26.
TABLE 4.53
PARENT-TEACHER ATTITUDES TOWARD THE TREND IN WHICH MOTHERS OF SCHOOL AGE CHILDREN ARE CHOOSING TO TAKE FULL TIME JOBS FOR OTHER THAN ECONOMIC REASONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Where children are of Pre-school age</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable, qualified</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable, qualified</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Where children attend elementary school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable, qualified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable qualified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Where children attend secondary or high school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable, qualified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable, qualified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To summarize, the analysis of the liberalism-conservatism dimension revealed that no significant difference existed between the parent and teacher groups. Both groups took a liberal position on marriage breakdown as sufficient grounds for divorce and mothers of elementary and secondary school students taking 'jobs. On the other hand, both groups took a conservative position on the trend toward increased permissiveness in the sex standards of young people and the issue of mothers with pre-school age children working. The fact that both parents and teachers approved of mothers of elementary school children working, places them somewhat higher on the liberalism scale than the respondents in the Vanier study, the majority of whom found this situation unacceptable.

Factors Associated With Differential Attitudes

The primary purpose of this project was to analyze and compare the attitudes of parents and teachers toward various aspects of family life education in the curricula of public schools. A secondary purpose was to examine significant differences in attitudes among members of each group toward the more controversial topics and issues in an attempt to determine possible classification factors associated with these differences.

The analysis of the responses in the previous section revealed that in this study, consensus rather than differences in attitudes characterized the data even on issues which historically have been associated with controversy and opposition,
particularly in the United States. Because of the high degree of acceptance and support for almost all aspects of family life education among the overwhelming majority of respondents, the extensive analysis planned for this section of the report is determined to be unnecessary.

However, some variation in responses regarding certain questions and issues were noted in the course of the analysis. The major areas of difference were as follows:

1) Only 49.3 percent (32) of the parents agreed with the authorities that parental failure was a factor underlying the need for family life education. Slightly over one-third, 33.8 percent, disagreed or strongly disagreed with this reason.

2) One-third of the parents, 33.4 percent, agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that parents were adequately prepared to give their children information about family life. Only a small majority, 59.0 percent (39), disagreed.

3) The preferred teacher-student sex arrangement also brought significantly different responses from parents with a small majority, 56.1 percent (37), stating that the sex of the teacher was not important, and a relatively large number, 39.4 percent (26) recommending a male teacher for boys and a female teacher for girls. In the teacher group, 19.1 percent (13) recommended a male teacher for boys and a female for girls but for a sizable majority, 73.5 percent (50), the sex of the teacher was not considered important.

4) The issue of compulsory or optional family life education courses brought almost evenly divided responses from parents, with 47 percent (31) favoring compulsory courses and a slightly lesser number, 40.0 percent (26), expressing opposition to making such courses compulsory. In the teacher group, 30.9 percent (21) disagreed or strongly disagreed with compulsory courses, however, the majority of teachers, 60.3 percent (41), agreed.

5) Of the 22 topics presented in Part I of the questionnaire, "moral and spiritual implications of sex" brought the highest negative reaction from both parents and teachers, with 18.2 percent (12) and 16.7 percent...
cent (11) respectively, considering the topic outside the boundaries of school responsibility.

Although members of both groups almost unanimously approved of each of the topics in Part I of the questionnaire, as would be expected, there were differences among members in both groups as to the grade levels recommended for specific topics to be taught in the school curriculum. Three of the topics considered by many to be controversial, namely: human reproduction and related aspects, boy-girl relationships, and contraception and birth control were included with the above named issues for further analysis.

In addition, on the issue of the schools offering family life courses in the evening to parents and other interested adults in the community, 56.1 percent (37) of the parents and 40.3 percent (27) of the teachers stated they would attend such courses. However, a substantial number in both groups, either did not plan to attend, 13.6 percent (9) and 23.9 percent (16) respectively, or were undecided on the issue, 28.8 percent (19) and 34.3 percent (34) respectively. This issue was also included for further analysis to determine possible factors related to the decision to attend, not attend or the fact of being undecided.

All of the above named variables, in both parent and teacher groups, were crosstabulated with each of the following variables to determine possible associations:

1) sex
2) age
3) age at marriage
4) education
5) residence
6) social class
7) number of children
8) sex of children
9) sex of youngest child
10) sex of oldest child
11) age of youngest child
12) age of oldest child

The chi-square statistic and the contingency coefficient were programmed to determine respectively, the presence of variable association and to provide an index of the strength of that association.

