### Title
Impacts of parents’ resources and helpers’ resources on Hong Kong children’s mastery motivation

### Author(s)
Wong, Jug Tung (黃則同)

### Citation
Wong, J. T. (2013). Impacts of parents’ resources and helpers’ resources on Hong Kong children’s mastery motivation (Outstanding Academic Papers by Students (OAPS)). Retrieved from City University of Hong Kong, CityU Institutional Repository.

### Issue Date
2013

### URL
http://hdl.handle.net/2031/7124

### Rights
This work is protected by copyright. Reproduction or distribution of the work in any format is prohibited without written permission of the copyright owner. Access is unrestricted.
Impacts of Parents’ Resources and Helpers’ Resources on
Hong Kong Children’s Mastery Motivation

A Report Submitted to
Department of Applied Social Studies
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Master of Social Sciences in Applied Psychology

by

WONG Jug-tung

April 2013
Abstract

This study aims to investigate into the impacts of the parents’ and foreign domestic helpers’ (FDHs) resources on Hong Kong children’s mastery motivation. Being the primary care-givers in the family environment, parents and FDHs have impacts on children’s development from cognitive, language and behavioral perspectives. Amongst these, their respective influences on children’s mastery motivation in terms of the intrinsic drive to master a challenging task remained unexplored in Hong Kong. In the current study, consensus from three kindergartens, their students’ parents and FDHs was sought to participate. 247 parents with children studying in Kindergarten Grades 2 and 3 each completed a set of Chinese questionnaires collecting information about their children’s mastery motivation using items from the Chinese version of Dimension of Mastery Motivation, their sense of parenting competence using items from the Chinese version of Parenting Sense of Competence as well as other demographic particulars including their educational levels and family income. 93 FDHs completed another set of English questionnaires measuring their sense of care-giving competence and other demographic particulars including their educational levels. Results from multiple regression analysis showed parents’ sense of parenting competence positively predicted both the instrumental and expressive pillars of Hong Kong children’s mastery motivation. In contrast, FDHs’ sense of care-giving competence did not predict either of them. Moreover, this study did not elicit findings supporting the association of Hong Kong children’s mastery motivation with other aspects of family resources such as family income, parents’ and FDHs’ educational levels. In sum, parents’ sense of parenting competence was a key family resource contributing significantly to the
development of Hong Kong children’s mastery motivation. These empirical observations supported the notion of increasing parents’ awareness on the importance of their parenting competence on their children’s mastery motivation as well as the introduction of health education programmes with a view to enhancing parenting competence.
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Chapter 1: Literature Review and Conceptual Framework

1.1. Literature Review

In the ecological theory, Bronfenbrenner (1986) suggested that individuals were under the influences of different environmental systems in their life-span development. Family, being one of the microsystems, formed an essential setting in which children had direct face-to-face interactions with their primary agents such as parents and other care-givers (Santrock, 2011). In the family environment, there were “proximal processes” being taken place during which there were reciprocal interactions between children and their immediate environment involving persons, objects and symbols on a regular basis over an extended period of time (Bronfenbrenner, 1995). Children were shaped by these powerful reciprocal interactions with their primary care-givers, the quantity and quality of which had immense and significant effects on their development (Bronfenbrenner, 2004). Amongst these, mastery motivation was a key factor underpinning children’s development from cognitive, social and communicative perspectives (Brockman, Morgan, & Harmon, 1988). As regards the relationship between familial resources and Hong Kong children’s mastery motivation remained unexplored, the current study aimed at looking into the impacts of the resources of parents and foreign domestic helpers (FDHs) on the development of Hong Kong children’s mastery motivation.
Mastery motivation. Mastery motivation was an intrinsic drive that fuelled an individual to master a task which was at least moderately challenging (Sparks, Hunter, Backman, Morgan & Ross, 2012). There were two building blocks underscoring mastery motivation - the instrumental and the expressive pillars (Barrett & Morgan, 1995). Morgan, Harmon, & Maslin-Cole (1990) explained that the instrumental pillar supported an individuals’ attempt in a “focused and persistent manner”. In this connection, Barrett & Morgan (1995) described that the instrumental part comprised four components – “object-oriented persistence”; “gross-motor persistence”; “social persistence with adults” and “social persistence with children”. With regard to social persistence, Combs & Wachs (1993) highlighted the overriding contribution of the children’s personal drives to engage themselves with adults and other children social interactions to their cognitive development. On the other hand, individual’s affective reactions in the course of doing a task or upon its completion contributed to the scoring of the expressive pillar, which consisted of two components, the “mastery pleasure” and “negative reactions to failure” (Barrett & Morgan, 1995). Harmon, Morgan & Glicken (1984) attributed mastery pleasure to individuals’ positive behaviors such as smiling and laughing, etc. when performing a task or upon its conclusion. On the other hand, Eccles, Wigfield & Schiefel (1998) suggested that individuals’ relative levels of negative reactions to failure were negatively associated with their motivation to manage new tasks. In other words, individuals’ high level of negative reactions to failure impaired their personal drive for managing new tasks.
Insofar as children were concerned, Morgan, Harmon & Maslin-Cole (1990) posited that mastery motivation was pertinent to how children optimized utilization of available resources with a view to dealing with a situation. The level of mastery motivation did not rely upon the success of the children’s attempts to handle a task. It was the instrumental and expressive pillars that mattered (Sparks et al., 2012). Children demonstrating persistence in managing a challenging task whilst showing positive affective reactions irrespective of the outcomes were essential qualities underscoring the foundation of their continuous development. In this regard, Hauser-Cram, Warfield, Shonkoff, Krauss, Sayer & Upshur (2001) found the psychological power of mastery motivation strongly and positively correlated to children’s development of social and cognitive skills. Yarrow, Morgan, Jennings, Harmon, & Gaiter (1982) also unveiled a moderate correlation between mastery motivation and children’s intelligence. On the other hand, Wise (2007) attributed children’s readiness to learn to mastery motivation.

