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Abstract

This research focuses on the design and validatation of a questionnaire that intends to investigate young mothers' child rearing practices in the social psychology across cultures framework. This instrument would assist teachers primarily in the field of early childhood care and education in creating more culturally responsive institutional care services. Questions about the regularity of young mothers' actions with regards to particular child rearing practices were asked in the questionnaire. The questionnaire was designed to measure five construct: a. autonomy, b. separateness, c. conformity, d. relatedness, and e. attachment. The first four constructs relate to the individualism-collectivism framework and the fifth to John Bowlby's attachment theory. A pilot test among (n=34) young Cape Coloured mothers in South Africa, between the ages of 18 and 35 was conducted and resulted in four of the five scales being validated. The findings show that the cultural complexities of childrearing practices within this group of people however calls for further research.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1. Introduction

Due to the cultural diversity of South Africa, various authors argue for the need to provide contextualised early childhood education and care (Linington & Excell, 2004; Ebrahim, Killian & Rule, 2011). Children learn much better when they can relate to what happens within the classroom (Lee & Johnson, 2007). Children relate better to curriculum if it reflects the home culture. Learning and pedagogy is more effective if it resembles the ways in which children are raised at home. Often there is a gap between the world of a teacher and the world of children, such as, Linington and Excell (2004) demonstrated in relation to new teachers in their study, showing how middle class new teachers struggled to adapt to a classroom filled with children from disadvantaged backgrounds (ibid.). Teachers need to have a greater understanding of children and their contexts within South African classrooms. Teachers are often not aware of the circumstances of the children under their care and can thus miss educational opportunities or misread children’s behaviour. In addition, due to the high prevalence of health issues in rural parts or disadvantaged areas, Ebrahim et al. (2011) also expressed the need for teachers in early childcare to be better equipped to help children with problems such as HIV&AIDS and poverty.

Children from disadvantaged backgrounds often grow up with delays in their development (Grantham-McGregor, 1998, as cited by Linington & Excell, 2004). Factors resulting in this may include "inadequate housing and adverse effects of the built environment, illiterate parents" and "poor care-giving" which includes "maternal privation and deprivation" (Bowlby, 1951; Tizard & Hodges 1978; Lennard & Lennard, 2001 as cited by Linington & Excell, 2004). Poverty is the main factor that causes
environmental deprivation in South Africa. Grantham-McGregor et al. (2007) further iterated how poverty among especially young children restrains the mental potential of youth within Southern Africa. In South Africa alone 75% of all children are eligible for Child support Grants (Budlender & Woolard, 2012) and 65 % of children are estimated to be living in poverty (Streak, Yu & van der Berg, 2008). Families who live in poverty are not always able to adequately provide for the educational needs of their children. Moreover, Fleisch (2009) emphasises the large educational gap created by years of apartheid that still exists in South Africa between formally advantaged and formally disadvantaged groups. Besides these broad divisions of socio-economic status, South Africa prides itself with 11 official languages of which each resembles a unique cultural heritage (http://www.southafrica.info). Within a nation with such diversity in class, race, language and culture the exact same curriculum will not be suitable to all children, and therefore there is a strong need for contextualised education (Gibson, 2012; Guo, 2012).

1.2. Benefits of early childcare and education

Quality early childcare has long term benefits for society as a whole. Neuroscience has shown that 80 per cent of the brain develops before the age of three (Smith, 2012). McCain and Mustard (1999, as cited in Colmer, Rutherford & Murphy, 2011) also emphasise the importance of the first three years of human life as being a period of significant brain development with implications on future physical, emotional and mental health. According to Guhn and Goelman (2011) the early development and wellbeing of young children not only correlate with future health benefits but also with better academic achievements. Children who have participated in quality institutional early experiences, and thus have acquired the skills to be school-ready, perform better in school (Van Zyl, 2011). Children who perform well in school are also most likely to be successful as adults (ibid.). In the United States of America the National Institute for Early Education Research (2003 as cited in Phelps, 2011) as well as the Effective
Provision of Pre-school Education (EPPE) programmes in the UK (Siraj-Blatchford, Taggart, Sylva, Sammons & Melhuish, 2008) emphasise the long term academic and social benefits of early childhood education. Moreover, children's early wellbeing is not only linked to their personal wellbeing at individual level but also to their wellbeing at community level (Guhn & Goelman, 2011). Quality early childcare thus benefits South Africans holistically, as the South African Government discerns: "the early years are a period of great potential for human development" (Department of Education, Department of Social Development & Department of Health, 2005, p.4).

1.3. Early Childcare and Education in South Africa

Services for young South African children are complex and currently defined with an umbrella term: Early Childhood Development. The International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED 0) defines as Early Childhood Care and Education (ECCE) those services that include children from birth up to six years old (UNESCO, 2006). In South Africa many people refer to these services as Early Childhood Development services (ECD) although ECD services include services for children up to nine years old, thus including primary education (Foundation Phase – Grade R to 3). In order to prevent misunderstanding within this thesis, education for the children 0-6 years will henceforth be referred to as ECCE. Although the findings of this study are relevant to institutions caring for older children, the study mainly focuses on the young child and early childrearing practices associated with the ECCE phase.

In South Africa ECCE services are school-, community- or home based. The private, home and community sectors however dominate these services (UNESCO, 2006). ECCE services would thus comprise the following:

- "The Reception Year (Grade R) at independent schools;
- The Reception Year (Grade R) attached to public schools, but managed by the school governing body and operated by a private individual or the community;
• Independent pre-primary schools for children of 3-5 years of age;
• Privately operated or community run crèches or nursery schools for children under 5 years of age;

As noted, there are a variety of institutions, private and public, assisting the government to reach the goal of having every six-year old child enrolled in formal schooling by the year 2014. However, it is crucial that these services are of high quality, but Hewett-Fourie (2008) among others expresses a concern regarding the quality of these programs and settings.

Quality is a contested term that is difficult to define. Searches in EBSCOhost for "quality early childcare" in 'all text' returned 2777 results. This shows the large interest that is layed on quality in current early childhood education research. There are many factors examined in relation to quality. For example, some seek to encourage academic readiness in ECCE (Geoffroy et al., 2010), some the quality of food (Enke, Briley, Curtis, Greninger & Staskel, 2007) and others strive to define what overall 'quality' for ECCE entails (Moylett, 2012; Logan & Sumsion, 2010; Ho, 2008; Degotardi, 2010). Degotardi (2010), Pluess & Belsky (2009), Fumoto (2011) and Moylett (2012) all agree that good and lasting relationships between caregivers and children in ECCE settings are vital components of quality ECCE. Higher quality ECCE is usually found in settings where care and education are integrated (Siraj-Blatchford et al., 2008). Nutbrown (as cited in Moylett, 2012, p.14) argues that all practitioners working with children "must be carers as well as educators, providing the warmth and love children need to develop emotionally alongside and as part of planned and spontaneous
learning opportunities”. In this study I focus on the quality of caring, or relationships as quality ECCE.

I combine this focus with the view that young children are a particularly vulnerable group in society. They have the right to develop their full cognitive, emotional, social and physical potential (Department of Education, Department of Social Development & Department of Health, 2005). Therefore, the purpose of quality ECCE is also to protect the child's right to develop their full potential as enshrined in the African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child (Human Rights Library, 1990). Education should be directed to develop the "child's personality, talents and mental and physical abilities to their fullest potential" (Human Rights Library, 1990, Article 11). It is in this understanding that children’s contexts become fundamental to consider in providing quality education and care.

1.4. What quality ECCE entails

Quality relationships have been found to have a profound influence on ECCE with a crucial impact on the child's future performance (Joshi, & Taylor, 2005) and can only be formed if the primary caregivers are emotionally available to children (Colmer et al., 2011; Fumoto, 2011). Therefore, teachers of young children should be emotionally available to the children under their care and provide consistent, sensitive and responsive attention to their needs (Colmer et al., 2011). This can be achieved through a better understanding of the child's home and cultural background (Lawrence, Brooker, & Goodnow, 2012).

In order to improve children's engagement in classroom activities and to better facilitate their learning, it is important to incorporate parental and cultural perspectives within pedagogy (Joshi & Taylor, 2005). Rosen (2010), for example found a need to increase family involvement when planning the curriculum for preschools. It has been noted that parents value education that is relevant to their home (Phelps, 2011). Moreover, the
needs and interests of children should also be considered when planning a curriculum (Hedges, Cullen & Jordan, 2011; Rosen, 2010). Thus, it is an important aspect of quality for teachers to understand the children’s home cultures and associated parental childrearing practices and goals (Fumoto, 2011; Anning, Cullen & Fleer, 2009; Lawrence, Brooker, & Goodnow, 2012; Petriwskyj, Thorpe & Tayler, 2005).

Teachers have the responsibility to learn about the children's family background and thus to make classroom experiences relevant to the children (Banks, 1993; Pelo & Davidson, 2000 as cited in Tu, Freeman & White, 2007). Culture is the most significant system within which human development occurs (Lee & Walsh, 2001 as cited by Lee & Johnson, 2007, p.236). It is important for teachers to understand the child's culture in order to understand the children better and thus be able to provide culturally accessible educational experiences. Lee and Johnson (2007) also noted that teachers should be aware of underlying folk theories about their children's learning and development in order to change their pedagogical practices to become more relevant to the children and thus to promote learning.

Research has shown that specified training to assist staff in becoming culturally sensitive, could improve relationships within the educational environment (Phelps, 2011). A context-bound child and family centre approach towards ECCE therefore needs to be further developed within South Africa (Ebrahim et al., 2011).

1.5. Rationale of the study

Due to the cultural richness of South African society, there is a need to investigate different cultural groups’ various styles of early child care at home and then to propose certain frames of institutional care to match particular cultural frameworks of parenting. To start such an investigation, this study focuses on a particular group of South Africans and aim to design an instrument to explore the cultural nature of young mothers' childrearing practices within that group.
In other words, the aim of this study is to design and validate an instrument that would measure how Cape Coloured mothers' child rearing practices rate on the international Individualism-Collectivism (I-C) scale, in order to describe their social psychological framework of parenting. A part of the questionnaire (APPENDIX E) specifically focuses on the nature of young mothers' attachment toward their young children and how this attachment relates to the I-C framework. The social psychological framework of Cape Coloured mothers and more specifically the nature of their attachment to their children will provide implications for caregivers' recommended practices in ECCE settings.

1.6. The study population

According to a South African government website (http://www.southafrica.info), the 'Coloured' people of South Africa are of mixed lineage from slaves brought from Africa, the indigenous Khoisan, African and those from European descent. After years of intermarrying, they have become a unique ethnic group and were separately defined by the government in 1950 by the Population Registration Act No 30 (O'Malley, n.a). Today they still define themselves as 'Coloureds' (McKaiser, 2012). The term 'mixed race' is used in South Africa today to refer to people of 'inter-racial' origin (ibid.). Erasmus (2001, p.17-23), Reddy (2001, p.66-71) and Grunebaum and Robins (2001, p.168-171) (as cited in Erasmus, 2010, p.65) agree that the identity of 'coloureds' in South Africa is associated with a "creolised, hybrid" culture which goes beyond seeing 'coloured' people as people from a 'mixed race'. 'Coloureds' therefore are argued to be ethnically different from people of 'inter-racial' origin. The Coloureds in Cape Town and surrounding areas are furthermore also distinctly different from the Cape Malay, Khoekhoe and the San people, who are also sometimes classified as 'coloured' people within South Africa (http://www.capetown.at). These Coloureds speak Afrikaans and mostly live in the Western Cape and Northern Cape Provinces, and are hence often referred to as Cape Coloureds. Afrikaans (the language they mostly speak) is the third
(of eleven) most spoken home language within South Africa, and is used more as a home language than English (ibid.).

In order to avoid confusion between ‘people of colour’ worldwide, people of ‘inter-racial’ origin and other ‘coloureds’, I will henceforth refer to my study population as Cape Coloureds as they are still often referred to within South Africa. Cape Coloureds were furthermore identified as an official subcategory in the 1950 population registration act No. 30, which also distinguished them from the Cape Malay and Griqua’s among others (Christopher, 1994, p.103ft as cited in O'Malley, n.a.). Whether Cape Coloureds are an "ethnic identity" or "ethnic affinity" (Erasmus, 2010, p.71) is not a debate this research is engaged with. My study population however all referred to themselves as being Cape Coloured, and therefore I use their identification in my sample for this study.

1.7. Benefits and Significance

The exploration of customary childrearing practices in the homes of young Cape Coloured mothers will provide a platform for teachers to develop better understandings of the ‘world’ of the children within their classrooms. Teachers who possess a tool for guidance toward the understanding of a child’s social psychological background specific to his or her culture, are better equipped to enhance their classroom practices to meet each child’s developmental and educational needs. Such a teacher will also be able to design classroom materials and programmes that are context specific and nurture good relationships with children and families, hence provide quality ECCE. Cape Coloureds will especially benefit from this study since if the developed tool is applied in classroom contexts their children will benefit much more from their educational experiences. Other South African communities can also make use of this tool after validating it to their own cultural contexts.
1.8. **Chapter outline**

Chapter 2: Theoretical framework and methodology.