Examination of the data from the Crosstabs operation revealed that in every crosstabulation the vast majority of cells in the contingency table contained expected frequencies of less than 5. According to Freeman:

... we must be careful that none of our expected frequencies is less than 5. When an expected frequency is very small, tiny differences in discrepancy are weighted very heavily. Thus, when any expected frequency is below 5, $X^2$ becomes unstable—it is not a fair test of our hypothesis.¹

Champion writes:

... no cell should have an expected frequency of less than 5. When $X^2$'s are computed for data where cell frequencies drop below 5, the resulting $X^2$ value becomes

grossly inflated and does not reveal a true picture of the way things are distributed.¹

Because all of the contingency tables were larger than 2 x 2 tables the Yates correction for continuity could not be applied. In addition, the other commonly suggested remedy for this situation, that of "collapsing" categories to increase expected cell frequencies, was not feasible because the relatively small N in each group would dictate a degree of "collapsing" that would make the resulting data of very limited practical value. Based on these facts, chi-square was considered not a suitable indicator of variable association in this case and the data from the Crosstabs operation was discarded.

Theoretically, however, because the chi-square from the above mentioned Crosstabs operation were highly inflated, associations between variables would be indicated where in actual fact no such associations existed. Despite this probability, the data from the Crosstabs operation revealed associations in only 12 cases out of 216 crosstabulations. To insure that the associations indicated in the 12 cases were indeed a result of inflated chi-squares, Guttman's coefficient of predictability (\( \lambda \)) was applied to each of the 12 cases. This statistic indicated that no significant association existed between each of the 12 pairs of variables.

Based on the above findings it may be concluded, with qualifications, that no association was found to exist between the responses to the issues and topics outlined at the beginning of this section and the classification variables listed above (see pp. 158-59).
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

Purpose

The primary purpose of this research was to analyze and compare the attitudes of parents and teachers toward various aspects of family life education in the curricula of public schools. A secondary purpose was to examine significant differences in attitudes among respondents within each group toward the more controversial topics and issues in an attempt to determine possible factors associated with these differences.

Methodology

The study was a quantitative descriptive study of the sub-type, population description. The sample of 100 parents was selected by a stratified random sampling procedure from all the parents in Kent County, Ontario, who had at least one child attending one of the 32 elementary schools under the Kent County Board of Education. The teacher sample of 107 was randomly selected from all the teachers, full-time and part-time, including principals and vice-principals, employed by the Kent County Board of Education at the time of the survey.

The data was collected by a questionnaire developed specifically for the study and standardized for both groups.
The questionnaire was mailed to the teachers and brought home from school by the children of the parents. The data was analyzed by computer using the program, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, subprograms Codebook and Crosstabs.¹

Findings

The response rates for parents and teachers were 68 percent and 63.6 percent respectively. Almost three-quarters of the questionnaires returned by parents, 74.6 percent, were completed by mothers. The teacher respondents were almost evenly divided between male and female, 54.4 percent and 46.6 percent respectively.

There was fair representation of age groups in the sample. Teachers were somewhat younger than the parents with 45.3 percent less than 30 years of age compared to only 25.7 percent of the parents in this age range. The reverse was true in the 30 to less than 40 year age range with 43.9 percent of the parents in this category compared to 25.4 percent of the teachers. Almost one-third of the respondents in each group were over 40 years of age.

The majority of parents and teachers, 88.0 percent and 79.4 percent respectively, were married at the time of the survey; the majority, 51.5 percent and 71.5 percent respectively, marrying between the ages of 20 and 25 years. Only 3.4 percent of the teachers, compared to 42.4 percent of the parents, were teenagers at the time of marriage.

¹Nie et al, Statistical Package.
Nine teachers and none of the parents were unmarried.

The majority of parents who responded, 59.6 percent, had not completed high school. However, 26.9 percent were high school or trade school graduates and 14.5 percent had higher education ranging from 1-3 years of college or university to graduate professional training. The majority of teachers, 95.6 percent, had at least 1-3 years of college or university, with 76.5 percent having undergraduate or graduate degrees.

All major geographic areas, city, town and country were adequately represented as were all social classes. Although the majority in both groups were English Canadian, thirteen other ethnic groups were also represented.

All of the parents had 2 or more children in their family with 80.6 percent having both male and female children and 88.1 percent having at least one female child. In the teacher group, 64.8 percent had at least one child, with half of these, 50.2 percent, having both male and female and 77.3 percent having at least one female child. The youngest child in the parent families was 10 years of age or less in 77.6 percent of the cases and for the teachers with children, in 65.9 percent of the cases. Over 73 percent of the parents and 54 percent of the teachers with children had at least one child over 10 years of age.

Thus, the sample had broad representation in terms of age, sex, marital status, age at marriage, education, residence, ethnicity, social class, numbers of children and sex of children and was considered to be fairly representative of the gen-
eral parent-teacher population in Kent County.