**Environmental factors.** There were several factors contributing to children’s mastery attempts. Morgan, Harmon & Maslin-Cole (1990) suggested that environmental factors gave rise to individuals’ differences in the intrinsic motivation. Sparks et al. (2012) posited that environmental factors were strongly associated with the quality of parents-and-children interactions. In fact, care-givers’ positive remarks were related to the positive development of children’s mastery motivation (Turner & Johnson, 2003). This was echoed by Harter (1978) who pointed out positive responses from primary care-givers in terms of reinforcements and encouragement were conducive to strengthening children’s mastery motivation especially in the first few
years of age. If children were given autonomy to explore their environment, their mastery motivation would be enhanced (Marsland, 2005). On the other hand, Harter (1978) suggested that the positive ways primary care-givers responded to children’s distress had favorable impacts on the development of children’s mastery motivation.

Goodnow (1988) proposed that parental cognitions came into play in the proximal processes involving parents-and-children reciprocal interactions. In this regard, Bugental & Johnson (2000) held the view that parental cognition in terms of parents’ self-esteem was of overriding essence. Johnson & Mash (1989) found the good association between parents’ self-esteem with their capabilities to report children’s behavioral problems. This was in line with Ohan, Leung & Johnson’s (2000) observations indicating that parents with low self-esteem in terms of parental satisfaction and efficacy were less likely to identify and report children’s problematic behaviors. In this connection, Gibaud-Wallston and Wandersman (1978) developed a scale measuring parents’ sense of parenting competence from the perspective of parents’ perception of their self-esteem in terms of self-efficacy and satisfaction of being a parent. Bugental (1987) explained that parenting self-efficacy corresponded to the extent to which parents were confident and comfortable when dealing with their children’s problems. This was in line with the remarks made by Johnson and Mash (1989) which defined self-efficacy as an instrumental dimension reflecting competence, problem-solving ability and capability in the parenting role. On the other hand, Johnson and Mash (1989) elaborated parenting satisfaction as an “affective dimension reflecting parenting frustration, anxiety and motivation”. Apart from the possible
impacts of parents’ self-esteem on children’s mastery motivation, parents’ socio-economic status may also had a role to play. Tulkin (1977) suggested that the socio-economic status of the mothers in terms of income and educational levels was positively correlated with the quality of the maternal-and-children interactions.

**FDHs in Hong Kong.** Increased participation of women in the labour workforce was prominent in Hong Kong. This was manifested by the increase in the average number of female working members in domestic households of Hong Kong from .64 in 1991 to .70 in 2006 (Census and Statistics Department, 2011). This brought about an important social phenomenon indicating that the number of mothers engaging in the labour work force was on the increase leading to an increase in dependence on other resources for taking care of their children. FDHs were regarded as a viable option especially for nuclear families which consisted of both working parents and when extended family support was remote. Employment of FDHs in Hong Kong was therefore common. There were around 286,000 FDHs being employed in 2010 contrasted with 233,000 in 2006 (Census and Statistics Department, 2011). This accounted for 23.3% increase in five years. There was currently a lack of studies investigating into the relationship between the FDHs and the Hong Kong children’s development, not to mention the FDHs’ impacts on children’s mastery motivation. Amongst these limited studies, Cheuk and Wong (2005) suggested FDHs responsible for care-giving their employers’ children was associated with the increased risks and severity of children’s specific language impairment.
Bronfenbrenner (1995) highlighted that “significant others” of the immediate environment contributing to the development of the active beings in the “proximal processes”. In other words, children were shaped by familial resources in the development of their mastery motivation. Parents and FDHs formed essential parts of these resources in the reciprocal interactions with the Hong Kong children. The current study attempted to investigate into the relationship between Hong Kong children’s mastery motivation and the familial resources.

1.2. Conceptual Framework and Hypotheses

Having regard to the possible impacts of the familial resources on the children’s development, the current study generates five hypotheses. The first hypothesis (H1) states that parents’ sense of parenting competence positively predicts Hong Kong children’s mastery motivation. The second hypothesis (H2) proposes that FDHs’ sense of care-giving competence positively predicts Hong Kong children’s mastery motivation. The third hypothesis (H3) suggests that the intellectual qualities of the parents in terms of their educational levels positively predict Hong Kong children’s mastery motivation. The fourth hypothesis (H4) describes that FDHs’ educational level positively predicts Hong Kong children’s mastery motivation. The fifth hypothesis (H5) states that family income positively predicts Hong Kong children’s mastery motivation.
Chapter 2: Methodology

2.1. Participants

Three kindergartens were sourced by means of convenience sampling. They were Islamic Po Oi Kindergarten in Tsing Yi, New Territories (Po Oi); Shun Tak Fraternity Association Leung Lee Sau Yu Kindergarten in Shatin, New Territories (Shun Tak) and St. Margaret Mary’s Catholic Kindergarten in Happy Valley, Hong Kong Island (St Margaret). They were separately approached for their participation in the current study on a voluntary basis. The principals of these kindergartens all gave consent to take part and assisted in the distribution and collection of questionnaires.