Chapter 3: The instrument: constructs and survey questions.

Chapter 4: Description and analysis of data and findings.

Chapter 5: Further considerations and recommendations.

1.9. **Key Concepts:**

1.9.1. **Designing an Instrument**

The design of an instrument is usually associated with quantitative research. This research has a quantitative emphasis and mixes it with qualitative interviews with the aim of verifying the instrument, which will ultimately be used to investigate Cape Coloured child rearing practices within South Africa.

The researcher has designed this instrument, the survey questionnaire, by examining and combining various scholarly works within the fields of childrearing, educating the young and cultural studies.

1.9.2. **Young mothers**

Families impart culture on children starting at children's birth (Froerer, 2009). In order to capture the present, 'fresh', culture of childrearing among Cape Coloured people, 'young' or 'novice' mothers are chosen as study population. Young mothers in this study refer to young women who are 'new' and 'young' in mothering.

For the purposes of this study and to reach the optimal number of reply from the target group's population, it was decided to include in the group of young mothers females (with children) from to 18 to age 35. Young mothers should also at least have one child below the age of six years so that the questionnaire could be answered with a sense of freshness. These mothers should not have children above 12 years because within
South Africa older siblings often rear their younger siblings when they are old enough to do so or when their parents are affected by disease or deceased.

1.9.3. Childrearing practices
Child rearing practices refers to the actions of mothers socialising their young children to become part of their culture and community. Parenting is composed of routine activities that communicate and reinforce cultural messages (Harkness & Super, 2002, as cited in Bornstein & Cheah, 2006).
Chapter 2

Theoretical Framework and Methodology

2.1. Introduction

As previously noted, 65% of young South African children are estimated to be living in poverty (Streak et al., 2008). The South African government has therefore adopted a poverty-targeted approach towards ECCE (Ebrahim, 2010) through which the government seeks to provide programs for poor and vulnerable children (Ebrahim et al., 2011). Scholars within South Africa have made efforts to accommodate to children from disadvantaged backgrounds when testing them for school readiness (see Herbst & Huysamen, 2000). Some scholars also have made special efforts to expose their prospective teachers to young children from disadvantaged backgrounds (see Linington & Excell, 2004). ECCE is thus seen to have an important intervention role to play in the lives of poor young children and their families (Rule, Ebrahim & Killian, 2008 as cited in Ebrahim et al., 2011). Furthermore, it is argued that the extent and quality of ECCE play a vital role in the rehabilitation of South Africa (Dawes & Biersteker, 2011). The need for teachers to be culturally sensitive toward their learners (Tu et al., 2007; Lee & Johnson, 2007) as well as the need for such training, have been noted by scholars such as Phelps (2011) and Linington and Excell (2004). However, there is a need to develop further approaches, tools and practices to gauge pre-service and in-service ECCE teachers/practitioners to become more culturally sensitive toward the childrearing practices of South Africans from different cultural backgrounds and to incorporate cultural knowledge into their own practices.

2.2. Relevant childrearing practices

The rearing approach taken by parents contributes to processes of learning. Learning "takes place within a social, historical and cultural context" (Rogoff, 2004 as cited in
Peterson, Valk, Baker, Brugger & Hightower, 2010, p.156.) Mothering and childrearing practices vary in practice among cultures (Van Doorene, 2009; Golden & Erdreich, 2012). Different factors, such as socio-economic status, education, demographic and cultural heritage of families influence childrearing practices (see Cheah & Chirkov, 2008). Parenting behaviour is guided by cultural beliefs (Newland et al., 2012). Childrearing and socialization is part of the "production, reproduction, and transmission of cultural beliefs and practices" (Froerer, 2009, p.3). Childrearing is thus a main facet of culture. It is the way in which culture is reproduced.

Breault (2005) noted, that teachers should investigate the philosophical underpinnings of teaching methods and their implications for their students, besides parents' responsibility to investigate whether the schools their children attend match their own worldview or philosophical underpinnings. Pre-service teachers are often aware that their own cultural values (and philosophical underpinnings) in relation to child rearing, teaching and learning, are different from that which they feel is expected from them in the field of ECCE (Akerson, Buzzelli & Eastwood 2010). Teachers and professional caregivers should therefore understand how fundamentally influential and important culture is in ECCE and what its diversity means for their teaching approaches (Hunt, 1999, as cited in Tu et al., 2007). It is important for teachers to better understand how their own philosophical underpinnings differ from that of the parents of the children within their care. If teachers know about the cultural beliefs of families, teachers and caregivers are better able to adapt their teaching methods and learning environments in order to best suit the needs of the children in their care. It is also important however, as Sorin (2005, p.12) underlines, to "rethink pedagogy and practice to suit new demands" that arise from changing cultural contexts of child rearing and education.

Culture plays an important role in learning and education (Peterson et al., 2010). Minority cultures have often been ignored by the 'majority rule' within schools (Tu et al., 2007). Teachers use alienating educational methodologies for minority groups by
default (Bekerman & Kopelowitz, 2008) without considering the cultural heritage of the people whom they are teaching. This situation is further complicated in South Africa, because practitioners often feel demotivated by their low salary benefits and high stress levels of work (Ebrahim et al., 2011; Hewett-Fourie, 2008). Fumoto (2011) found a similar situation in the United States and underlines that this is partly due to the implementation of the 'wrong' curriculum or culturally irrelevant curriculum that leads children to remain disengaged and act out in classrooms, making it hard for teachers to stay in control which in turn causes immense stress in their work.

2.3. Cultural orientations

Froerer (2009) succinctly summarises that culture is instilled during childrearing and therefore childrearing practices are fundamentally cultural by nature. Different cultures have different priorities when rearing their children (Suizzo et al., 2008; Cheah & Chirkov, 2008). Various scholars have studied the role of culture in childrearing or parenting practices from different theoretical perspectives (see Bornstein & Cheah, 2006; Cheah & Chirkov, 2008; Suizzo et al., 2008; Tamis-LeMonda, Wang, Koutsouvanou & Albright, 2002; Froerer, 2009; Hill, Stein, Keenan & Wakschlag, 2006). For this thesis those studies are considered in more details that argue for a differentiation to be made between families who rear their children in ways that emphasise individuality and/or conformity to different measures (Kagitçibasi, 1994, 1996 as cited in Suizzo et al., 2008). According to Wang and Tamis-LeMonda’s (2003, p.629), individualistic and collectivist values are also important in child rearing. In their definition "[i]ndividualistic values reflect personal preferences, needs, and rights; collectivist values emphasize interpersonal harmony and the subordination of self-interest to that of the group".

Another important aspect of childrearing that is considered in this thesis is Attachment. Attachment is defined as "our unique human ability to form lasting relationships with
others, and to maintain these relationships over time and distance" (Harrison, 2003, p.1). Culture impacts on the formation and quality of attachment relationships (Metzger, Erdman & Ng, 2010) and the way they are enacted (Smith, Bond & Kagitcibasi, 2009). Within South Africa, the principle of Ubuntu is generally adhered to among many cultural groups. This term denotes that "infants and young children are seen as belonging to the community" (Tomlinson, 2011, p.8). This implies also that the safety and well-being of children are often seen as the collective responsibility of the community (ibid.). Ubuntu however is not prevalent among all groups within South Africa and therefore the different meanings and practices of attachment in parenting need to be investigated. The following framework will be used to investigate parenting practices.

2.4. Social psychology across cultures framework

In order to investigate the various ways cultures differ in their child rearing practices, this study uses the 'social psychology across cultures' framework as proposed by Smith, Bond and Kagitçibasi (2009). According to Smith et al. (2009) in *Understanding Social Psychology Across Cultures*, all psychology should be social psychology because psychology should not isolate human behaviour from its context. Smith et al. (2009, p.5) explain that their "perspective stems from cross-cultural psychology". Cross-cultural psychology originates in Wundt's (1879) *Völkerpsychology*. Wundt studied languages, customs, myths, religions and art of particular cultures in laboratory fashion. From his studies social anthropology emerged which "documented the practices and social relationships characterising a given society" and theories concerning why societies differ from others were developed (Smith et al., 2009, p.13). Hence the school of 'culture and personality' was born. From this school, Ruth Benedict (1946) was particularly interested in understanding the "overall profile of a given society" (Smith et al., 2009, p.13) through anthropological fieldwork. Cross-cultural psychology engaging in individual and group types of investigations, thus seeks
to understand "distinctions between individual-level analysis and cultural-level analysis" of human behaviour (Smith et al., 2009, p.14).

It is important to highlight the differences between cultural psychology and cross-cultural psychology. Cultural psychology studies the historical diversity of individual thought and actions within a particular culture, whereas cross-cultural psychology considers cultures as bounded by relatively stable morals and values and its aim is to compare cultures on particular constant criteria, such as independence or collectivism (Shweder et al., 2006). Cultural psychology was partly influenced by the 'culture and personality' school, but also by ethnopsychology in social anthropology (LeVine, 2001, 2007a, 2007b as cited in Fung, 2011). Cross-cultural psychology and cultural psychology differ theoretically, epistemologically and methodologically (Fung, 2011). Cultural psychology prefers methods such as field research, participatory observations, in-depth interviews and ethnographic methods (Jessor, Colby & Shweder 1996 and Miller, Hengst & Wang, 2003 as cited in Fung, 2011), whereas cross-cultural psychologists prefer quantitative forms of measurement and emphasise the need to test theories (Smith et al., 2009). The I-C (Individualism-Collectivism) framework plays an important role in the social psychology across cultures worldview to create theories that explain the differences between cultures (see Smith et al., 2009; Cheah & Chirkov, 2008; Newland et al., 2012; Froerer, 2009) and persons (see Kagitçibasi, 2005; Beilmann & Realo, 2012). My study has adopted a social psychology across cultures framework and utilizes a survey method combined with interview questions.

The I-C Framework, specific concepts and the creation and items of the questionnaire that I used for this study are explained in detail in the next chapter. Here I continue my review with outlining the different ways in which an instrument is validated according to available literature. The instrument was created to measure differences between cultures and persons' cultural orientations. At the same time I include the methodology that I have employed to validate the instrument in this study.
2.5. **Instrument reliability and validation**

In lay terms, factor analysis (or FA) is a statistical process by which 'factors' or variables are sought that would describe most of the variation within a data set (Beaumont, 2012). These factors could also be called latent variables or constructs (ibid.). When FA finds that the instrument measures the construct that the researcher designed for the instrument to measure, the instrument is validated. FA is thus used in validating an instrument.

There are different kinds of factor extraction methods used in FA. In IBM SPSS Statistics software package which is widely used, the following extraction methods are available: 1) principal components (PC), 2) unweighted least squares, 3) generalised least squares, 4) maximum likelihood, 5) principal axis factoring (PAF), 6) alpha factoring, and 7) image factoring. The most frequently used methods of extraction are PC and PAF (Coakes, Steed & Ong, 2009). When doing factor analysis, factors are firstly explored by doing exploratory factor analysis to determine or classify the item factor structure or summarize the variables tested in the questionnaire (Coakes et al., 2009; see Zhai, 2012; Prieto, 2012, Gambin & Swieciecka, 2012, Rogers, 2012). This is usually done with questionnaires that are intended to explore a new field of study. Zhai (2012) used principal component (PC) analysis with verimax rotation as part of exploratory FA in a study to explore the satisfaction of college students regarding their education.

Secondly, after factors have been identified and a questionnaire has been adapted, confirmatory factor analysis is done to confirm these factors within a particular domain (Coakes et al., 2009; see Prieto, 2012; Zhai, 2012; Sala et al., 2012; Stes, De Maeyer & Van Petegem, 2013; Rogers, 2012). This sometimes means that the process is repeated to confirm factors. In some cases the confirmatory process involves saving the factor extraction scores as a variable and then computing the mean and standard
deviations for these scores (Beaumont, 2012). If the factor extraction scores have a mean score of zero and a standard deviation of one then the instrument has been standardized (ibid.). In this study the goal is to test the reliability and validity of scales/measures designed from literature to particularly test certain constructs. Factor analysis will therefore be appropriate (Coakes et al., 2009).

Scholars from the field of Education suggest that for an instrument to be reliable it should produce the same feedback if repeated in a similar situation or among respondents from the same population (Pietersen & Maree, 2010; Wiersma & Jurs, 2009). According to Wiersma and Jurs (2009, p.479), reliability of measurement is the "consistency of the measurement", and the validity of measurement is "the extent to which a measurement instrument measures what it is supposed to measure" (p.480). For this study validity would imply that the participants correctly understand the instrument questions and that the instrument measures are statistically reliable.