Need for family life education

The majority of parents and teachers, 77.2 percent and 83.9 percent respectively, were in agreement with changing social conditions as a factor underlying the need for family life education. However, the parent group was significantly less willing to put the blame on parents with only 49.3 percent agreeing with parental failure as a factor underlying the need compared to 72.1 percent of the teachers. Teachers overwhelmingly agreed that formal education for family life is needed because parents are not adequately prepared to provide such education, 88.2 percent compared to only 59.0 percent of the parents who shared this view.

Responsibility for family life education

Only 7.5 percent of the parents and 8.8 percent of the teachers felt that educating children about family life was the exclusive responsibility of parents. The majority in both groups, 64.1 percent of the parents and 60.3 percent of the teachers, indicated that the primary responsibility for such education should be shared among parents, schools and religious bodies. Schools were considered more favorable than religious bodies, with 86.5 percent of the parents and 83.8 percent of the teachers including schools in their choices compared to 70.1 percent and 67.7 percent respectively, who included religious bodies.
Why schools?

A strong majority of parents and teachers, 78.8 percent and 73.5 percent respectively, either agreed or agreed strongly that the school was the logical place to teach formally education about family life because it is the only institution that reaches all the children in the community and such education can best be given by professional educators.

What should be taught and when?

A substantial majority of parents and teachers, 77.6 percent and 85.3 percent respectively, felt that appropriately planned programs of family life education should be offered from kindergarten to grade 13.

In addition, 22 topics common to courses in family life were presented to the respondents for their opinion as to "if" or "when" each topic should be taught in school. Included among the topics were education about the family in relation to its members and to society, parent-child conflicts, child development; family crises and problems; individual social development; human reproduction and related aspects; boy-girl relationships, including premarital sex; moral and spiritual implications of sex; marriage planning, marital conflict, planning children; contraception and birth control, venereal disease, abortion, homosexuality and drug abuse. Parents and teachers agreed, with overwhelming majorities, that each topic should be taught in family life education programs. The mean percentages of parents approving each topic was 90.7 percent.
compared to a corresponding mean of 94.9 percent for the teachers. The range for parents approving was 97.0 percent and 81.8 percent and for teachers, 98.5 percent and 83.3 percent.

There was a high degree of consensus in both groups with respect to the grade level at which each topic should be taught. Grades 8-10 was the most popular category for most topics. Among the topics parents would approve of at this level were: family crises and problems, human reproduction and related aspects, boy-girl relationships, moral and spiritual implications of sex, contraception and birth control, marriage planning, venereal disease, homosexuality, and drug abuse. Teachers recommended presenting human reproduction and related aspects in grades 5-7, but would wait until grades 11-13 for family problems, marriage planning, contraception and birth control, and homosexuality. There was almost general agreement as to the levels recommended for the other topics.

Who should teach family life education?

The majority of the respondents in both groups, 63.6 percent of the parents and 57.3 percent of the teachers, considered as most favorable a teacher of family life courses who is (1) specially trained at a university to teach such courses, (2) married and (3) a parent. In order of priority, special university training was included among the desired characteristics by 92.5 percent of the parents and 88.2 percent of the teachers, marriage was included by 74.2 percent and 63.2 per-
cent respectively, and a slightly lesser majority, 69.6 percent and 60.3 percent respectively, considered parenthood also desirable.

The majority of parents and teachers, 56.1 percent and 73.5 percent respectively, considered the sex of the family life education teacher not important. However, a substantial number of parents, 39.4 percent compared to 19.1 percent of the teachers, recommended a male teacher for boys and a female teacher for girls.

**How should family life education be taught in school?**

The majority of parents and teachers, 65.2 percent and 57.5 percent respectively, felt that family life education in schools should be offered as separate courses with visiting professional people from the community to discuss certain topics. Visiting professional people appeared to be a favorable aspect since only 6.0 percent of the parents and 2.9 percent of the teachers recommended separate courses alone.

The majority of parents and teachers, 62.1 percent and 67.9 percent respectively, felt that family life education classes should be organized so that boys and girls are separated only when certain topics are discussed. About one-quarter of the parents and teachers recommended co-educational classes all the time.

The majority of teachers, 60.3 percent, agreed that family life courses should be compulsory while slightly less
than a majority of parents, 47.7 percent, shared this view. Forty percent of the parents opposed compulsory courses.

Objectives of family life education

A substantial majority of parents and teachers, 81.8 percent and 77.9 percent respectively, felt that family life education in schools would help students become more capable and responsible parents later in their lives and result in more stable families. An equally strong majority, 78.8 percent and 76.4 percent respectively, agreed that such education would help prevent such problems as unplanned pregnancies, abortion, venereal disease, child neglect and abuse, marital breakdown et cetera.