In the current study, parents of children studying in kindergarten grades two (K2) and three (K3) of these three kindergartens were requested to consider giving consent to take part in this study. It was assumed that these children were less than 72 months old so as to comply with the administration criterion of the scale measuring children’s mastery motivation. Acting upon the advice from the kindergartens’ management, 110, 130 and 150 sets of questionnaires were distributed to the school management of Po Oi, Shun Tak and St Margaret respectively for their subsequent distribution. Excluding 14 returned questionnaires being discarded due to missing information about children’s age or the reported children’s age was 72 months or over, there were 233 samples. 69 out of 110 questionnaires were received from families of Po Oi, 41 out of 130 from Shun Tak and 116 out of 150 from St. Margaret. There were another seven questionnaires being received from the friends of the researcher being sourced by
convenience sampling. Amongst these samples, parents of the boys made up 50.2% ($n = 117$) against those of the girls at 49.8% ($n = 116$). The mean age of the children was 57.9 months ($SD = 7.2$ months) and the reported age ranged from 46 to 71 months.

2.2. Measures

**Parents’ questionnaires.** The conduct of this research was based upon the distribution of two sets of questionnaire. The first set (a sample at Appendix A) was designed for parents which consisted of an information note specifying the purposes of this study, the use and presentation of the information in a collective manner, the treatment of the all the information on a confidential basis as well as the proper disposal of the questionnaire. Parents giving consent to participate would sign on the consent letter and they were prompted to complete the remaining parts of the questionnaires consisting of questions in three domains. The first domain was designed for parents to give their observations on their children’s behaviors throwing light on their children’s mastery motivation. These observations were collected by means of 45 questions being adopted from the 17th version of the Chinese translated Dimension of Mastery Questionnaire for the Pre-school children (DMQ-C). The second domain rested upon parents’ self-reflection measuring their sense of parenting competence using 17 questions from the Chinese translated Parenting Sense of Competence (PSC-C). The third comprised nine questions on families’ socio-economic status and other general demographic particulars. In sum, the parents’ set consisted of a total of 71 questions. It is worth noting that all materials in the parents’ set were printed in Chinese based upon the advice from the kindergartens’ management.
**FDHs’ questionnaires.** The other set (a sample at Appendix B) was designed for FDHs. Similar to the parents’ set, there was an information note, a consent letter and the questions. There were seven questions focused on FDHs’ demographic particulars and 16 questions relating to the FDHs’ self-evaluation on their sense of competence of being as a care-giver (most questions were adopted for use from the English version of PSC with the term “parents” being replaced by “care-givers”). All materials in the FDHs’ set were printed in English.

**DMQ-C.** Prior permission was obtained from the questionnaire developers for the use of the DMQ-C and PSC-C respectively. In fact, there were four sets of DMQ-C for measuring mastery motivation of persons at different ages. As regards the target population was children studying K2-K3 of the three kindergartens aged less than 72 months, the Preschool set for the age of 1½ and 5 years old (less than 72 months) was adopted. It is worth noting that the DMQ-C was translated from the English version which had already been modified to enable parents and primary care-givers of children with reading ability in the primary grade one to three to complete. It had acceptable internal consistency (with alpha coefficient at .81) (Morgan et al., 2009) compared with the alpha coefficient at .91 of the current study. Also, DMQ-C was suitable for administration by parents and teachers (Morgan, Gliner & Harmon, 2006). There were arguments pinpointing that mastery motivation could be assessed more objectively by means of structured tasks (Wang, Hwang, Liao, Chen & Hsieh, 2011). However, assessment by means of structured tasks in a prescribed setting within a short period of time elicited limited information regarding the children’s behaviors in other context. In
contrast, parents’ knowledge and memories of their children’s behaviors in various settings over a longer period of time generated results with better psychometric properties, not to mention the relative ease of administration by means of questionnaires (Wang et al., 2011). DMQ-C was therefore regarded as an effective instrument for measuring children’s mastery motivation in terms of time and cost (Morgan, Busch-Rossnagel, Barrett & Wang, 2009).