According to these understanding validity and reliability can be tested statistically (see Pietersen & Maree, 2010). Suizzo et al.’s (2008) study also focussed on childrearing practices among different ethnic groups, and is based to a great extent on Kagıtçıbasi’s theories from within the social psychology across cultures framework. Suizzo et al.’s study (2008, p.467) that compared "dimensions of independence and interdependence in parents' beliefs about daily child-rearing practices across four ethnic groups", for example, made use of the following procedures to validate their instrument: a) initial questionnaires were validated through interviews with mothers; b) questions relevant to the constructs being measured were added to the questionnaire; and c) principal axis factoring was used as factor extraction method. Oblique rotations with Kaiser Normalization were used as they expected factors not to have strong correlations. Three factors were extracted (conformity, autonomy and prosocial) of which the scale reliabilities ranged from $\alpha=0.69$ to 0.83 (Suizzo et al., 2008). These steps are in line
with the rest of the literature used in this study and have been together adopted in my study (see recommended steps 1, 2 and 4 below on p.24-25).

Prior to an instrument’s field test it should be tested for content and face validity by other scholars within the same field of research in order to test whether the items are likely to test what is intended (Zhai, 2012; Pietersen & Maree, 2010). After it has been field tested, the instrument can be statistically tested for internal reliability (using the Cronbach alpha test for example) and construct validity (item analysis and then factor analysis) (Pietersen & Maree, 2010).

This study employs the Cronbach alpha coefficient test testing for internal reliability, because it is commonly used to measure a multipoint data scale, which in this case is similar to an attitude scale (Wiersma & Jurs, 2009), which is similar to the scales used in my questionnaire. If the instrument is not reliable (usually α < 0.60), it cannot be valid (ibid.). After an internal reliability test, item analysis is done. An inner-item score of >0.2 is acceptable (ibid.). Cronbach test in SPSS includes an inter-item correlation, which can be used for item analysis (Coakes et al., 2009). From this test, and the Item-Total statistics table (that shows which alpha score will be increased if an item is removed) unreliable items should at this point be removed (Coakes et al., 2009; Pietersen & Maree, 2010).

After internal reliability of scales have been determined and items have been analysed, construct validity should proceed by doing Factor Analysis (FA). The first step in validating the factors is to test the data for sampling adequacy. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test does this, and should have a score > 0.5 and the Bartlett test of sphericity should have a significant value (Coakes et al., 2009). A scale is also suitable for factoring when most of the values in the correlation matrix exceed the value of 0.3 (Coakes et al., 2009). The Eigen values >1 confirm how many factors are dominant within the scale and should ideally explain at least 50% of the variance within the scale.
Factors can be explained by using various rotations to the data set. Coakes et al. (2009) and Pietersen and Maree (2010) suggest that oblique rotation should be used when different factors are correlated with each other and orthogonal rotation if they do not or have very low correlations with each other. Promax (Dahodwala et al., 2012; Beaumont, 2012) and quartim are choices for oblique rotations that allows for correlations (Pietersen & Maree, 2010; Beaumont, 2012). Varimax is an orthogonal rotation that is preferred by scholars when factors are uncorrelated (Pietersen & Maree, 2010; Coakes et al., 2009; Beaumont, 2012).

Pietersen and Maree (2010) further suggest that exploratory factor analysis be done in any case independent of the goal of analysis, when an entirely new population is dealt with. I will therefore start exploring the factors by using the principal axis factoring extraction method as also suggested by Coakes et al. (2009) and Beaumont (2012). Rotations will be done depending on the outcome.

In summary and in order to validate my questionnaire the following recommended steps were implemented after it has been tested for face validity by two scholars in the field of early childhood:

1. Three interviews were held with three young mothers in order to validate the instrument qualitatively by discussing the questionnaire. Qualitative responses were interpreted together with the participants. The purpose of the interviews was to validate the questionnaire for understanding (to ensure that the questions were understood as it was intended) as well as for clarity and ease of reading, before it was disseminated. Interviews were recorded and participants had the option of having recordings played back to them in order to verify what they had said. Results were used to amend the questionnaire to facilitate better understanding of participants so that the questionnaire
would be closer to their cultural understanding as based on information they gave. Questions for the interviews can be seen in APPENDIX A.

2. Changes were made to the instrument (see chapter 4 for more detail).

3. A field/pilot test was done – this included collecting responses to the questionnaire from 34 participants.

4. Statistical analysis of questionnaire scales was done for a) internal reliability; and b) constructing validity (this included analysis of scale items and factor analysis).

5. Necessary changes to the instrument were done.

Recommended steps 6 & 7 are not included in this thesis due to its limited size and are awaiting further study.

6. Restart the validation process (in another study) if the changes are major.

7. Determine the number of subjects for future implementation of the instrument.


2.6. Ethical considerations

In order to protect participants’ rights to dignity I have treated interviewees with respect. I also followed the University of Newcastle’s ethical conduct guidelines and have gained ethical approval to conduct this research. No questions were included that are of personal nature, and participants/respondents were informed that they could withdraw at any stage. Participants were not in a dependent or unequal relationship with me, the researcher. In order to further ensure that participants did not feel coerced to participate, snowball sampling was used. Snowball sampling allows participants to call upon others to participate in the study (Creswell, 2012). Persons were also given a local contact number for questions or complaints. Participants are not identifiable directly or indirectly in the thesis or any reporting of the results. All documentary data is securely stored. Participants were asked to listen to recordings
and allowed to decide what parts of the interview to be included in the analysis and were also notified that they could request a summary of the findings (see APPENDIX F for information letter to initial participants).

2.7. Demographics

Doing this study in a small rural town that was largely representative of the population aimed to be studied in this thesis strengthened the cultural cohesiveness of practices. This town was in the Hessequa district in the Western Cape Province of South Africa. It was convenient for me to use this population because it is close to my hometown, and I knew a contact person who could start snowball sampling.

Recent statistics show that there are about the same amount of ‘coloured’ people (4 615 401) as ‘white’ people (4 586 838) living in South Africa (8.9% respectively) (STATSSA, 2012a). The total population of people within the Western Cape is estimated to be 5 287 863, which is 10.45% of the total population of 50 586 757 within South Africa (STATSSA, 2012a). Inside the Hessequa municipality (where the data for this study was collected), Eden district, within the Western Cape, the Coloured people comprise 72.4% of the local population (Community Survey 2007, as cited in Western Cape Government, 2011). Literacy levels within this district is about 70% and poverty levels have dropped from 31.6% in 2001 to 21.7% in 2010 (Global Insight Regional Explorer, 2011 and Department of Social Development, 2009 as cited in Western Cape Government, 2011). Drug and alcohol abuse however, which is a sign of social need, is still a widespread problem among ‘coloureds’ in the Western Cape (Haefele, 2011).
Chapter 3

The instrument: constructs and survey questions

3.1. Introduction

Designing an instrument is a very exact process. In this study I designed and pilot-tested an instrument in order to validate it. This instrument investigates the cultural nature of young mothers’ childrearing practices. In this chapter I further elucidate the cultural constructs from the framework of social psychology across cultures and the questions used in the instrument.

3.2. The instrument

3.2.1. Background

Different cultures have different meanings for concepts, concepts such as obedience and independence (Tu et al., 2007). Teachers therefore need a tool to guide them in understanding these differences in meaning among cultures other than their own. Some of the concepts that made these differences were identified by Hofstede (1980) in his book titled Cultures Consequences: international differences in work-related values. This book labelled first and made popular the collectivism versus individualism dimensions (Triandis, Bontempo & Villareal, 1988; Kagitçibasi, 1997) which concepts were subsequently critiqued and further developed (Tu et al., 2007; Thomson, 1992; Kagitçibasi, 1997). Individualism and collectivism attributes have been studied since, remain under scrutiny in relation to many cultures and therefore are refined (Thomson, 1992; Kagitçibasi, 1997). Psychologists, anthropologists and cross-cultural scholars have engaged in the study of these dimensions to understand cultural differences (see Suizzo et al., 2008; Kagitçibasi, 1997, 2005; Smith et al., 2009).
Individualism (an independent cultural orientation (Cheah & Chirkov, 2008)) is one of
the most researched among cultural values (Newland et al., 2012) perhaps because it
is argued in our contemporary context that traditional values are on the downfall and
that the greatest enemy thereof is individualism (Beilmann & Realo, 2012).

Accentuating values that are not upheld by a culture, such as those associated with
individualism in a collectivist culture, can be harmful to healthy family relationships
(Kagitçibasi, 2005). In a similar way a curriculum, with an emphasis on individualism
within a culture which values collectivism will therefore be counterproductive or less
relevant.

South Africans at large (of whom most are Xhosa or Zulu) are described as "a
collectivist society with high heterogeneity ratings" (Diener & Diener, 1995 and Eaton &
Louw, 2000 as cited in Keller & Bergman, 2012). In collectivist cultures for example,
the "self is defined primarily in terms of its relationships with significant others" (Keller &
Bergman, 2012). When considering how to best educate Cape Coloureds, it is
imperative to take note of the cultural nature of their home childrearing practices. This
study designed an instrument to explore the cultural orientation of families' childrearing
practices. It asks questions that relate to the I-C framework and evaluates whether
there is a dominant trend, or whether demographics (e.g. income or home stability)
play a greater influential role on the current childrearing practices among Cape
Coloureds.

Individualism and collectivism are viewed as being polar opposites at cultural level
(Triandis & Suh, 2002 as cited in Beilmann & Realo, 2012) but orthogonal at individual
level of analysis (e.g. Gelfand, Triandis & Chan 1996, Realo et al. 2002 as cited by
Beilmann & Realo, 2012). Wang and Tamis Le-Monda (2003), Suizzo et al., (2008) and
Cheah and Chirkov (2008) all agree that different cultures hold to these orientations
and values to different measures. It is important to note that the I-C (Individualism-
Collectivism) framework only outlines broadly the variations within cultures and only
serves as guideline to human behaviour. To "know something about a person's culture does not mean we can predict that person's behaviour" (Gonzalez-Mena, 1997, p.87 as cited in Tu et al., 2007, p.20).

Childrearing composes a part of the family culture, as Kagitçibasi's work (2005) also shows. Cultural values are implanted through childrearing, and selves are created (ibid.). Kagitçibasi (1997) describes various scholars' views, interpretations, findings, and variations of level-values on the I-C framework. She further points out that the I-C framework is of a person's relatedness to others as a culture group and on a personal level, and therefore "it is possible to introduce an even finer tuning of this conceptualization by differentiating further between an autonomy versus heteronomy dimension (agency) and a relatedness versus separation dimension (interpersonal distance)" (Kagıtçibasi, 2005, p.39). Kagıtçibasi (2005) further explains that autonomy and relatedness co-exist differently in families from different cultures and are attributes that psychologists and counsellors agree upon to be important for healthy family relationships and images of self. The less autonomy a person holds, the more heteronomous he/she is. This scale is therefore named Agency. The less related a family is to one another the more separated the members are, thus the scale is labelled Interpersonal Distance. Compared to the I-C framework autonomy and separation would be images of individualism and relatedness, and heteronomy would be images of collectivism (Kagıtçibasi, 2005). The different family models also have implications for self as depicted in FIGURE 1 below.
Kagitçibasi (2005) further described four family models based on interpersonal distance as follows:

a) The interdependence traditional family model is held by the majority of cultures globally. This model is characterized by intergenerational interdependence emotionally and materially. Children are valued and are supportive towards their parents. These types of families uphold values of relatedness and conformity (heteronomy). Autonomy in young children is not valued.

b) The individualistic family model is based on independence and values autonomy and encourages young children to be independent.

c) The psychological interdependence model values both relatedness and autonomy and is seen as the ideal and balanced family model.

d) In the hierarchical-neglecting family model, parents value neither autonomy nor relatedness (Kagitçibasi, 2005).

These concepts form the basis of the measures used in the questionnaire. The questionnaire asked mothers to indicate how regularly in their opinion they perform a
certain action. Likert-type scale responses included Always, Mostly, Often, Sometimes, Rarely and Never.

3.2.2. Compiling Measures
The first four measures of the questionnaire (see APPENDIX E) relate to the I-C framework and were designed from the work of Suizzo et al. (2008), Cheah and Chirkov (2008) and Kagıtıbasi (2005). These scholars adhered to the social psychology across cultures framework. The last measure (attachment) is based on the work of Colmer et al. (2011). The instrument is designed to measure for "autonomy", "separateness", "conformity", "relatedness" and "attachment" as part of the cultural nature of childrearing practices. I now further explain the constructs and outline the related questions.