Parental involvement in family life education programs

A strong majority of parents and teachers, 81.6 percent and 86.7 percent respectively, felt that parents should be kept fully aware of the content of family life courses and have the opportunity to discuss and review the teaching materials, if they so desire, before they are used in class.

If the schools offered evening family life courses for parents and other interested adults in the community, 56.1 percent of the parents reported they would attend such courses compared to 40.3 percent of the teachers. Substantial numbers in both groups, 28.8 percent and 34.3 percent respectively, were undecided on this issue.
Community reaction to family life education in schools

The majority of parents and teachers, 88.0 percent and 82.3 percent respectively, reported that if their school implemented a family life education program they would support it, while 67.1 percent and 66.2 percent respectively, predicted that other parents and teachers would also support such a program. In addition, 68.2 percent of the parents and 74.6 percent of the teachers predicted that students would be interested in family life courses.

Parent-teacher value conflicts in family life education

There was no consensus of opinion as to whether a problem with family life programs was that teachers would probably pass on to their students values that are different from those of the parents. Respondents in both groups had mixed reactions to the statement with 38.5 percent of the parents agreeing, 29.2 percent disagreeing and 32.3 percent were undecided compared to 47.1 percent of the teachers agreeing, 26.4 percent disagreeing and a further 26.5 percent undecided. The difficulty appeared to lie in the fact that many respondents agreed that different values might be passed on to students but disagreed that this constituted a problem per se.

Family privacy and family life education

Almost equal majorities of parents and teachers, 72.8 percent and 73.5 percent respectively, reported they would not
be concerned about their children revealing private information about their own families in family life education classes.

Sexual component of family life education

The majority of parents and teachers, 65.5 percent and 77.6 percent respectively, disagreed that education about sex and sexuality should not be a part of family life programs because sexual discussions between boys and girls at such early ages could lead to early sex play and later promiscuity or sexual problems.

Liberalism-conservatism

The questionnaire contained three questions from the 1968-69 Vanier survey, which were intended to study the liberal-conservative dimension between the groups and for comparison with the respondents in the Vanier study. The analysis of the liberalism-conservatism dimension, as examined by the three questions, revealed no significant differences between the two groups. Both groups took a liberal position on marriage breakdown as sufficient grounds for divorce and mothers of elementary and secondary school students taking jobs. On the other hand, both groups took a conservative position on the trend toward increased permissiveness in the sex standards of young people and the issue of mothers with pre-school age children working. However, the fact that both parents and teachers approved of mothers of elementary school children working would seem to place both groups somewhat
higher on the liberalism scale than the respondents in the Vanier study, the majority of whom found this situation unacceptable.

Factors associated with differential attitudes

Differences in attitudes toward certain issues and topics were crosstabulated with 12 classification variables in an attempt to determine possible factors associated with the differences. The examination revealed, with qualifications, no association between the responses of the members of each group and the variables tested.

Conclusion

The overall findings of this study reveal that the attitudes of parents and teachers toward the concept of family life education in the curricula of public schools are characterized by similarities rather than differences. The study suggests that both parents and teachers in Kent County, to the extent that the sample represents the general population, recognize the importance of family life education programs and strongly support the inclusion of such programs in the curricula of public schools from kindergarten to the end of high school. In addition, variables such as age, sex, education, marital status; number, age and sex of children; et cetera, were found to have no significant association with the attitudes of respondents in either group toward family life education in public schools.
Both parents and teachers agree strongly that family life education programs should be comprehensive and should cover all aspects of family living including sex education. Furthermore, the sex education component should not be limited to the biological facts but should also examine the social, moral and spiritual implications of sexual behavior.

According to both groups, family life education courses should be taught in co-educational classes except when certain topics are discussed. The teacher could be of either sex but should be specially trained at university to teach such courses, married, and a parent. Family life education should not be integrated into existing courses but rather it should be taught as separate courses utilizing expert resource persons in the community, such as nurses, lawyers, social workers, doctors et cetera, to supplement the efforts of teachers. This latter finding appears to suggest doubt on the part of parents and teachers that teachers, even with special university training and personal experience, are capable of handling alone the entire job of teaching family life education in the schools. Whether this doubt reflects a lack of confidence in the capabilities of teachers in this area or a recognition by both groups of respondents of the wide scope of family life education could not be determined.

The findings suggest that little opposition would be encountered from parents and teachers if attempts were made to implement an appropriately planned, comprehensive family
life education program throughout the entire public school curriculum in Kent County. The term "appropriately planned" suggests involving parents and teachers and incorporating their suggestions and opinions in all phases of program planning.