DMQ-C comprised 45 items on a five-point Likert scale measuring parents’ perception of their children’s mastery motivation (1 = not typical at all, 3 = similar to children with the same age and 5 = typical) (Morgan et al, 2009). These 45 items underscored a total of seven subscales, four of which measured the instrumental pillar of children’s mastery motivation. They were “persistence at object or cognitive tasks”; “gross motor persistence”; “social mastery motivation with adults”; and “social mastery motivation with peers and children” respectively. The average score of these four subscales resembled the “Total Persistence Score” which threw light on the score of the instrumental pillar. The higher the “Total Persistence Score” resembled greater parents’ perception of their children’s persistence or efficacy (Morgan et al., 2009). On the other hand, there were two subscales measuring the expressive pillar of mastery motivation in terms of the “mastery pleasure” and “negative reactions in mastery situations” respectively. The higher the score of the “mastery pleasure” represented the children’s positive affection in the course of or upon the conclusion of a mastery attempt. The reverse held true for the “negative reactions in mastery situations” (Morgan et al., 2009). The last subscale was regarded as a “measure of ability”. It was
termed as “general competence” and was not part of the mastery motivation. Scorings for items 3, 6, 9, 11, 13, 33 and 39 of DMQ-C were reversed.

**PSC-C.** PSC-C contained 17 items in six-point Likert scale measuring parents’ self-perception of their self-esteem in terms of their satisfaction and efficacy of being a parent (1 = strongly disagreed and 6 = strongly agreed). There were two subscales respectively measuring satisfaction and efficacy. Nine items (consisting of Items 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 12, 14 and 16) formed the satisfaction subscale whereas the remaining eight items (Items 1, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13, 15 and 17) made up the efficacy subscale. Scorings for 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 12, 14 and 16 were reversed. Higher scoring points resembled parents with greater self-esteem. Gibauld-Wallston and Wandersman (1978) claimed that PSC had an acceptable reliability with alpha coefficients of the efficacy and satisfaction subscales at .70 and .82 respectively. This was comparable to the alpha coefficients of the efficacy and satisfaction subscales of the current study at .78 and .84 respectively.

**Scale for FDHs’ sense of care-giving competence.** There was currently no scale measuring FDHs’ competence of being primary care-givers in terms of their satisfaction and efficacy. In the current study, most items of PSC-C had been considered for modification. The term “care-givers” was used to replace “parents” in all items from the PSC-C with the exclusion of Item 5 (“My mother/father was better prepared to be a good mother/father than I am”). This item was not included because there was no evidence suggesting that the FDHs’ mother/father had relevant working experience as FDHs in the Chinese families of Hong Kong. Thus, there was no basis for the FDHs to compare their care-giving competence against their parents. In other
words, there were a total of 16 items (instead of 17) in six-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagreed and 6 = strongly agreed) measuring the FDHs' care-giving competence. Eight items (Items 1, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12, 14 and 16) formed the efficacy subscale whereas the remaining eight items (consisting of Items 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 11, 13 and 15) formed the satisfaction subscale. Scorings for items 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 11, 13 and 15 were reversed and higher scoring points resembled FDHs’ greater self-esteem. The alpha coefficients for the efficacy and satisfaction subscales of the current study were at .84 and .76 respectively indicating the acceptable reliability of the new scale.

2.3. Procedures

Parents willing to take part in this study were requested to sign on the consent forms and complete the Chinese questionnaires. They were then requested to put their completed questionnaires in the return envelopes, seal and return them to the kindergartens concerned. Similar to the parents, FDHs willing to take part in this study would sign on a consent form and complete the English questionnaire. They were then requested to put and seal their completed questionnaires in the envelopes and return them to the kindergartens concerned. Separate envelopes were provided for the parents and FDHs with a view to optimizing their respective confidentiality and privacy.

The parents’ and FDHs’ sets for the same family were later matched each other by means of a unique numbering system. Same serial number was found on the top right hand corner of the consent forms for the parents and FDHs belonging to the same family. To facilitate data input and analysis, prefix one was allotted to the families of
Po Oi, two to Shun Tak, three to St. Margaret and four to other families. For example, serial number 1001 refers to the first questionnaire for the family of a student of Po Oi who was randomly assigned by the kindergarten management. If a family had FDH, there would be one set of Chinese questionnaire and one set of English questionnaire being returned in separate sealed envelopes. They were later matched by the serial number. This prefix system also facilitated subsequent statistical comparison amongst groups.
Chapter 3: Results

3.1. Descriptive Statistics

A total of 247 out of 397 sets of completed questionnaires were collected and received from the three kindergartens and other parents. The response rates of Po Oi, Shun Tak, St. Margaret and other parents were 68.2% \( (n = 75) \), 33.1% \( (n = 43) \), 81.3% \( (n = 122) \) and 100% \( (n = 7) \) respectively. 94.3% \( (n = 233) \) of children fell within the age range (not exceeding 71 months) compared against 3.6% \( (n = 9) \) with missing data on age and the remaining 2.0% \( (n = 5) \) exceeding 71 months. In other words, 14 samples were discarded and data from the remaining 233 samples were being used for statistical analyses in the current study.