3.2.2.1. Individualism
According to Wang and Tamis-Lemonda (2003, p.629), "individualistic values reflect personal preferences, needs, and rights". Cheah and Chirkov (2008) describe individualistic cultures as having an independent cultural orientation. These cultures adhere to the following values when rearing their children: autonomy, self-constraint, separation from others and agency (Markus & Kitayama, 1991 and Triandis, 1995 as cited in Cheah & Chirkov, 2008). The value 'Agency' refers to a person's ability to control his/her own actions by making their own choices (Cheah & Chirkov, 2008). Parents from this cultural orientation would, for example, focus more on self-directed play because it develops the child's personal style (Triandis, 1995 as cited in Chen, Chung, Lechcier-Kimel & French, 2011). Suizzo et al. (2008) adds self-reliance, independent choice and creativity to the list of values that are fostered by parents from individualistic cultural orientations. Autonomy and separateness measures are subdivisions of the Individualism dimension (Kagitçibasi, 2005).
3.2.2.1.1. Autonomy

Autonomy refers to the child's ability to be his/her own agent and to be subject to his/her own rule but children "at the same time act willingly, without a sense of coercion" (Kagitçibasi, 2005). Agency and autonomy are overlapping constructs (ibid.). Autonomy would include that a child does things by him-/herself (Suizzo et al., 2008).

The following statements were to test for this construct:

1. I encourage my toddler to eat by him/herself  
   (from "letting children feed themselves" (Suizzo et al., 2008, p.476));
2. I encourage my toddler to dress him/herself as far as they can 
   (from "encouraging children to do things on their own" (Suizzo et al., 2008, p.476));
3. I encourage my toddler to voice her/his own opinions, and 
4. I encourage my toddler to choose his/her own beverage when going out somewhere 
   (from "encouraging children to develop their own individual tastes" and "encouraging children to make their own choices" (Suizzo et al., 2008, p.476));
5. I allow my toddler to fight for what she/he wants,
6. I allow my toddler to tell me when he/she doesn't want to do something I requested,
7. I allow my toddler to argue with me,
8. I discuss disagreements with my toddler, and
9. My toddler sometimes wins an argument 
   (5-9 from "exerting control" (Cheah & Chirkov, 2008, p.403) and "autonomy is the state of being a self-governing agent" (Kagitçibasi, 2005, p.404));
10. I encourage my child to choose his/her own friend 
    (from "make decisions on his/her own" (Suizzo et al., 2008, p.474).

3.2.2.1.2. Separateness

Separateness forms a part of the independence of the child. Separateness means to be separate from others or to have a negative interpersonal distance (Kagitçibasi as cited by Suizzo et al, 2008). Children coming from cultures characterised by separateness are often motivated to play by themselves (Triandis, 1995 as cited in
Chen et al., 2011; Kagitçibasi, 1996a as cited in Suizzo et al., 2008). They are also encouraged by parents and teachers to be separate, or independent, in their thinking. This would include to be creative (Suizzo et al., 2008) and also to use their own imagination (Wang & Tamis-Lemonda, 2003). The following statements test for Separateness:

1. I encourage my child to be creative, and
2. I encourage my child to think of something to do
   (1-2 from "having a lively imagination is important to me" (Singelis, 1994 as cited in Kagitçibasi, 2005, p.409) and "independent choice and creativity" (Suizzo et al., 2008, p.468);
3. I encourage my child to play by her/himself
   (from "encourage child to play alone" (Suizzo et al., 2008, p.476));
4. I allow my child to go places without informing me;
5. I allow my child to go to places outside of the home, without supervision; and
6. I encourage my child to leave others alone when they are not getting along well
   (4-6 from the idea of separateness and "unencumbered by any loyalties to others" (Kagitçibasi, 2005, p.406).

3.2.2.2. Collectivism

Wang and Tamis-Lemonda (2003, p.629) describes collectivistic cultures as valuing "interpersonal harmony and the subordination of self-interest to that of the group". Cheah and Chirkov (2008) described collectivistic cultures as having an interrelated cultural orientation. These cultures emphasise "relatedness, acceptance of norms and values, and relational harmony" when raising their children (Markus & Kitayama, 1991 and Triandis, 1995 as cited in Cheah & Chirkov, 2008, p.403). Cheah and Chirkov further explain that the value of 'Relatedness' refers to the feeling of "psychological or emotional connectedness" of individuals or having a "sense of belongingness" to "one's family, community or cultural group" (2008, p.403). Realo and colleagues (1997, as cited in Beilmann & Realo, 2012, p.208) demonstrate "relationships with family members (Familism), peers (Companionship), and society (Patriotism)" as three
interrelated subtypes of collectivism. Conformity is defined by Akerson and Buzzelli (2010, p.212) as "restraining actions that may upset or harm others, or to violate social norms". Suizzo et al. (2008) adds conformity to rules and social norms, and collaboration with peers to the list of values adhered to by cultures from collectivistic orientations. It has been noted that motherhood within Black communities of South Africa is shaped by collectivism (Arnfred, 2003 as cited in Van Doorene, 2009). African American parents are also known to value "structured and consistent family routine" (Phelps, 2011, p.iii) which coincide with traits of conformity found by Suizzo et al. (2008). Conformity and relatedness are subdivisions of the Collectivism dimension (Kagitçibasi, 2005).

### 3.2.2.2.1. Conformity

Conformity measures for heteronomy or low agency, where "heteronomy is the state of being governed from outside" (Kagitçibasi, 2005, p.404). Children are encouraged to be obedient, collaborate with peers, and follow age hierarchies and other social norms in cultures that emphasise conformity (Suizzo et al., 2008). The following statements are intended to test for this construct:

1. I expect/encourage my child to show respect towards older people;
2. I expect/encourage my child to be obedient to his/her teacher;
3. I expect/encourage my child to be obedient when I tell him/her to do something, and
4. I make sure that my child eventually obeys me when I give a command (1-4 from "obey adults without questioning, respect adults and people in authority" (Suizzo et al., 2008, p.474);
5. I expect/encourage my child to greet a visitor in the home (from "properly greeting visitors" (Suizzo et al., 2008, p.476));
6. I expect/encourage my child to be obedient to his/her older siblings (from "age hierarchy" (Kagitçibasi, 1996a as cited by Suizzo et al., 2008, p.475)).
3.2.2.2. Relatedness

This construct measures for a positive interpersonal distance (Kagitçibasi, 2005) or a psychological connectedness towards family and friends (Cheah & Chirkov, 2008). Children display "prosocial" behaviour in these cultures and are encouraged to work with others, be responsible for others and show empathy (Suizzo et al., 2008, p.475).

These statements test for Relatedness:

1. I expect/encourage my child to apologise when fighting with a friend (from "subordinating the individual to the group" (Kagitçibasi, 2005, p.409));
2. I expect/encourage my child to be kind to his/her friends (2-3 from "Are you kind to others?" (Kitayama, Markus, Kurokawa, Tummala & Kato, 1991 as cited in Kagitçibasi, 2005, p.409);
3. I expect/encourage my child to be a friend to everybody, and
4. I expect/encourage my child to share her/his toys with his/her friend/s (3-4 from "prosocial skills such as sharing toys" (Suizzo et al., 2008, p.475);
5. I expect/encourage my child to show a caring attitude towards others that are in need (from "teaching children to feel empathy for others" (Suizzo et al., 2008, p.477));
6. I expect/encourage my child to learn how to work well with other children in a team (1, 2, 3, 6 relate to "Social Sensitivity/Cooperation" as being "Cooperative, benevolent, and receptive attitudes toward others" for example "kindness" (Cheah & Chirkov, 2008, p.419);
7. I make sure I know where my child is
8. I always check where my child is when I can't see him/her (6-8 from the notion of positive interpersonal distance (Kagitçibasi, 2005) and as opposite to 4-5 in separateness (as negative interpersonal distance)).

The measures (autonomy, separateness, conformity and relatedness) so far discussed relate to the I-C framework. Another construct emerging from literature that relates to the wellbeing of young children and family relationship is attachment.
3.2.2.3. **Attachment**

Attachment refers to the first relationships that are built and held onto over a long period of time (Bowlby, 1951; Harrison, 2003). The first relationships that the child has with others are foundational to the child's future emotional, social and cognitive well-being (Colmer et al., 2011). Attachment relationships are hierarchical and determined by culture (Smith et al., 2009; Davies, 2011). Babies can develop this important relationship with caregivers also, who are stable in a child’s life, e.g. ECCE teachers or other staff in childcare settings and distant relatives (Davies, 2011). Attachment has four main functions: "providing a sense of security, regulating affect and arousal, promoting the expression of feelings and communication, and serving as a base for exploration" (Davies, 2011, p.8).

Attachment theory was developed by John Bowlby and emerged out of Ethological thinking (Stevenson-Hinde, 2007). Ethological thinking comprises the study of manners and customs as well as the study of character (ibid.). Today it is found that there is a link between antisocial behaviour and the person's early family life being disrupted (Murray & Farrington, 2005 as cited in Tomlinson, 2011). Attachment theory underlines the primacy of emotional relationships for children’s development and learning (e.g., Watson & Ecken 2003 as cited in Guhn & Goelman, 2011, p.200) and the disruption thereof is "likely to be instrumental in the development of later aggression and violence" (Fonagy, 2004, as cited in Tomlinson, 2011, p.13). Due to attachment's variation between cultures (van IJzendoorn & Sagi-Schwartz, 2008) and because many homes in South Africa have been disrupted in the past due to political unrest and racial divisions, and attachment therefore needs to be further investigated (Tomlinson, 2011).

Among many people within South Africa (especially the Xhosa and Zulu) the principles of Ubuntu is adhered to. Ubuntu describes "African values of group identity and
solidarity” (James, 2001 as cited in Ebrahim, 2010) and is associated with communitarianism, which flows from "the practice of compassion, kindness and respect for human dignity" (Ebrahim, 2010, p.46). This term also denotes that "infants and young children are seen as belonging to the community" (Tomlinson, 2011, p.8). This implies also that the safety and well-being of children are often seen as the collective responsibility of the community (ibid.). Many children in South Africa are left to be cared for by an aunt or relative for prolonged periods. Among the people living with poverty and tenants of close and small housing facilities also contribute to such close social interactions (Tomlinson, 2011).

Attachment is not specifically connected to the I-C framework. Kagitçibasi (2005) does however discuss a healthy attachment to parents as "integrating autonomy with relatedness" (p.406). This connection can be tested in the data analysis, but is not done in this study because the focus of this study is to validate the instrument.

Colmer et al. (2011, p.17-19) describe attachment in three criteria: 1) meeting the child's basic needs; 2) assisting the child to manage his/her own feelings; and 3) being emotionally available to the child. The following statements test for attachment:

1. I allow my infant to explore but stay within near proximity (from the idea of "Circle of Security" and a "Secure base behaviour…refers to the balance between attachment (proximity) and exploration" (Cooper, Hoffman, Marvin & Powell, 2000 as cited in Colmer et al., 2011, p.17) and "Support my exploration" (Colmer et al., p.17 (FIGURE 1)));
2. I assist my child to manage their own feelings (from "help children learn to manage their feelings" (Colmer et al., 2011, p.18));
3. I attend to my infant as soon as possible when she/he cries (from "Comfort me" (Colmer et al., p.17 (FIGURE 1.) and being "emotionally available to them and they feel secure" (Dolby, 2003 as cited in Colmer et al., p.19));
4. I breast feed my infant,
5. I spoon feed my infant/toddler,
6. I myself change my infant/toddler's diapers,
7. I put my infant to sleep daily
   (4-7 from "primary caregiver attends to the child’s routine needs, including
   changing, sleep and mealtimes" Colmer et al., 2011, p.19).

The question asking 'who also assists' in these functions was added to each question
above in order to further investigate how Cape Coloureds enact attachment because
attachment is enacted differently between cultures (Smith et al., 2009).

3.3. Conclusion

In this chapter the design of the instrument used in this study was discussed. A
questionnaire was developed which contained 37 closed-ended questions and two
open ended questions for qualitative feedback. The questionnaire asks psychological
questions pertaining to the cultural nature of childrearing practices, measuring for the
five constructs discussed above. Due to the small nature and time constraints on this
study, the questionnaire is kept simple. The designed instrument is a tool to measure
Cape Coloured mothers' social psychological framework according to Kagışibası’s
(2005) family model as shown in FIGURE 1 through investigating their childrearing
practices.
Chapter 4

Description and analysis of data and findings

4.1. Introduction

The mixed methods research design (Creswell, 2008) comprises qualitative interviews and a survey questionnaire. During the interviews the questionnaire was discussed with three participants to verify whether questions were understood correctly before using the questionnaire in the field test. The instrument then was administered and 34 participants' answers were received and analysed as part of this thesis.

4.2. Interview Participants

To ensure voluntary and informed consent, I did not contact mothers for initial interviews but worked through a contact person who made contact with mothers and handed them the information sheets about the research and consent forms. Eight mothers were approached of whom three were willing to participate. From the contact details on the returned written consent forms, I arranged for interviews with the three mothers individually. All three these mothers had two young children (below age 7). Two mothers were in the 30-35 age bracket and the third in the 25-29 age bracket.