Limitations of the Study

The major limitations of this study were as follows:

1) The sample was selected from only those parents and teachers under the Kent County Board of Education and as such the findings may not lend themselves to generalizations about the whole parent and teacher populations in the county or in areas outside of Kent County.

2) The parent sample was chosen by first randomly selecting 100 children from the class lists provided by all the elementary schools. In this method of sampling, the chances of a family being selected increased as the number of children on those lists from the same family increased. Thus, there existed a bias toward larger families. It was not feasible to control for this factor and the extent to which it contaminated the random sample is unknown.

3) The relatively small sample and the dearth of opposing viewpoints among the respondents made a comprehensive examination of factors underlying opposition to family life education impossible.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and limitations of this study, it is recommended that:

1) the study be replicated, with a comparatively larger sample, in various parts of the province and the country to determine regional differences in attitudes towards family life education. Where significant differences in attitudes and opposition toward such programs exist, it is suggested that a thorough examination of possible factors underlying these differences be carried out.
2) the Kent County Board of Education reassess its current position on family life education programs, in light of the information provided by this study, and determine the feasibility of moving as quickly as possible toward the implementation of a comprehensive family life education program throughout the entire school curriculum.

3) all universities make available courses in family life education to enable teachers to obtain the knowledge and expertise necessary for them to adequately teach the subject and gain the confidence and respect of parents, students and colleagues.

4) parents and teachers, such as those who expressed such strong support for family life education in this study, make their views known to their school board members and related officials to ensure that such programs receive the sanction and demand necessary for them to become an integral part of the school curriculum.

Epilogue

The future of marriage and family life, like the society in which they exist, may always be clouded with an uncomfortable degree of uncertainty. However, the ability of both to weather the pressures of social change may depend to a large extent on the education and preparation given today to the architects of future families. The parents and teachers in this study have strongly supported the intervention of outside agencies, particularly the school, to help insure that no child is deprived or handicapped because of the inability of his parents to prepare him adequately to cope with the demands of a rapidly changing society. The nature and extent of this intervention may determine, to a significant extent, what the future holds for marriage and family life for many people. In speculating about a possible answer to the problem of unhealthy marriages and families,
Dr. Lawrence Kubie has written:

. . . perhaps the answer will come through a basic and fundamental change in our system of education, a change which recognizes that no matter how well a human being is educated in chemistry, physics, economics, history or literature, he remains a barbarian unless he knows something about himself.¹

Perhaps family life education programs throughout the school system would represent a move in the direction of such a change.

Dear Parent or Teacher:

You have been selected as one of a group of 200 parents and teachers to represent Kent County in a research study about the attitudes of parents and teachers toward family life programs in the schools. Your school system does not have such programs at this time but your opinions, as expressed in this study, could have a very important influence on any plans the school board might have in this area in the future.

I am a graduate student in the final year of the Masters program at the University of Windsor School of Social Work. I am conducting this study as a Masters thesis with the full cooperation and authorization from your school board. This authorization was given to me in a letter dated March 3, 1975 which stated:

The Kent County Board of Education at its regular meeting in February, approved the following recommendations from its Curriculum Committee:
that Mr. Sidney Flynn be permitted to circulate the questionnaire on Family Life Programs, subject to the following conditions:
a) that the circulation of the questionnaire be conducted on the basis of random sampling across the county; and
b) that a summary report of the results of the questionnaire be sent to the Curriculum Committee.

Please complete the enclosed questionnaire and mail it in the addressed, STAMPED envelope as soon as possible. Most of the questions require only check (√) answers so, although it appears long, it can be completed in about 20 minutes.

Your identity is NOT required for the purposes of the study so please do not write your name or address on the questionnaire.

This study is a rare opportunity for you, as parents and teachers, to express freely and honestly your personal opinions regarding school programming that concerns your children or students. I trust you will use this opportunity to make your views known.

Please accept in advance my thanks and appreciation for your interest and participation in this study.

Yours sincerely,

Sidney J. Flynn, B.A., B.S.W.

P.S. If you or your friends wish to know the results of this study please send me a card at 7-81 Baldoon Rd., CHATHAM after September 1, 1975 and I will send you a summary of the results.
**QUESTIONNAIRE**