Amongst these 233 samples, parents of the boys made up 50.2% \( (n = 117) \) against those of the girls at 49.8% \( (n = 116) \). The mean reported age of the children was 57.9 months \( (SD = 7.2 \text{ months}) \). There was no significant difference regarding the distribution of respondents’ family income amongst the samples. 39.2% \( (n = 89) \) of the surveyed families reported the employment of FDHs compared against 60.8% \( (n = 138) \) saying no. Amongst these families with the employment of FDHs, 86.5 % \( (n = 77) \) came from St. Margaret. This may be due to the relative better income status of families in the neighborhood of Happy Valley of the Hong Kong Island which had family income over $20,000 \( (n = 104) \) when compared with the Po Oi \( (n = 9) \) and Shun Tak \( (n = 7) \). Please refer to Table 1 for a summary of the demographic distribution.
Table 1

Summary on General Demographic Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Po Oi</th>
<th>Shun Tak</th>
<th>St Margaret</th>
<th>Other parents</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boys</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Girls</strong></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (months)</th>
<th>Po Oi</th>
<th>Shun Tak</th>
<th>St Margaret</th>
<th>Other parents</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 48</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 to 59</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 71</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income ($)</th>
<th>Po Oi</th>
<th>Shun Tak</th>
<th>St Margaret</th>
<th>Other parents</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤20,000</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>96 (43.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20001-50000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>59 (26.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥50,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66 (29.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>65 (29.4%)</td>
<td>40 (18.1%)</td>
<td>110 (49.8%)</td>
<td>6 (2.7%)</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| With FDH     | 3     | 2        | 77          | 7             | 89 (39.2%) |
| Without FDH  | 64    | 39       | 35          | 0             | 138 (60.8%) |
### 3.2. Relationship between Study Variables

Table 2 summarized the statistical relationship in terms of dependence amongst various variables in terms of their correlation.

Table 2

*Correlations between Subscales of Children’s Mastery Motivation, Parents’ Sense of Parenting Competence, FDHs’ Sense of Care-giving Competence, Parents’ Education, Parents’ Spouses’ Education, FDHs’ Education and Family Income.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Instrumental motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Expressive motivation</td>
<td>.611**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Parenting competence</td>
<td>.397**</td>
<td>.380**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. FDHs’ care-giving competence</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>.370**</td>
<td>.354**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Parents’ education</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.170**</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Spouses’ education</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.139*</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.730**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. FDHs’ education</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Family income</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.204**</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.739**</td>
<td>.750**</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** significance at 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* significance at 0.05 level (2-tailed).
**Children’s mastery motivation and its components.** Children’s mastery motivation rested upon two pillars, the instrumental and expressive components. This study unveiled a significant association between the instrumental scale and its four components (object-oriented persistence, gross motor persistence, social persistence with adults and social persistence with children) with correlation ranging from .779 to .830, \( p<.01 \). This study also found a significant relationship between the expressive pillar and its two components (i.e. mastery pleasure and negative reactions to failure) with correlation from .701 to .757, \( p<.01 \) respectively.

**Parenting sense of competence and children’s mastery motivation.** In this study, parenting sense of competence was found significantly correlated to the instrumental component \( r(228) = .397, p < .01 \). The four factors (object-oriented persistence, gross motor persistence, social persistence with adults and social persistence with children) of the instrumental component of the mastery motivation were significantly correlated to the parenting sense of competence ranging from .254 to .399, \( p < .01 \). On the other hand, the parenting sense of competence was significantly correlated to the expressive component \( r(228) = .380, p < .01 \). The two factors (mastery pleasure and negative reactions to failure) of the expressive component were significantly correlated to the parenting sense of competence with range from .228 to .328, \( p < .01 \).

**FDHs’ care-giving competence and children’s mastery motivation.** FDHs’ care-giving competence was only found significantly correlated to the expressive pillar of mastery motivation, \( r(61) = .370, p < .01 \). It was also significantly correlated to the mastery pleasure, \( r(61) = .286, p < .05 \) and negative reactions to failure, \( r(61) = .228, p \)
However, it was not significantly correlated with the instrumental component $r(61) = .235, p > .05$. It was only significantly correlated to gross motor persistence of the instrumental pillar, $r(61) = .277, p < .05$.

**Parents’ education and children’s mastery motivation.** There was no significant correlation between the parents’ education and the instrumental component of children’s mastery motivation $r(231) = .041, p > .05$ as well as expressive $r(231) = -.027, p > .05$. Similarly, there was insignificant correlation between another parents’ (spouse) education and the instrumental component $r(228) = .087, p > .05$ as well as expressive component $r(228) = .048, p > .05$. This study failed to establish the direct relationship between parents’ educational level and the development of Hong Kong children’s mastery motivation.

**FDHs’ education and children’s mastery motivation.** There was no significant correlation between the FDHs’ education and the instrumental component of children’s mastery motivation $r(58) = .174, p > .05$ as well as expressive $r(58) = .156, p > .05$. In sum, this study did not elicit findings supporting the direct relationship between FDHs’ educational level and the development of children’s mastery motivation in the Chinese families of Hong Kong.

**Family income and children’s mastery motivation.** There was no significant correlation between the family income and the instrumental component of children’s mastery motivation $r(219) = .092, p > .05$ as well as expressive $r(219) = .029, p > .05$. In this regard, this study did not come up with any empirical evidence supporting the
impacts of family income to the development of Hong Kong children’s mastery motivation.