4.3. Results from the interviews

The participants took part in a one off discussion of the questionnaire which lasted between 40 and 50 minutes each. During the interviews all three participants made only one and the same suggestion, to add a question about what age the mother intended or did breast feed her infant. The following suggestions were made by at least two participants:

1. Add under the heading of religion some examples church denominations (i.e. VGK – Vereenigende Gereformeerde Kerk in Afrika, the Afrikaans for Reformed
Church of Africa, and AGS – *Apostoliese Geloof Sending*, the Afrikaans branches of the Apostolic Faith Mission church) because the word *protestant* in the original was not understood.

2. Add monthly figures to annual income in brackets.

3. Add the ages in brackets to the first question within each age category. For example toddler (3-5 years).

4. Vary "I expect my child to" and "I encourage my child to" in questions 17 to 22 (questions of relatedness).

5. Split the question "I spoon feed my infant/toddler" in two questions.

6. Add an example to "I assist my child to manage their own feelings".

Only one person suggested the following minor amendments, but because I thought they did not negatively change any of the questions, I applied them to the questionnaire.

7. Add "current" to the "age of the youngest (or eldest) child".

8. Bold the instructions before the questions to catch attention.

9. Add an example to creativity (I added another question – "I encourage my child to use any colour of their choice when colouring a picture").

10. Split "I allow my child to go places without informing me" in two: "I allow my child to go far places without informing me" and "I allow my child to go places near the home without informing me (e.g. neighbours)".

11. Add "to stay busy" to "I encourage my child to think of something to do".

12. Add "at least" to "I expect/encourage my child to show (at least) a caring attitude towards others that are in need".

13. Add "at all times" to "I make sure I know (at all times) where my child is".

14. Add the question "how else does my child get to sleep?" with an open response.

15. Add the instruction "fill in the questions as you understand them"

16. Add "in fixed relationship" to marital status. I changed this suggestion to "in a fixed relationship with child's father" because the intent of the question would be to measure the stability of the home life.

After further consideration of the interview data, the following minor changes were also added to the questionnaire to match the suggestions participants have made with other areas:
17. "without subtractions" to monthly income question (because answering for income after deductions like, medical aid etc., were made could put people in a lower income bracket which would distort the information),
18. "can tick more than one" to the instruction of Marital status (because a mother might be unmarried as well as in a fixed relationship with the child's father),
19. the gender of eldest and youngest child to demographic questions (to whether gender plays role in the way that mothers rear their children),
20. a reminder note before the attachment questions "Remember to say who helps..." (to encourage mothers to answer these questions).

The above 20 amendments were applied to the questionnaire which were then prepared for distribution.

4.4. Other qualitative findings

During the interviews participants used different understandings for terms; for example, respect in the question "I expect/encourage my child to show respect towards older people". Interviewee 1 commented the following, "He should not back chat with others (laugh). What I say I say he should listen and he must, he must always like in as in not call people by their names like an older person, an aunty, not call by their name. That's now something. And when someone comes in greet them." Interviewee 3 had a more general understanding of respect as she answered, "yes I am very strict with that because if you give them the little finger they grab the hand".

Creativity implied in the questions/statement "I encourage my child to think of something to do" and "I encourage my child to be creative". Interviewee 2 understood the former question/statement to refer to "help in the home" whereas Interviewee 1 had another approach and commented, "then I say to him that I cannot tell you what to do because I don't know what you want to do, so think what you want to do then you do it". Interviewee 1 responded to creativity in the latter question as "what can I say? If I say to him play with your thoughts. If I say to him for example, you must do a project like, ah, for the school. Think, as they say think out of the box. Don't, if I give you a page or
a picture, don't just go according to that, think what you can do differently for example what change will you bring in”. Interviewee 2 viewed creativity as “to focus more on schoolwork”. Interview 3 said in this regard, "they are continuously busy with pencils and pens, even if they write on the walls they are busy to write…and the crèche helps a lot with the development of creativity”.

Some mothers might think that discussing the child's anger with him/her is helping her/him to cope their emotions, while other mothers might disagree and feel that punishment is the only way to help the child to deal with negative emotions. For the question "I assist my child to manage their own feelings" the following comments were made:

Interviewee 2:

“When the child is angry or sad, that you maybe say to him, that if you are sad talk out your heart”.

Interviewee 3 added:

“Sometimes. Because [name] when I spanked her and she finished crying, she will come and say mommy you have spanked me hard. Then we will talk about it. Sometimes I explain why.”

Cape Coloured mothers’ understanding of terms such as respect, creativity and helping the child to cope with emotions should thus be further explored qualitatively.

4.5. Questionnaire respondents

After the interviews, I asked the participants if they knew more young mothers who would be interested in completing the questionnaires, and thus snowball sampling (or chain referral sampling) was started in order to find young mothers not easily accessible otherwise (Nieuwenhuis, 2010). All three interviewed mothers agreed. I
gave them a number of information sheets about the research attached to the amended questionnaires with a reply paid envelope to hand over to their acquaintances. The first interviewee took 10 questionnaires to hand out, the second interviewee took 46, and the third took 5. The initial contact person took 20 of these new questionnaires and information sheets with envelopes to hand out to young mothers acquainted to her. Altogether 81 questionnaires were given to the contact persons. Due to the lack of postal service in two participants' residential area, I gave them the option of collecting the completed questionnaires and bringing them back to me, or notify me when I could collect them. Only 6 responses were posted, the rest were collected by hand and returned to me. In all, 40 responses were received of which 6 were invalid. Three of these invalid forms had more than 50% missing data and the other three did not fulfil the criteria for children's ages therefore I consider them irrelevant as I was specifically looking for young mothers based on their children's ages.

4.6. Participation and consent

Implied consent was understood when respondents returned the completed questionnaires. This was explained in the information sheets given with the questionnaires. Respondents were required to complete the questionnaire, which took about 15 minutes. Open-ended questions at the end could optionally also be filled in by the respondents commenting on the questionnaire. This could have taken another 10 minutes. Respondents were then requested to post back the questionnaire to the address displayed on the self-addressed reply paid envelope provided or to hand them back in the sealed envelopes to the contact person who gave it to them.

4.7. Description of the data

Young mothers were between the ages of 18 and 35. 47.1% of the mothers were in their late twenties (between the ages of 25 and 29). 93.9% of mothers did not have
any education above school level (which ends at Grade 12), and 21.2% of those only attained a maximum level of education Grade 8. Regardless of these mothers' low level of education, FIGURE 2 also shows about 88% of the mothers were employed at the time.

FIGURE 2: Employment Status
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Only 50% of mothers indicated that they were either married or in a fixed relationship with their child's father. 38.2% of all mothers indicated that they lived in a shack while only 11.8% of all mothers were unemployed. 61.8% of mothers were in the low income group as per their combined annual household income indicated on the questionnaire. Of those 32.4% of families earned less than R15 000 per annum. This would approximately amount to less than 125 AU dollars per month. Low-, Medium- and High socio-economic income levels, as indicated in TABLE 4, have been taken from the University of South Africa’s Bureau of market research information sheet 2011/06 (UNISA, 2011).
TABLE 1: Annual household income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-15 000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 001-50 000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 001-100 000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle SES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 001 or more</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>75.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no idea</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Missing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23.5% of mothers indicated that they had no idea what their combined household income was, and 3% did not complete the question. This could indicate that even more mothers were in the low income group. Only four people (11.7%) indicated that they were in the middle or high income group, and half of these (2) indicated that they lived in a shack (see TABLE 2). None of the mothers indicated that they lived in RDP homes (small homes built by the government) while 38.2% lived in shacks.

FIGURE 3: Bar graph for annual household income
TABLE 2: Annual Household Income and Current residence Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Household Income</th>
<th>Current residence frequency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shack</td>
<td>Brick house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle SES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no idea</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3: Marital status and Employment status Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Employment status</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Permanently Employed</td>
<td>Temporary Employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with partner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In fixed relationship</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never been married</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3 shows that all mothers that were married or in a fixed relationship were employed. This shows that the factor that traditionally would bring about home stability (i.e. marriage) is countered by mothers having to work. Most mothers were however only temporarily employed.

FIGURE 4 shows that most mothers had either one or two children. None of the mothers had four or more children. This could be because mothers with young children were the focus of this study and mothers with children older than 13 were excluded in this survey.
Coloured women between the ages of 20 and 34 comprise about 24.6% of all Coloured females within South Africa and Coloured women comprise 9% of the total female South African population (calculated from STATSSA, 2012a). 51.79% of Coloureds in South Africa are women (ibid.). The Hessequa municipality is estimated to have 39076 residents of whom 71.4% are Coloured (STATSSA, 2012a). This could imply that of the 27900 (71.4% of 39076) approximately 3555 could be women between the ages of 20 and 34 (24.6% of 51.79% of 27 900). My sample size is approximately 1% of the target population and findings will therefore not be generalized.

The unemployment rate in the Eden district (of which Hessequa is apart of) is estimated to be 18.5% (STATSSA, Community Survey 2007 as cited in Western Cape Government, 2011) as compared to the 11.76% unemployment of my respondents.

Another interesting point is that according to the October household surveys, 1995–1999 (as cited in Budlender, Chobokoane & Simelane, 2004) 35 of every 100 women
aged 15-49 were married in 1995 compared to the decrease to 30 in 1999. This decrease is confirmed in that only 26.5% of my respondents indicated that they were married. Statistics South Africa (2012b.) indicates that 75% of marriages occur between the ages of 18 and 34, which would place my average in line with current trends. Civil marriages however have fluctuate in the last thirteen years, with an increased from 2001 to 2006 and a decrease after 2006 (STATSSA, 2012b).

4.8. Validation of the instrument

SPSS software was used for the capturing and analysis of data. I did random spot checks to verify that data was correctly keyed in. No mistakes were found. Missing values were replaced with the mean score of that question.

4.8.1. Internal scale reliabilities

The whole instrument had an alpha Cronbach reliability score of 0.828. Individual scale measures were all reliable (>0.7) except for ‘separateness’. The different measures had the following reliability scores:

TABLE 4: Reliability scale scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Cronbach alpha score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>0.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separateness</td>
<td>0.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>0.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatedness</td>
<td>0.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment</td>
<td>0.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole instrument</td>
<td>0.828</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this point the 'separateness' scale is deemed unreliable and further analysis is not done with this scale because if a scale is not reliable it is invalid (Pietersen, &
The autonomy (0.73), conformity (0.848), relatedness (0.848) and attachment (0.866) scales have been deemed reliable.

**Comment**: The results on the separateness scale were too diverse to establish a reliable cultural measurement (or score). In TABLE 5 the results are shown, and in APPENDIX C the item correlation matrix can be viewed. Item correlations ranged from negative 0.394 to positive correlations of 0.553.

**TABLE 5: Statistics for Separateness scale items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>N Valid</th>
<th>N Missing</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Error of Mean</th>
<th>Median*</th>
<th>Mode*</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Range*</th>
<th>Minimum*</th>
<th>Maximum*</th>
<th>Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$s_{11}$ child to think of something to do</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$s_{12}$ child to play by themselves</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$s_{13}$ child to be creative</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$s_{14}$ child choose own colours</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$s_{15}$ child to leave who not get along with</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$s_{16}$ allow child to go FAR places without informing</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$s_{17}$ allow child to go NEAR home places w/o informing</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$s_{18}$ child outside home without supervision</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* for these readings 1=Always; 2=Mostly, 3=Often, 4=Sometimes, 5=Rarely and 6=Never applies

Note the diversity in the large range for answers to each question. Also note that the mean, median and modes differ for questions alternately. These are contributing factors for why the questions for the separateness scale are deemed invalid.
4.8.2. Construct validity

4.8.2.1. Scale items

Autonomy had one item that had an inter-item score that correlated less than 0.2 with the rest of the scale. Because of this small correlation, this item ("I encourage my child to choose his/her own friend") was removed from the autonomy measure/scale (Pietersen & Maree, 2010). As consequence, the autonomy scale reliability improves slightly to α=0.745. The inter-item scores of the conformity, relatedness and attachment scale all exceeded 0.2 and all other items (questions) remained for continued analysis.

4.8.2.2. Factor analysis – Exploring factors

Scales are separately analysed because the whole instrument did not have statistically sufficient sample size (KMO < 0.5 and not significant) (Coakes et al., 2009). However, I did not see this as a problem because this is the first time that these questions are explored in this questionnaire and each scale is uniquely designed to measure particular constructs. Separate scales had constructs within each scales therefore needed to be explored and confirmed separately. Each scale had only a few questions (6-10) and participants were from one cultural group, which decreased the need for a large sample as Coakes et al. (2009, p.130) suggests that at least “five subjects per variable is required for factor analysis”.