**PART I**

Many schools in Canada and the United States are offering students courses dealing with marriage and family life. The first two (2) pages of this questionnaire list many of the topics covered in these courses. Please examine each topic in the left-hand column and check (✓) the block to the right that best expresses your personal opinion as to **when** or **if** the topic should be taught in school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>GRADES</th>
<th>GRADES</th>
<th>GRADES</th>
<th>Should be offered but do not know when.</th>
<th>Should NOT be offered!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Importance of the family to its members and to society.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors involved in happy family living. (decision-making, sharing responsibility, family obligations, communication, etc.)</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding different types of families, styles and patterns of family life, responsibilities of parents, etc.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent-child conflict areas. (choice of friends, allowance, accountability, hours, school achievement, etc.)</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics of family life. (credit, budgeting, money management, etc.)</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors leading to healthy physical, emotional and mental development of children.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family crises. (childbirth, adoption, loss of loved one, retirement, separation/divorce, sudden unemployment, etc.)</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family problems. (alcoholism, child abuse, child neglect, poverty, physical, mental or social disability, long term unemployment, housing, etc.)</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADES</td>
<td>GRADES</td>
<td>GRADES</td>
<td>Should be offered but do not know when.</td>
<td>Should NOT be offered!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLEASE NOTE:** Topics are geared to the age and maturity of the child.

- Functions of family helping services in the community. (Community & Family Services, Welfare services, Public Health, Children's Aid Society, Day Nursery, Credit Counselling, etc.)
- Developing social skills. (relating to others, making friends, etc.)
- Learning to talk freely about feelings, values, standards & behavior.
- Human reproduction, childbirth, functions and anatomy of male/female sex organs, physical changes in boys and girls at puberty, correct terminology, etc.
- Boy-girl relationships. (developing values and standards of behavior regarding choice of partner, going steady, necking, petting, sex before marriage, etc.)
- Moral/spiritual implications of sex.
- Factors to consider in planning marriage. (age, race, religion, culture, finances, etc.)
- Common conflict areas in marriage. (money, working wife, in-laws, planning children, social/recreational life, etc.)
- Factors to consider in planning children. (cost, responsibility, effects on marital relationship)
- Contraception and birth control. (methods and issues involved, etc.)
- Understanding common social problems. Disease (extent, possible causes, issues and risks involved, etc.)
- *Venereal disease
- *Abortion
- *Homosexuality
- *Drug abuse
PART II

Please read each of the following questions and check (√) the one answer that best expresses your personal opinion. PLEASE ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS SINCE YOUR OPINION ABOUT EACH ONE IS VERY IMPORTANT TO THE VALUE OF THE SURVEY.

1. Which group or groups do you think should have the primary responsibility for teaching children about family life?
   ___ A. Parents, schools and religious bodies
   ___ B. Parents and religious bodies
   ___ C. Parents and schools
   ___ D. Parents alone
   ___ E. Schools alone
   ___ F. Other (Please specify) ______________________

2. In your opinion, should a teacher of family life courses be:
   (Please check only one)
   ___ A. Married?
   ___ B. Married and a parent?
   ___ C. Specially trained at a university to teach such courses?
   ___ D. Specially trained and married?
   ___ E. Specially trained, married and a parent?
   ___ F. Other (Please specify) ______________________

3. Should teachers of family life courses be:
   ___ A. Male?
   ___ B. Female?
   ___ C. Male for boys; female for girls?
   ___ D. Sex of teacher does not matter.
   ___ E. Other (Please specify) ______________________
4. How do you think classes about family life should be organized?
   ____ A. Boys and girls together in the same class all the time
   ____ B. Boys and girls in separate classes all the time
   ____ C. Boys and girls in separate classes when certain topics are discussed
   ____ D. Other (Please specify) ________________________________

5. How should education about family life be offered in schools?
   ____ A. As separate courses
   ____ B. As parts of courses already offered
   ____ C. As separate courses with visiting professional people from the community to discuss certain topics. (doctors, nurses, social workers, lawyers, etc.)
   ____ D. Other (Please specify) ________________________________

6. In your opinion, when should schools offer appropriately planned programs of education about family life?
   ____ A. Elementary school only (Kindergarten through Grade 8)
   ____ B. High school only (Grade 9 through Grade 13)
   ____ C. Kindergarten through Grade 13
   ____ D. Other (Please specify) ________________________________

7. One of the concerns some parents have about family life courses is that their children may reveal, in class, private information about their own family. Would you have such concerns if your child or children were taking such courses?
   ____ A. Yes
   ____ B. No
   ____ C. Unsure
8. If your school attempted to introduce family life programs, including topics such as you have seen in Part I of this questionnaire, what in your opinion would be the reaction of parents and teachers?