3.3. Multiple Regressions

This study attempted to work out the predictor-and-predicted relationship between the instrumental pillar of the Hong Kong children’s mastery motivation and five predictors or independent variables – parents’ sense of parenting competence, FDHs’ sense of care-giving competence, parents’ education level, FDHs’ educational level and family income. In this connection, family income, parents’ education and FDH’s education were first entered into the first block of the multiple regression equation simultaneously. Parents’ sense of parenting competence and FDHs’ sense of care-giving competence were later entered into the second block. Likewise, the same regression method was adopted for finding the predictor-and-predicted relationship between the expressive pillar of Hong Kong children’s mastery motivation and the same five predictor variables. Family income, parents’ education and FDH’s education were first entered into the first block of the multiple regression equation simultaneously. Parents’ sense of parenting competence and FDHs’ sense of care-giving competence were later entered into the second block. Result of the regression analyses were presented in the ensuing paragraphs.

**Instrumental pillar and the predictors.** As depicted in Table 3, parents’ sense of parenting competence significantly predicted instrumental pillar of mastery motivation, $\beta = .454, t(51) = 4.253, p < .01$. In contrast, FDHs’ sense of care-giving competence failed to predict the instrumental pillar. The whole regression model
explained a 27.8% variance in predicting the instrumental pillar of Hong Kong children’s mastery motivation, $R^2 = .278$, $F(6,51) = 4.660$, $p <.01$. The change of $R^2$ at .256 was also significant at $p <.01$.

Table 3

*Multiple Regressions Assessing the Instrumental Pillar of Hong Kong Children’s Mastery Motivation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Block 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Block 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.578**</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>1.676**</td>
<td>.560</td>
<td>2.993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family income</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ education</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>-1.066</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouses’ education</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDHs’ education</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.929</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDHs’ sense of care-giving competence</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>-.160</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ sense of Parenting competence</td>
<td>.454**</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .091$  
Adjusted $R^2 = .022$  
$\Delta R^2 = .256$

**$p < .01$ (two-tailed)**

Expressive pillar and the predictors. On the other hand, results of the regression suggested that parents’ sense of parenting competence significantly predicted expressive pillar, $\beta = .305$, $t(51) = 2.880$, $p < .01$. In contrast, FDHs’ sense of
care-giving competence failed to predict the expressive pillar. The whole regression model explained 22.4% variance in expressive pillar of Hong Kong children’s mastery motivation, $R^2 = .224$, $F(6,51) = 3.738$, $p < .01$. The change of $R^2$ at .232 was also significant at $p < .01$.

Table 4

*Multiple Regressions Assessing Expressive Pillar of Hong Kong Children’s Mastery Motivation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Block 1</th>
<th>Block 2</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.398**</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>1.314**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family income</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ education level</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>-.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouses’ education level</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDHs’ education level</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDHs’ sense of care-giving competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ sense of Parenting competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.305**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .063$  
Adjusted $R^2 = -.008$

$R^2 = .305$  
Adjusted $R^2 = .224$

$\Delta R^2 = .232$

***$p < .01$ (two-tailed)
Contrary to previous assumptions, the current study was not able to establish predictor-and-predicted relationship between parents’ and FDHs’ resources in terms of their educational levels and family income with Hong Kong children’s mastery motivation.
Chapter 4: Discussion and Conclusions

4.1. Discussion

**Parenting competence as a predictor variable.** This study found the positive and significant correlation between parents’ sense of parenting competence and both the instrumental and expressive pillars of the Hong Kong children’s mastery motivation. Multiple regressions were conducted and the results of which suggested that the parents’ sense of parenting competence significantly predicted both the instrumental and expressive pillars of children’s mastery motivation respectively. This was in line with the ecological theory suggesting that parents’ resources were important in maintaining the quality of reciprocal interactions with their children in the proximal process (Bronfenbrenner, 1986). Parents’ sense of parenting competence or parental self-esteem in terms of satisfaction and efficacy had a significant role to play in the children’s development (Bugental & Johnson, 2000). These parents’ resources were not only vital in helping parents identify behavioral problems for the formulation of preventive measures (Ohan, Leung & Johnson, 2000) but also equipped the parents with the capabilities essential for facilitating the development of children’s mastery motivation.

**Insignificant impacts of FDHs’ care-giving competence.** On the other hand, FDHs’ sense of care-giving competence was only significantly correlated with the expressive pillar of the Hong Kong children’s mastery motivation. Results of the multiple regressions also failed to establish the predictor-and-predicted relationship
between the FDHs’ sense of care-giving competence and any of the components of Hong Kong children’s mastery motivation. There may be several possible underlying reasons. Though the scale being adopted for measuring FDHs’ sense of care-giving competence had an acceptable reliability at .71, it had not undergone robust psychometric tests. On the other hand, FDHs’ questionnaires in the current study were written in English which might not address the language needs of the Indonesian domestic helpers. Furthermore, the likely FHDs’ perceived parents’ influence could not be under-estimated. FDHs had to manage their self-perception of the likely risks of their perceived weaknesses indicated in the questionnaires being made known of to their employers. Furthermore, there was social desirability effect affecting FDHs (Cohen & Swerdlik, 2010). On the other hand, the current study found the positive and significant correlation between parenting sense of competence and care-giving sense of competence, $r(61) = .354, p < .01$. There was a possibility that parenting sense of competence might mediate the effect of FDHs’ sense of care-giving competence on Hong Kong children’s mastery motivation.