TABLE 6 below shows that 3 scales were very significant (p<0.001) and had sampling adequacy (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin reading of > 0.5) (Coakes et al., 2009). Using the PAF (Principal Axis Factoring) extraction method, four factors had Eigen values greater than 1 for the autonomy scale, however 2 factors were sufficient to explain more than 50% of the variance. Only one factor was sufficient to explain the variance for relatedness and attachment scales.
TABLE 6: Scale analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>KMO score</th>
<th>Most Correlations &gt;0.3</th>
<th>Eigen values &gt;1</th>
<th>Explaining &gt;50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>0.575**</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatedness</td>
<td>0.732**</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment</td>
<td>0.768**</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bartlett test of sphericity significant at <0.001

Extraction was terminated for autonomy and relatedness because the communality of a variable exceeded 1.0. The total variance could not be explained for conformity. Correlations were medium to high ranging from $r_s = 0.4$ to 0.71. A correlation matrix for the items in the conformity scale can be seen in APPENDIX D. Factors could thus only be explained for attachment by using the PAF extraction method.

The extractions are shown for the attachment scale in TABLE 7. It shows that items A_02 (I assist my child to manage his/her own feelings) and A_05 (I spoon feed my toddler) have a higher factor loading for factor 2 and can thus be removed from the scale.

TABLE 7: Attachment factor matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMEAN(A_01)</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMEAN(A_02)</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMEAN(A_03)</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMEAN(A_04)</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMEAN(A_05)</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>.376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMEAN(A_06)</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>-.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMEAN(A_07)</td>
<td>.874</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring.

Item A_06 "I myself change my infant or toddler's diapers" had a higher score for factor 1 and will remain. These questions did not specifically relate to the 'infant' and thus do
not match and explains the variation. Removing these two questions increases the attachment scale reliability to α=0.888 and would account for more than 50% of the variance. Therefore a single factor solution would be appropriate for attachment (Coakes et al., 2009).

When using the Principal Component (PC) factor extraction method the conformity scale, the first factor has an Eigen value of 4.096 and explains for 68.26% of the variance. The same procedure showed the first factor on the relatedness scale with an Eigen value of 4.311 explaining for 53.89% of the variation. For relatedness, the second factor had an Eigen value >1 (1.307), but the gap between the first and the second is very large. At this point it is therefore assumed that a one factor solution is appropriate for the relatedness and conformity scales.

Thus far the autonomy, conformity, relatedness, and attachment scales have been explored. I now proceed with Beaumont's (2012) instructions for confirming the factors for the 4 scales.

4.8.2.3. Confirming Factors

Using the information above it is decided to confirm the scales for one factor each using the Principal Component extraction method (Beaumont, 2012). The default settings were used for the factor dimension reduction, which included no rotations. The only addition was to save the factor scores. The Syntax for this process (the steps followed in SPSS) is shown in APPENDIX B, and the results in TABLE 8.

TABLE 8 reveals that all factor scores had a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1 which indicates that the variables (or scales) are all standardized (Beaumont, 2012). This means that the factors relating to the questions measuring for the autonomy, conformity, relatedness and attachment are confirmed. The questionnaire relating to these 4 scales is therefore validated.
TABLE 8: Results for confirming factors

Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REGR factor score 1 for Autonomy</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-.178</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGR factor score 1 for Conformity</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGR factor score 1 for Relatedness</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-.59</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGR factor score 1 for Attachment</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-.128</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.9. Influences on scale

Using the information given in the questionnaires I investigate whether any demographics had any significant influence on the mean score of each scale. These results cannot be generalized because this is only a pilot test. The sample size for generalisation should be calculated and would depend on factors such as the size of the population as well as the sampling error (Creswell, 2012) but would be estimated to at least 100. However, the results should give a good indication of which other factor/s, besides culture, motivates young Cape Coloured mothers to rear their children with a particular emphasis. The results are now discussed.

Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) were conducted to determine the differences between the mean scores of each scale and each of the demographics asked in the questionnaire (Spangler & Grossman, 1993). The results showed significance (at a 0.05 level) for the amount of children for autonomy and separateness; the age of the eldest child for autonomy and separateness; residence for separateness; marital status for autonomy; and employment status and maximum education attained on attachment. See more details in TABLE 9 with results also from post hoc tests showing group differences to dependent variables, in this case the scales (Suizzo et al., 2008). This means for example, that the autonomy scale is greatly dependent on whether a mother has one or two children. Furthermore, the separateness scale depends on the variable Residence. Mothers living in brick homes do not encourage separateness as opposed
to mothers who live in shacks. Tomlinson (2011) found that close interactions were often found among people living with poverty and tenants of close housing. The type of housing however was not expressed. Perhaps those mothers in my study population and living in shacks are more vulnerable to the abuse of drugs and alcohol (Haefele, 2011) and therefore subject to family disruption and separateness (Tomlinson, 2011).

**TABLE 9: Demographic influences on scales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Statistical Result</th>
<th>Group difference between</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>[F(2,31) = 3.401, p = 0.046]</td>
<td>one child and two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>Separateness</td>
<td>[F(2,31) = 3.531, p = 0.042]</td>
<td>one child and two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of eldest child</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>[F(2,31) = 3.862, p = 0.032]</td>
<td>infants and primary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of eldest child</td>
<td>Separateness</td>
<td>[F(2,31) = 4.617, p = 0.018]</td>
<td>toddlers and primary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>Separateness</td>
<td>[F(1,30) = 5.283, p = 0.029]</td>
<td>shack and brick house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>[F(3,29) = 3.831, p = 0.02]</td>
<td>married and never been married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Attachment</td>
<td>[F(20,13) = 2.729, p = 0.034]</td>
<td>unemployed and permanently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max education</td>
<td>Attachment</td>
<td>[F(20,12) = 9.764, p = 0.000]</td>
<td>see last graph</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note**: Not relative scores for attachment were replaced with the scale mean.

From the I-C framework only the individualism dimension was determined by the variables. The following Error Bar graphs depict the differences for the relevant scales:
To correctly interpret the error bars graphs, it should be remembered that the higher the score the less frequent an action was encouraged (Always had a score of 1 and Never a score of 6). When looking at the first six Error Bar graphs, the influences on autonomy are stacked below each other. The first graph shows that mothers with one child are less inclined to encourage their child to be autonomous than mothers with 2 children. This might be because a mother with one child indicates that the child is young, which coincides with the second graph. The second graph that relates to autonomy indicates that mothers whose eldest child is an infant are significantly less inclined to encourage attributes of autonomy than mothers whose children are in primary school. This would be because infants are not expected to be autonomous. As children grow older mothers expect them to be more autonomous (Vandenplas-Holper et al., 2006 as cited by Meunier & Roskam, 2009). The third graph pertaining to autonomy indicates that Cape Coloured mothers who are married encourage their children to be more autonomous than mothers who have never been married. This could be because the family is more secure with parents who have committed themselves toward each other.

4.10. Open ended questions

The last two questions in the questionnaire were open-ended questions asking for feedback on question(s) deemed difficult to understand and how the questions could be restated. 50% of the participants left this section blank, and the other 50% said either that all questions were clear, or that they had no problems regarding the questions. This is a good indication that the questions were not ambiguous to the study population and that the two questions mentioned above could in future be excluded.

With regards to the open-ended question "up to what age did you or do you intend to breast feed your infant", 11.8% replied 1 year or less, 29.4% 2 years and 8.8% replied 3
years. The rest of the respondents either made no reply (32.4%) or said "not applicable" (14.7%). This question can in future be quantified in the categories: 1 year or less; 2 years; 3 years; and more than 3 years.

To the questions whether the mother herself puts her infant to sleep, 38.3% responded "Always", "Mostly" or "Often". 17.6% responded "not applicable", and 23.5% made no response. For the next open-ended question (how else does your infant get to sleep), that was added to the previous question, 41.2% of mothers made no response and 8.8% of mothers responded that this was not applicable to them. 38.2% of mothers indicated something to the effect that the child gets to sleep by themselves, either with a bottle or a full stomach. 11.8% indicated other measures such as the father lulling the child to sleep, or singing to the infant. This shows that ‘putting’ a child to sleep could have different meanings to mothers. It could be understood as laying the child down, or lulling the child until he/she sleeps. The qualitative questions confirmed that different cultures understand concepts differently

4.11. Summary

In this chapter the collected data was analysed and discussed. The autonomy, relatedness, conformity and attachment scales were found to be statistically valid. The open-ended questions regarding feedback could be removed. The open-ended questions regarding attachment should be either quantified or explored further by doing interviews with mothers. The concepts within the separateness scale also need to be further explored qualitatively among the Cape Coloured people.
Chapter 5

Further considerations and recommendations

5.1. Introduction

After discussing how measures for autonomy, conformity, relatedness and attachment were validated in the previous chapter, here I discuss first other noteworthy findings and some suggestions for further research. Then a discussion of the limitations to this study follows and some considerations why the separateness scale was not validated in this study. Thereafter I provide some notes and recommendations for the administration of this tool before the conclusion.

5.2. Discussion of noteworthy findings

During the process it was noted that mothers with only one child would sometimes answer only the questions regarding the child’s age group. It would therefore have been more appropriate to avoid distinguishing between children’s ages. 41.2% of mothers in the study only had one child. An analysis of the missing values confirms that many mothers did not complete questions regarding infants, if they did not have an infant at present. In TABLE 10 the shadowed parts show that four of the seven questions relating to infants in the attachment scale were not answered by more than 20% of the respondents. Therefore, it should have been explained to mothers that they should answer the questions by thinking about how they would act with a child of the given age in the question.
Another point worth mentioning is that one comment made in Question 42 (the open-ended question) was more of an outcry for assistance in raising the participant’s child. The particular mother noted that she did not have any guidance in raising her child. This is a matter that could be addressed in future. This could be confirmed by the fact that 65% of mothers did not indicate that anyone helped them with any of the items (tasks) regarding attachment. Only half of those who responded indicated however, that the child’s father helped with certain duties. The mother’s grandmother was second on the list, and third was the mother’s mother. The mother’s grandfather and sister, and the day-mother (a person who minds the child by day - this can, but does not necessarily include ECCE staff members like a crèche teacher) were also mentioned as helping the mother.

Employment and the mothers’ education were the only independent variables that significantly related to the attachment scale. Mothers who were permanently employed had higher scale readings on attachment, in other words they were less attached.

Most of the mothers in my study (63.6%) were in the low socio-economic income group and could be seen as working-class mothers. According to Golden and Erdreich (2012, p.6) working-class mothers have been stigmatized as being “too lazy or ignorant

### TABLE 10: Univariate Statistics of Missing Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Missing Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CY05: I expect/encourage my child to be obedient to his/her older siblings</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A_01: I allow my infant to explore but stay within near proximity</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A_03: I attend to my infant as soon as possible when they cry</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A_05: I spoon feed my toddler</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A_02: I assist my child to manage their own feelings</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A_052: I spoon feed my baby</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A_06: I myself change my infant or toddler’s diapers</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A_07: I put my infant to sleep daily</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A_04: I breast feed my infant</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A_042: Up to what age do you intend to breast feed your infant?</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to help their children get ahead”. This might be because they feel inadequate to help their children, they had no help in learning child-rearing practices or are less educated, or are often due to hard-labour jobs (like farm work in this district) physically too tired to really give the needed attention to their children.

Another noteworthy point is that demographical variables had the greatest influence on the autonomy and separateness scales (from the individualism dimension). This gives an indication that the individualism dimension is not greatly determined by culture, but is more influenced by independent variables among Cape Coloured mothers. The collectivism dimension therefore represents a stronger element of the cultural nature of Cape Coloured people. Correlations between scales were also significant between the conformity and relatedness scales (from the collectivism dimension) mean scores (r=0.65, p < 0.000). The sum of the conformity (256.04) and relatedness (387) scales are also much less (and therefore the scale is stronger – i.e. Always = 1) than those of autonomy (1170.94) and separateness (997) scales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 11: Descriptive Statistics of scales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separateness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: not relative (7) scores for attachment were replaced with the scale mean scores.

This would confirm that the childrearing culture of young Cape Coloured mothers tend toward being collectivistic in nature. This is similar to Amfred’s (2003 as cited in Van Doorene’s, 2009) findings about motherhood within other majority groups within South Africa that are also shaped by collectivism.
5.3. Suggestions for further research

From this study the instrument designed showed that Cape Coloured people are likely to follow a family model of interdependence as proposed by Kagıtçibasi (2005) (see page 30 of this thesis). Scale mean scores and how scales correlate however need further exploration in a larger study in order to adequately advise what family structure Cape Coloured mothers use as proposed by the social psychology across cultures framework. Other groups within South Africa also need to be explored as there are only limited number of studies conducted on motherhood and childrearing within South Africa (van Doorene, 2009).