   ___ A. Most parents and teachers would support it  
   ___ B. Most parents and teachers would **NOT** support it  
   ___ C. Most parents would support it; most teachers would not  
   ___ D. Most teachers would support it; most parents would not

9. What do you think would be the reaction of students to such courses?

   ___ A. Interested  
   ___ B. **NOT** interested  
   ___ C. Indifferent (wouldn't care one way or the other)  
   ___ D. Other (Please specify) __________________________

10. What would be your personal reaction to such courses?

    ___ A. I would support it  
    ___ B. I would **NOT** support it  
    ___ C. Undecided  
    ___ D. Other (Please specify) __________________________

11. If the school offered family life courses in the evenings, at the same time, to parents and other interested adults in the community, would you:

    ___ A. Attend?  
    ___ B. **NOT** attend?  
    ___ C. Undecided  
    ___ D. Other (Please specify) __________________________
PART III

Please respond to each of the following statements by checking (√) the one (1) answer that best expresses your personal opinion regarding the statement. As before, YOUR OPINION ABOUT EACH STATEMENT IS VERY IMPORTANT.

1. Most parents are adequately prepared to give their children information about reproduction, child development, marriage, as well as other aspects of family relationships.
   ____ A. Strongly agree
   ____ B. Agree
   ____ C. Undecided
   ____ D. Disagree
   ____ E. Strongly disagree

2. Formal education for family life is required by children today because the conditions of life are so very different from those in the past.
   ____ A. Strongly agree
   ____ B. Agree
   ____ C. Undecided
   ____ D. Disagree
   ____ E. Strongly disagree

3. The school is the logical place to teach formally education about family life because it is the only institution that reaches all the children in the community and such education can best be given by professional educators.
   ____ A. Strongly agree
   ____ B. Agree
   ____ C. Undecided
   ____ D. Disagree
   ____ E. Strongly disagree
4. Formal education about family life, including topics such as you have seen in Part I of this questionnaire, would help students become more capable and responsible parents later in their lives and result in more stable families.

   ___ A. Strongly agree
   ___ B. Agree
   ___ C. Undecided
   ___ D. Disagree
   ___ E. Strongly disagree

5. Formal education about family life would help prevent such problems as unplanned pregnancies, abortion, venereal diseases, child neglect and abuse, marital breakdown, and so on.

   ___ A. Strongly agree
   ___ B. Agree
   ___ C. Undecided
   ___ D. Disagree
   ___ E. Strongly disagree

6. Education about sex and sexuality should NOT be part of a program about family life because sexual discussions between boys and girls at such early ages could lead to early sex play and later promiscuity or sexual problems.

   ___ A. Strongly agree
   ___ B. Agree
   ___ C. Undecided
   ___ D. Disagree
   ___ E. Strongly disagree
7. Courses about family life should be required of all students before completing requirements for high school graduation.
___ A. Strongly agree
___ B. Agree
___ C. Undecided
___ D. Disagree
___ E. Strongly disagree

8. Formal education about family life is required by children because their parents fail to give them the necessary background and support.
___ A. Strongly agree
___ B. Agree
___ C. Undecided
___ D. Disagree
___ E. Strongly disagree

9. Parents should be kept fully aware of what is being taught to their children in family life courses and have the opportunity to discuss or review teaching materials (literature, films, etc.) if they so desire, before they are used in class.
___ A. Strongly agree
___ B. Agree
___ C. Undecided
___ D. Disagree
___ E. Strongly disagree

10. One of the problems with family life programs in schools is that teachers would probably pass on to their students values that are different from those of the parents.
___ A. Strongly agree
___ B. Agree
___ C. Undecided
___ D. Disagree
___ E. Strongly disagree
PART IV.

Many changes have occurred in certain areas of family life in recent years and these changes have created considerable disagreement. Your personal opinion about three of these areas would add greatly to the overall value of this survey. Please respond to the following three questions by checking the response that best expresses your personal opinion.

1. In general do you think that marriage breakdown in itself, without reference to the innocence or guilt of the parties concerned, should be sufficient grounds for divorce?
   _____ A. Yes
   _____ B. Yes, with some qualifications
   _____ C. Unsure
   _____ D. No, with some qualifications
   _____ E. No

2. Do you think that an increased permissiveness in sex standards of young people is an acceptable or regrettable development?
   _____ A. Acceptable
   _____ B. Acceptable with some qualifications
   _____ C. Unsure
   _____ D. Regrettable with some qualifications
   _____ E. Regrettable
3. Many mothers of school age children are choosing to take full time jobs for other than economic reasons. (That is, not because they need the extra money). How do you personally regard this development?

(a) Where the children are of pre-school age?

___ A. Acceptable
___ B. Acceptable with some qualifications
___ C. Unsure
___ D. Unacceptable with some qualifications
___ E. Unacceptable

(b) Where the children attend elementary school?

___ A. Acceptable
___ B. Acceptable with some qualifications
___ C. Unsure
___ D. Unacceptable with some qualifications
___ E. Unacceptable

(c) Where the children attend secondary or high school?

___ A. Acceptable
___ B. Acceptable with some qualifications
___ C. Unsure
___ D. Unacceptable with some qualifications
___ E. Unacceptable
PART V

For classification purposes certain information about you and your family is needed. Because the same questionnaire will be returned by parents and teachers from all over Kent County, without names or addresses, you or your family cannot be identified by the following questions.