**Social learning.** Parents and FDHs were key players in the family environment in which there were proximal processes being taken place amongst themselves (Bronfenbrenner, 1995). Through modeling and observational learning, FDHs may be shaped to imitate their employers’ behaviors from the perspective of children’s care-giving (Ormrod, 1999). There was room for uncovering the role of social learning in this association.
Possible mediator effects. The current study did not elicit the direct association between the children’s mastery motivation and socio-economic status in terms of family income and educational levels of the significant others. On the other hand, this study unveiled that family income was significantly correlated with the parents’ sense of parenting competence, $r(216) = .204, p < .01$. There was also a correlation between parent’s education and parents’ sense of parenting competence, $r(228) = .170, p < .01$. This may be partly explained by the evidence suggested by Turner & Johnson (2003) that exogenous variables such as parents’ educational level predicted parents’ belief which in turn predicted parents-and-children relationship. Turner & Johnson (2003) then found the predictor-and-predicted relationship between the parents-and-children relationship and children’s mastery motivation. Tulkin (1977) shared that the positive correlation between maternal socio-economic status and the quality of the maternal-and-children interactions. However, the research design was not formulated to find out the direct impact of socio-economic status on parents-and-children relationship and how this possible association was translated into the development of children’s mastery motivation. The respective impacts of family income and parents’ education on Chinese children’s mastery motivation may be mediated by parents’ sense of parenting competence.

4.2. Limitations and Future Studies

Sampling. In the current study, there were three kindergartens being selected by means of convenience sampling instead of random sampling. Coupled with the limited sample size, it was not mature to generalize the study findings to the population
at large (Cohen & Swerdlik, 2010). In future studies, more resources may be considered to be deployed to sample the population with a view to finding a representative distribution having due regard to the districts, ethnicity, religion, etc..

**Cause-and-effect.** The current study found that FDHs’ sense of care-giving competence was significantly correlated with the expressive pillar of Hong Kong children’s mastery motivation. However, correlation did not imply cause-and-effect relationship between the dependent and independent variables (Aldrich, 1995). Tabachnick & Fidell (2001) suggested that it was possible for the dependent and independent variables being correlated significantly but did not show their relationship in the regression model. This tied in with the results of the multiple regressions in the current study which proved that the predictor-and-predicted relationship between FDHs’ care-giving competence and Hong Kong children’s mastery motivation was not significant.

**Other familial factors.** The current study attempted to find a proper balance having regard to the resources available and the areas to be covered. It was then decided to investigate into the relationship between Hong Kong children’s mastery motivation and family resources from five perspectives in terms of parents’ sense of parenting competence, FDHs’ sense of care-giving competence, parents’ and FDHs’ educational level and family income. However, there were other familial factors which may come into play but not being taken into consideration in the current study. For example, Bowlby (1982) suggested that the children-and-care-givers relationship formed the basis upon which children found protection, support and a secure base to
explore the wider world and in managing communications with others. In other words, children’s secure attachment was related to their capabilities to explore the environment. There were also other factors such as parenting styles (Baumrind, 1971) and parents’ psychological well-being (Beckman, 1971) which may have a role to play. All these may be additional keys for future studies to unlock the intricate relationship of different factors on the quality of parents-and-children interactions and their possible mediating effects on Hong Kong children’s mastery motivation.

Other FDHs’ factors. The ultimate effects of children and care-givers in the proximal processes contributed to the course and outcome of children’s development (Bronfenbrenner, 1995). FDHs’ sense of care-giving competence were affected by reinforcements and punishments during the social interactions (Bandura, 1977) with their employers and children. This opened up another terrace for further studies into unveiling the impacts of parents-and-FDHs relationship on the parenting sense of competence and FDHs’ care-giving competence respectively. Attachment model may also have a role to play. Simmons, Nelson & Quick (2003) suggested that secure adults had flexible, constructive and reciprocal relationship with others and were able to work autonomously and independently. Secure individuals also had positive psychological states which geared them to manage resources for meeting challenges. This may give rise to better FDHs’ self-evaluation on their efficacy. Thomas & Russell (2000) posited that there was strong and significant correlation between employee’s psychological well-being and the employer’s rating of job performance. This gave another hint for investigating the impact of FDHs’ psychological well-being to the
FDHs’ sense of care-giving competence. It is suggested that future studies may also develop various levels of research: First addressing how the family resources from various perspectives affect the parents-and-children relationship and second on how this relationship associates with children mastery motivation.

**FHDs’ language proficiency.** It is worth noting that 60.3% ($n = 38$) of FDHs responding to the questionnaires (in English) were Filipinos whereas 38.1% ($n = 24$) were Indonesian. Gonzales & Sibayan (1998) suggested that Philippines remained the third country which had the largest number of English-speaking citizens. On the other hand, English Proficiency Index (2011) classified Indonesia as “Low” with regard to English proficiency. More thoughts could be placed on the use of FDHs’ respective mother languages in future studies to address the issues on the test-takers’ capacity to understand and respond properly to the contents of the questionnaires (Cohen & Swerdlik, 2010).

### 4.3. Implications

**New scale measuring FDHs’ care-giving competence.** It is worth noting that there was currently no scale measuring the FDHs’ care-giving competence. This study borrowed all questions from PSC-C with slight changes and modification to work out a new scale consisting of 16 items. A reliability analysis was conducted showing that the new scale had an acceptable reliability with alpha coefficient at .71. Preliminary analysis supported the removal of four items from the new scale, Item 5, 7, 10 and 13.