There is also a need to explore the relationships between attachment and autonomy and/or relatedness among Cape Coloureds as proposed by Kagıtçibasi (2005). There is also a need for research with regards to the relationship between attachment and family disruption (Tomlinson, 2011) among Cape Coloured families as substance abuse is prevalent among children and young adults (Haefeke, 2011). This would include the qualitative exploration of how Cape Coloured mothers understand and enact attachment.

A need furthermore exists for educating young Cape Coloured mothers within the low socio-economic group in rearing and training their children. These findings altogether express the need for more research in regards to childrearing and education among Cape Coloured mothers in order to develop programs that will aid young working-class mothers as well.

Kagitçibasi (2005) found that the traditional family model of total interdependence (valuing both relatedness and conformity) is customary in "rural agrarian society with low levels of affluence but is also seen in urban low-socioeconomic status (SES) contexts, where intergenerational interdependence is necessary for family livelihood"
(p.410). Kagitçibasi furthermore explains the importance of abiding to this family model to those who practice it.

Children contribute to the family economy while young, and they have “old-age security value” for their parents when they grow up (Kagitçibasi, 1982; 1990). Thus, the child’s economic and utilitarian value has salience for parents, and high fertility is implicated, because more children provide more economic and utilitarian support (Caldwell, 2001; Fawcett, 1983). The independence of the child is not functional (thus not valued), because an independent child may leave the family and look after his or her own self-interest when he or she grows up. Thus, independence and autonomy of the growing child can be a threat to family livelihood through the family life cycle (Kagitçibasi, 1982, 1990). Obedience orientation is therefore dominant in parenting.

(Kagitçibasi, 2005, p.410-411)

Children from rural and low SES families are expected to be of future economic benefit to their parents. Parents depend on their children for future old age support. Children from these families are reared to be obedient to their parents and later responsible for them. If this interdependence is broken down at school through a curriculum that rears children to be independent, families will ultimately become dysfunctional. The lack of old age care provided by children is already noticeable in the fact that most South African citizens above 60 are dependent upon social grants and old age services delivered in institutions (SASSA, 2012; STATSSA, 2012a).

Collectivist cultures are not well suited to a 'Western' curriculum, which promotes values that are contradictory to the interdependence family model. 'Western' curriculum promotes individual thought and independence in classroom methodology and pedagogy. For example, curriculum that adopts a 'Western pedagogy' encourages "children to make their own choices" and to learn to argue or regularly debate their point of view (Suizzo et al., 2008, p.476). According to the results of this pilot study, collectivist attributes would be more suitable for my study population. Such attributes would include, for example, following rules and routine in a meaningful way, working cooperatively, showing respect to the teacher, accepting norms and being emotionally
connected with peers and family (Cheah & Chirkov, 2008; Akerson & Buzzelli, 2010; Phelps, 2011; Suizzo et al., 2008).

Individualistic and independent attributes are not necessarily negative, but should be understood in context (Hall, Wilson & Frankenfield, 2003; Van Eeden & Mantsha, 2007). Promoting certain forms of independence can be counterproductive in cultures that value a traditional interdependent family model (Beilmann & Realo, 2012; Kagitçibasi, 2005).

McDermott and Rakgokong teacher's manual (2009, p.8) is a good example of how South African teachers are encouraged to teach children to discuss academic work in contemporary classrooms by discussing "their [own] problem-solving strategies". This might be seen as going against the "traditional approach", which is frowned upon by many because it assumedly teaches children "to learn the method by rote, follow the rules and supply an answer which pleases the teacher" (McDermott & Rakgokong, 2009, p.9). In the light of this study these assumptions are to be rethought.

All in all the pedagogy and curriculum in South African schools and training institutions need to be investigated. Furthermore, the economic and longitudinal implications of promoting a one sided independence in education within a dominantly interdependence culture needs to be carefully considered within South Africa. Previous research has shown that this has negative effect on family relationships (Beilmann & Realo, 2012; Kagitçibasi, 2005).

5.4. Limitations to the study
This study included the development and pilot testing of an instrument as part of a coursework minor thesis. It was therefore expected to be small due to high time constraints. A longer study would have given more time to gather a larger sample size.
A larger sample size would particularly have been more beneficial in validating the 
separateness scale.

Many factors influence childrearing within cultures (Peterson et al., 2010), in this study 
questions were limited to the five scales being investigated, which brings some 
restrictions to the usefulness of findings. Investigating other factors within child rearing 
or ECCE would highlight other aspects of institutional care for young children. Other 
psychological and social variables that may have influenced the readings on the scales 
but have not been dealt with in this study, might also impact on child-rearing practices, 
such as substance or child abuse. Questions were a focussed few with the purpose of 
having a shorter questionnaire that would in turn increase the response rate, and 
decrease the number of respondents needed to be approached. Despite these efforts 
the response rate was still lower than expected and analysis was thus done with the 
responses available (n=34). In some pilot tests however, with an instrument of 50 
items, only 15 respondents were required (Creswell, 2012) and in many cases not 
more than 20 respondents are used for a pilot test (Wiersma & Jurs, 2009).

My response rate was 42%. Receiving responses was difficult due to the fact that 
there is no postal service in two residential areas under investigation, which made it an 
extra effort to receive questionnaires. Many mothers were busy working mothers which 
might also had an influence on them filling out the questionnaire. The response rate for 
surveys done in educational research is often less than 50% (Porter & Whitcomb, 2003 
as cited in Wiersma & Jurs, 2009) but a response rate higher than 50% is desirable in 
educational research (Creswell, 2012). Response rate could have been increased by 
following Prieto’s (2012, p.54) method of using "initial and follow up mail procedures" 
but the time limitation of this study overruled the use of this method besides the fact 
that Prieto only reached 22% response rate. Krägeloh et al.’s (2012) study in the field 
of psychology also had a low response rate (24%) and used an existing instrument. 
Thus, the response rate of my study that used mostly pre-validated constructs and
questions is comparable with Prieto (2012) and Krägeloh et al.'s (2012) studies which both used pre-validated models.

Another limitation of the study is the translation of the questionnaire to suit the language of the target population. There are particular general issues with translation, such as concepts in different languages vary (Van Eeden & Mantsha, 2007; Hall, et al., 2003). Moreover, African languages have been found to often lack the necessary vocabulary in order to efficiently translate certain concepts (Grieve, 2005 and Van Den Berg, 1996 as cited in Van Eeden & Mantsha, 2007). Hall et al. (2003) noted that some words might have a positive connotation in the original language but gain a negative connotation when literally translated into the target language.

Van Eeden and Mantsha (2007) furthermore emphasize that the manifestation of constructs that relate to experience and emotion are directly related to culture. African and Western perspectives on "collectivism versus individualism, sociocentric versus egocentric, and interdependence versus independence" also differ from each other (Van Eeden & Mantsha, 2007, p.64). This has been confirmed in this study by the fact that the separateness scale could not be validated. Concepts within the questions of separateness scale in the individualism dimension (e.g. creativity and reasons for why children play or don’t play alone) were not explored adequately in this study.

Translations can be done either literally, "which allows for direct comparison on the different language versions" (Van de Vijver & Tanzer, 1997 as cited in Van Eeden & Mantsha, 2007, p.66) or by doing the translation - back translation procedure which is more reliable (Van Eeden & Mantsha, 2007; Hall et al., 2003). The limitations of this study therefore include that the questionnaire was translated literally and no back-translations were made. Errors were however limited by stating questions simply and translators (the researcher and a qualified language (English and Afrikaans) teacher
assisting) being able to relate to the content of the questionnaire and approximate the context of the culture (Hall et al., 2003).

5.5. Notes and recommendations

Before this tool can be administered properly, the separateness scale still needs to be validated. In order for this tool to be effectively administered, the items that relate to the concepts respect, creativity, and helping children to cope with their emotions need revision after being explored qualitatively. The open-ended question about how long the mother aims to breast feed her infant can be quantified. The questions on how mothers put their children to sleep also need qualitative exploration to shed more light on Cape Coloured attachment.

5.6. Conclusion

The study of childrearing practices through the lens of social psychology across culture framework shed light on the cultural nature of young Cape Coloured mothers' practices. Cape Coloured mothers rear their children in ways that stand in somewhat opposition to Western individualist populations (Smith et al., 2009; Van Doorene, 2009) from whom ideas for curriculums are often borrowed. The aim of this study was to create a platform that would help to formulate appropriate pedagogical practices that will be more suitable for this minority group within South Africa. Teachers in general within South Africa need to acquire skills to develop "new context-specific teaching strategies" to suit the classrooms they work in (Linnington, & Excell, 2004). More research among different cultural groups within South Africa is therefore needed. Such information gathered would help train teachers who will thus benefit in being enabled to formulate specific teaching strategies that would suit the cultural orientation of the children within their classrooms. To help teachers to identify the cultural specifics of child rearing practices of Cape Coloured people and to develop suitable teaching strategies in line
with those, an instrument for measuring the cultural nature of childrearing practices was presented in this study.
References


Indicators Research, 103, 193-217.


**APPENDIX A**

**Interview Questions**

*(English)*

Open-ended interview questions after the questionnaire was completed:

Which questions were difficult to understand?

What would you suggest to change in the question to have it better understood?

What did you understand from question 1? (2, 3 etc.) (Discuss each question briefly)

How would you have asked the question? (For questions that were not what I have meant - after it is explained)

(To confirm the new question) Would this be better?

*(Afrikaans)*

Oop-einde onderhoud vrae nadat die vraelys ingevul is:

Watter van die vrae was moeilik om te verstaan?

Wat sou u voorstel om te verander om die vraag meer verstaanbaar te maak?

Wat het u onder vraag 1 verstaan? (vraag 2, 3 ens. – Bespreek elke vraag kortliks.)

Hoe sou u die vraag gevra het? (Vir vrae wat nie was soos bedoel is nie – en nadat dit verduidelik is)

(Om die nuwe vraag te bevestig) Sou dit so beter wees?
APPENDIX B

Syntax for Confirming Factors

```
DATASET ACTIVATE DataSet2.
FACTOR
   /VARIABLES IY01_1 IY02_1 IY03_1 IY04_1 IY05_1 IY06_1 IY07_1 IY08_1 IY09_1
   /MISSING LISTWISE
   /ANALYSIS IY01_1 IY02_1 IY03_1 IY04_1 IY05_1 IY06_1 IY07_1 IY08_1 IY09_1
   /PRINT INITIAL EXTRACTION
   /CRITERIA FACTORS(1) ITERATE(25)
   /EXTRACTION PC
   /ROTATION NOROTATE
   /SAVE REG(ALL)
   /METHOD=CORRELATION.

FACTOR
   /VARIABLES CY01_1 CY04_1 CY03_1 CY07_1 CY02_1 CY05_1
   /MISSING LISTWISE
   /ANALYSIS CY01_1 CY04_1 CY03_1 CY07_1 CY02_1 CY05_1
   /PRINT INITIAL EXTRACTION
   /CRITERIA FACTORS(1) ITERATE(25)
   /EXTRACTION PC
   /ROTATION NOROTATE
   /SAVE REG(ALL)
   /METHOD=CORRELATION.

FACTOR
   /VARIABLES CX01_1 CX02_1 CX08_1 CX03_1 CX04_1 CX05_1 CX06_1 CX07_1
   /MISSING LISTWISE
   /ANALYSIS CX01_1 CX02_1 CX08_1 CX03_1 CX04_1 CX05_1 CX06_1 CX07_1
   /PRINT INITIAL EXTRACTION
   /CRITERIA FACTORS(1) ITERATE(25)
   /EXTRACTION PC
   /ROTATION NOROTATE
   /SAVE REG(ALL)
   /METHOD=CORRELATION.

FACTOR
   /VARIABLES A_01_1 A_03_1 A_04_1 A_052_1 A_06_1 A_07_1
   /MISSING LISTWISE
   /ANALYSIS A_01_1 A_03_1 A_04_1 A_052_1 A_06_1 A_07_1
   /PRINT INITIAL EXTRACTION
   /CRITERIA FACTORS(1) ITERATE(25)
   /EXTRACTION PC
   /ROTATION NOROTATE
   /SAVE REG(ALL)
   /METHOD=CORRELATION.

DESCRIPTIVES VARIABLES=FAC1_1 FAC1_2 FAC1_3 FAC1_4
   /SAVE
   /STATISTICS=MEAN STDDEV MIN MAX.
```
## APPENDIX C

### Item Correlation Matrix for Separateness Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>s14.child choose own colours</th>
<th>s13.child to be creative</th>
<th>s11.child to think of something to do</th>
<th>s12.child to play by themself</th>
<th>s16.allow child to go FAR places without informing</th>
<th>s17.allow child to go NEAR home places w/o informing</th>
<th>s18.child outside home/sight without supervision</th>
<th>s15.child to leave who not get along with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Correlation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s14.child choose own colours</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>-.310</td>
<td>-.256</td>
<td>-.316</td>
<td>.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s13.child to be creative</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.553</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>-.244</td>
<td>-.378</td>
<td>-.277</td>
<td>.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s11.child to think of something to do</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td>.553</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>-.303</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.186</td>
<td>.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s12.child to play by themself</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s16.allow child to go FAR places without informing</td>
<td>-.310</td>
<td>-.244</td>
<td>-.303</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>-.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s17.allow child to go NEAR home places w/o informing</td>
<td>-.256</td>
<td>-.378</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>-.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s18.child outside home/sight without supervision</td>
<td>-.316</td>
<td>-.277</td>
<td>-.186</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s15.child to leave who not get along with</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>-.394</td>
<td>-.227</td>
<td>-.153</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX D

#### Spearman Correlations for Conformity Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>c19.child learn show respect</th>
<th>c22.expect obedience to teacher</th>
<th>c21.expect obedience to teacher</th>
<th>c25.supervise obedience to older siblings</th>
<th>c20.child greet visitor in the home</th>
<th>c23.expect obedience to older siblings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Correlation Coefficient</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Correlation Coefficient</strong></td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>1.00**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Correlation Coefficient</strong></td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Correlation Coefficient</strong></td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Correlation Coefficient</strong></td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>1.00**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Correlation Coefficient</strong></td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
APPENDIX E

FINAL QUESTIONNAIRE

Answer the following questions honestly as you would understand it, by placing a tick in the appropriate box of your choice, or write on the line where appropriate. Remember there are no correct/incorrect answers, only valid or invalid ones (those that I cannot read). Please note that none of the questions in this questionnaire implies that you should or should not do a certain action. The questionnaire is not intended to change your behaviour toward your child in any way. If you however feel challenged or have any inquiries with regards to your child rearing practices please feel free to contact the researcher at 0725850146. Or write to Child Research Query, P.O.Box 319, Stillbay, 6674, Western Cape.