1. Sex
   ___ A. Male
   ___ B. Female

2. What is your present marital status?
   ___ A. Married (civil or religious)
   ___ B. Married (common-law)
   ___ C. Widowed
   ___ D. Divorced
   ___ E. Separated
   ___ F. Unmarried

3. Into which of the following age groups do you fall?
   ___ A. Under 21 years
   ___ B. 21 years to 25 years
   ___ C. 26 years to less than 30 years
   ___ D. 30 years to less than 40 years
   ___ E. 40 years or more

4. If married, into which of the following age groups were you when you were married?
   ___ A. Under 20 years
   ___ B. 20 years to 25 years
   ___ C. 26 years to 30 years
   ___ D. Over 30 years
5. If married, into which age group was your spouse when you were married?
   - A. Under 20 years
   - B. 20 years to 25 years
   - C. 26 years to 30 years
   - D. Over 30 years

6. Would you please give me a rough indication of your formal educational level by checking one (1) of the following:
   - A. Grade 6 or less
   - B. Grade 7 to Grade 9
   - C. Grade 10 to Grade 11
   - D. High school graduate (includes public high school, trade school, etc.)
   - E. 1 to 3 years of college or university
   - F. College or university graduate (undergrad. degree)
   - G. Graduate professional training

7. If married, please indicate your spouse's educational level.
   - A. Grade 6 or less
   - B. Grade 7 to Grade 9
   - C. Grade 10 to Grade 11
   - D. High school graduate (includes public high school, trade school, etc.)
   - E. 1 to 3 years of college or university
   - F. College or university graduate (undergrad. degree)
   - G. Graduate professional training

8. Where do you live in Kent County?
   - A. Within the city of Chatham
   - B. Town (Wallaceburg, Thamesville, Dresden, etc.)
   - C. In the country
9. If you don't mind, would you please indicate to what ethnic group you belong?

   ____ A. Dutch
   ____ B. Italian
   ____ C. North American Indian (Amerin)
   ____ D. French Canadian
   ____ E. English Canadian
   ____ F. Other (Please specify) __________________________

10. (a) Please tell me the name of the usual job of the main wage earner in your family.

   ____ A. Assembly Line Worker
   ____ B. Machine Operator
   ____ C. Farm owner
   ____ D. Clerical/Stenographic/ Sales worker
   ____ E. Accountant (C.P.A.)
   ____ F. Teacher
   ____ G. Other (Please specify) __________________________

(b) Please give me a brief description of the kind of work this involves. __________________________

11. And finally, would you please write the ages of your children in the blocks below:

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you kindly for your patience and co-operation. To protect your privacy, please do NOT write your name or address anywhere on the questionnaire or envelope.

Mr. Sidney Flynn,
Chatham-Kent Community & Family Services,
259 Wellington Street West,
Chatham, Ontario.

Dear Sid:

The Kent County Board of Education, at its regular meeting in February, approved the following recommendations made by its Curriculum Committee:

"that Mr. Sidney Flynn be permitted to circulate the questionnaire on Family Life Programs, subject to the following conditions:

(a) that the circulation of the questionnaire be conducted on the basis of a random sampling across the county; and
(b) that a summary report of the results of the questionnaire be sent to the Curriculum Committee."

I trust that this approval will permit you to proceed with your study.

If there is any assistance I can provide re the mechanics of the survey, I will be pleased to provide it.

Yours sincerely,

T. R. Martin,
Superintendent
Program and Personnel

TRM/at
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VITAE

Sidney Johnson Flynn was born at Portau, Labrador on February 20, 1945. He attended elementary school at Portau and high school at Wilfred T. Grenfell Amalgamated School, St. Anthony, Newfoundland. He graduated from Memorial University of Newfoundland with a Bachelor of Arts degree in 1970 and a Bachelor of Social Work degree in 1971.

Mr. Flynn has worked as a protection and family services worker with the Kent County Children's Aid Society for the past three years and is currently on a leave of absence to complete graduate studies. His B.S.W. field placement was in the Psychiatric unit of the International Grenfell Association Hospital at St. Anthony, Newfoundland, under the supervision of Dr. Allastair Guthrie. His M.S.W. field placement was at Chatham-Kent Community and Family Services, a marriage and family counselling agency, under the supervision of Mr. Christopher Chan. Other work experience have included over 2 years with the Iron Ore Company of Canada and Wabush Mines in Western Labrador.

Mr. Flynn was admitted to the M.S.W. program at the University of Windsor School of Social Work in September 1974 and expects to graduate in October 1975.