Your Age:
- □ 18
- □ 19-24
- □ 25-29
- □ 30-35

Ethnicity:
- □ Cape Coloured
- □ Xhosa
- □ Other _______________________

Education attained:
- □ Grade 0-8
- □ Grade 9-12
- □ Certificate
- □ Diploma
- □ Degree
- □ Post Degree

Employment status:
- □ Unemployed
- □ Permanent Employment
- □ Temporarily employed
- □ Self-employed

Number of Children:
- □ 1
- □ 2
- □ 3
- □ 4 or more

Age of your eldest child currently _________ Gender: □ Male □ Female

Age of your youngest child currently: ___________ Gender: □ Male □ Female

Number of people residing in the household
- □ 1-2
- □ 3-5
- □ 6-8
- □ 9+

Marital Status (you can mark more than one here)
- □ Married
- □ Cohabiting
- □ In fixed relationship with child's father
- □ Widow
- □ Divorced
- □ Never been married

Annual total household income in Rand (before subtractions):
- □ 0-15 000
- □ 15 001-50 000
- □ 50 001-100 000
- □ More than 100 001
- □ No idea

R 0-R 1250 monthly) (1251-4166) (4167-8333) (more than R 8 334 per month)

In which type of house do you stay?
- □ Shack
- □ RDP Home
- □ Brick house

Religion:
- □ Catholic
- □ Muslim
- □ Old Apostolic
- □ Protestant (e.g. RCA or AFM)
- □ Other
In the statements below the term 'Infant' is referred to when you should answer the question with regards to a 0-2 year old. The term 'toddler' is referred to when you should answer the question with regards to a 3-5 year old child. The term 'child' is referred to when you should answer the question with regards to any of your children (usually older than 5).

1. I encourage my toddler (3-5 year) to eat by him/herself
   □ Always □ Mostly □ Often □ Sometimes □ Rarely □ Never

2. I encourage my toddler dress him/herself as far as they can
   □ Always □ Mostly □ Often □ Sometimes □ Rarely □ Never

3. I encourage my toddler to voice her/his own opinions
   □ Always □ Mostly □ Often □ Sometimes □ Rarely □ Never

4. I encourage my toddler to choose his/her own beverage when going out somewhere
   □ Always □ Mostly □ Often □ Sometimes □ Rarely □ Never

5. I allow my toddler to fight for what she/he want
   □ Always □ Mostly □ Often □ Sometimes □ Rarely □ Never

6. I allow my toddler to tell me when he/she doesn’t want to do something I requested
   □ Always □ Mostly □ Often □ Sometimes □ Rarely □ Never

7. I allow my toddler to argue with me
   □ Always □ Mostly □ Often □ Sometimes □ Rarely □ Never

8. I discuss disagreements with my with my toddler
   □ Always □ Mostly □ Often □ Sometimes □ Rarely □ Never

9. My toddler sometimes wins an argument
   □ Always □ Mostly □ Often □ Sometimes □ Rarely □ Never

10. I encourage my child (3-12) to think of something to do in order to remain busy
    □ Always □ Mostly □ Often □ Sometimes □ Rarely □ Never

11. I encourage my child to play by him/herself
    □ Always □ Mostly □ Often □ Sometimes □ Rarely □ Never

12. I encourage my child to be creative
    □ Always □ Mostly □ Often □ Sometimes □ Rarely □ Never

13. I encourage my child to use any colour (of their choice) when colouring
    □ Always □ Mostly □ Often □ Sometimes □ Rarely □ Never

14. I encourage my child to leave others alone when they are not getting along well
    □ Always □ Mostly □ Often □ Sometimes □ Rarely □ Never
15. I allow my child to go far places without informing me
☐ Always  ☐ Mostly  ☐ Often  ☐ Sometimes  ☐ Rarely  ☐ Never

16. I allow my child to go near places without informing me (e.g. neighbours)
☐ Always  ☐ Mostly  ☐ Often  ☐ Sometimes  ☐ Rarely  ☐ Never

17. I allow my child to go to places outside of the home, without supervision
☐ Always  ☐ Mostly  ☐ Often  ☐ Sometimes  ☐ Rarely  ☐ Never

18. I encourage my child to show respect towards older people
☐ Always  ☐ Mostly  ☐ Often  ☐ Sometimes  ☐ Rarely  ☐ Never

19. I expect my child to greet a visitor in the home
☐ Always  ☐ Mostly  ☐ Often  ☐ Sometimes  ☐ Rarely  ☐ Never

20. I expect my child to be obedient when I tell him/her to do something
☐ Always  ☐ Mostly  ☐ Often  ☐ Sometimes  ☐ Rarely  ☐ Never

21. I encourage my child to be obedient to his/her teacher
☐ Always  ☐ Mostly  ☐ Often  ☐ Sometimes  ☐ Rarely  ☐ Never

22. I encourage my child to be obedient to his/her older siblings
☐ Always  ☐ Mostly  ☐ Often  ☐ Sometimes  ☐ Rarely  ☐ Never

23. I encourage my child to be a friend to everybody
☐ Always  ☐ Mostly  ☐ Often  ☐ Sometimes  ☐ Rarely  ☐ Never

24. I make sure that my child eventually obeys me when I give a command
☐ Always  ☐ Mostly  ☐ Often  ☐ Sometimes  ☐ Rarely  ☐ Never

Tick the appropriate spaces below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25. I encourage my child to apologise when fighting with his/her friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I encourage my child to be kind to his/her friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I encourage my child to share her/his toys with his/her friend/s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I expect my child to at least show a sympathetic attitude towards others in need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I encourage my child to learn to work well with other children in a team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I make sure I know at all times where my child is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I always check where my child is when I can't see her/him</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
32. I allow my infant (0-2) to explore but stay within near proximity
☐ Always  ☐ Mostly  ☐ Often  ☐ Sometimes  ☐ Rarely  ☐ Never  ☐ Not applicable
__________________________________also assists

33. I attend to my infant as soon as possible when she/he cry
☐ Always  ☐ Mostly  ☐ Often  ☐ Sometimes  ☐ Rarely  ☐ Never  ☐ Not applicable
__________________________________also assists

34. I breast feed my infant
☐ Always  ☐ Mostly  ☐ Often  ☐ Sometimes  ☐ Rarely  ☐ Never  ☐ Not applicable
__________________________________also assists

35. Up to what age did you or do you plan to breastfeed your infant?
________________________________________________

36. I spoon feed my infant (0-2)
☐ Always  ☐ Mostly  ☐ Often  ☐ Sometimes  ☐ Rarely  ☐ Never  ☐ Not applicable
__________________________________also assists

37. I myself change my infant or toddler’s diapers
☐ Always  ☐ Mostly  ☐ Often  ☐ Sometimes  ☐ Rarely  ☐ Never  ☐ Not applicable
__________________________________also assists

38. I put my infant to sleep daily
☐ Always  ☐ Mostly  ☐ Often  ☐ Sometimes  ☐ Rarely  ☐ Never  ☐ Not applicable
__________________________________also assists.

To complete your participation please insert this questionnaire in the envelope provided and post it back to the address provided.

Thank you for participating!

From the research team 😊
Information Statement for the Research Project:
Instrument design to investigate childrearing practices in a South African context

You are invited to participate in the research project identified above which is being conducted by Abigail van Zyl, a Masters student from the School of Education at the University of Newcastle.

The research is part of this student’s study at the University of Newcastle, supervised by Dr Zsuzsa Millei from the School of Education and Dr. Ona Janse van Rensburg from Faculty of Education at the North West University, South Africa.

Why is the research being done?
The purpose of the research is to design and validate a questionnaire that can investigate young mothers’ childrearing practices to aid creating more culturally responsive institutional care services. This study will help prospective and current teachers to understand the cultural practices of their students’ parents and to plan the work to best suit their cultural expectations.

Who can participate in the research?
Young Cape Coloured mothers between the ages of 18 and 35 are invited to participate. The youngest child of these mothers should not be older than 6 and the eldest not older than 13.

What choice do you have?
Participation in this research is entirely your choice. Only those people who give their informed consent will be included in the project. Whether or not you decide to participate, your decision will not disadvantage you. If you do decide to participate, you may withdraw from the project at any time without giving a reason and have the option of withdrawing any data which identifies you.

What would you be asked to do?
If you give your consent to participate in the interview, you will be phoned by Abigail van Zyl and asked to meet for an interview. During the interview you will complete a questionnaire and discuss the answers afterwards. The interview will be voice recorded to keep a record of what has been said. You will be able to listen to the recording after the interview and can edit
or erase your contribution. The interview will be about clarifying a questionnaire which will ask you questions about your childrearing practices.

If you choose to, you can invite more young mothers to take part in this research by giving them a questionnaire with a reply paid envelope provided at a later stage.

**How much time will it take?**
The interview would only take place once and should take about an hour to complete.

**What are the risks and benefits of participating?**
I cannot promise you any benefit from participating in this research. However, this study will spring start a future planned study that will aid to answer the need for improved quality Early Childhood Development programmes in South Africa. The exploration of customary childrearing practices in the homes of young South African mothers will aid teachers to develop better contextualized early childhood education in South Africa and especially for your and your community’s children. The researcher will make a summary of the results available to you after the research has been completed if you request that. Please indicate if you would like this on the consent form. You could also ask for more details during your interview.

**How will your privacy be protected?**
Any information collected by the researcher which might identify you will be stored securely on a password protected computer and only accessed by the researcher unless you consent otherwise, except as required by law. The information will be kept for at least five years.

**How will the information collected be used?**
The information that you give during the interview if you chose to do so, will be used by the researcher to change the questionnaire to be more in tune with how young Cape Coloured mothers of the rural Cape think about and understand child-rearing practices.

The information will be used in papers in scientific journals; in a minor thesis to be submitted for Ms Van Zyl’s degree; and at public exhibitions.

Individual participants will not be identified in any reports arising from the project.

**What do you need to do to participate?**
Please read this Information Statement and be sure you understand its contents before you consent to participate. If there is anything you do not understand, or you have questions, contact the researcher.

If you agree to participate in an interview, please fill out the consent form and return it in the reply paid envelope provided. After receiving your consent I will contact you to arrange a mutually agreed time and place that is convenient to you for the interview.

**Further information**
If you would like further information please contact the researcher Abigail van Zyl at 072 585 0146 or, Dr. Ona Janse van Rensburg at 0182991713.

Thank you for considering this invitation.

Abigail van Zyl  
Student

Dr. Zsuzsa Millei  
Chief Investigator
Complaints about this research

This project has been approved by the University’s Human Research Ethics Committee, Approval No. H- 2012-0423.

Should you have concerns about your rights as a participant in this research, or you have a complaint about the manner in which the research is conducted, it may be given to the researcher, or, if an independent person is preferred, to Dr. Ona Janse van Rensburg at 0182991713 or, email ona.jansevanrensburg@nwu.ac.za
APPENDIX G

Permission from SAGE for use of the figure on page 30.
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