Item 5 “I would make a fine model for a new caregiver to a child to follow in order to
learn what she/he would need to know in order to be a good caregiver” had a corrected item-total correlation at .176. Item 7 “A difficult problem in being a caregiver to a child is not knowing whether you’re doing a good job or a bad one” had a corrected item-total correlation at .168. Item 10 “If anyone can find the answer to what is troubling my employer’s child, I am the one” had a corrected item-total correlation at .055. Item 13 “If being a caregiver to my employer’s child were only more interesting, I would be motivated to do a better job” had a corrected item-total correlation at -.273. These items’ removal resulted in an enhanced internal consistency with alpha coefficient at .771. Also, the new scale apparently measured the caregivers’ sense of care-giving competence and earned a good face validity (Cohen & Swerdlik, 2010). However, this new scale has not undergone stringent psychometric tests proving its sound qualities such as concurrent validity and predictive validity (Cohen & Swerdlik, 2010). For example, there were other scales measuring self-esteem with good psychometric qualities such as the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale. Moreover, Berkman’s (1971) eight-item scale for measuring psychological well-being may also be adopted because individuals scoring low were likely to have very low self-esteem and reduced drive (Holmes, 1991). On the other hand, FDHs’ job satisfaction about care-giving could be measured by one of the dimensions proposed by Price & Mueller (1986) which had been widely adopted in other researches. If resources are available, more efforts could be devoted to validate a new scale for measuring FDHs’ care-giving by means of correlational investigation with other valid and reliable scales for the purpose of achieving convergent validity. If such a valid scale with sound
psychometric qualities is available, this will certainly form a solid foundation for future studies.

**Family education.** As regards parents’ sense of parenting competence was a good predictor of Hong Kong children’s mastery motivation, it is worth considering introducing family education programmes to enhance parents’ awareness and strengthen their sense of parenting competence which have profound effects on their children’s life-span advancements from various perspectives.

### 4.4. Conclusions

The current study has expanded the pool of knowledge giving light to the possible impacts of parents’ resources on Hong Kong children’s mastery motivation. The results offered initial empirical information indicating that parents’ sense of parenting competence positively predicted the Chinese children’s mastery motivation in Hong Kong. H1 was supported. In contrast, this study did not elicit findings showing that FDHs’ sense of care-giving competence predicted the Hong Kong children’s mastery motivation. H2 was not supported. This study was unable to uncover the direct predictor-and-predicted relationship between the intellectual qualities of the parents and FDHs in terms of their educational levels and the Hong Kong children’s mastery motivation respectively. Hence, H3 and H4 were not supported. This study did not show that family’s socio-economic status positively predicted the Hong Kong children’s mastery. H5 was not supported.
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Appendix A

有關家庭環境對兒童發展影響的研究事宜

致各位家長:

香港城市大學應用社會科學系正聯同 xxx 幼稚園進行一項有關家庭環境對兒童發展影響的研究。研究目的是透過問卷調查，收集有關父母及家庭傭工對孩童動機的影響。是項研究不單能夠加強各位家長對貴子女發展的了解，研究成果亦可為家庭教育工作者設計及改善現有的家庭環境。我們誠意邀請各位家長參與。

各位家長只需填寫附上的問卷，需時約十五分鐘。如閣下有聘用外籍家庭僱工照顧貴子女，亦請邀请或協助她/他填寫問卷。所有已填好的問卷請於 2012 年 11 月 18 日前，交回 xxx 幼稚園。

參與研究屬自願性質，所有資料將會保密。當整項研究完成後，所有問卷將會被銷毀。

如有任何查詢，請致電 6013 1589 與黃詩敏博士聯絡。謝謝！

香港城市大學應用社會科學系
碩士學生黃詩敏

二零一二年十一月十二日
有關兒童發展學術研究之問卷調查

＜問卷一＞（由家長填寫）

本人已詳閱有關通告內容，並同意參與有關研究。

學生姓名：____________________ 班別：_______

家長簽署：____________________

家長姓名：____________________

日期：2012年____月____日
有關兒童發展學術研究之問卷調查

第一部分

請依照每一題的狀況，從 1 到 5 中圈選最符合您孩子表現的數字。例如圈選 1，表示孩子的表現不曾這樣；如圈選 5，表示孩子的表現總是這樣。每個孩子都不一樣；有些孩子對一些事情動機很強，對其他事情則動機不強。即使您不確定孩子表現，也請回答所有問題。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>不曾這樣</th>
<th>跟同齡孩子差不多</th>
<th>總是這樣</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 會反覆練習一件新的技巧直到做得不錯為止。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 完成某件事以後會開心露出笑容。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 當無法做好肢體動作或技巧時，就會放棄。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 快速地解決問題。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 當不會做一件事的時候，就容易放棄。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 了解事物有一點慢。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 喜歡嘗試難的事情勝過簡單的事情。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 喜歡和大人說話，同時嘗試讓大人保持興趣。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 對於難度高的玩具或活動，只嘗試一小段時間就不再試了。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 會做事情。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>項目</th>
<th>對照樣本</th>
<th>對照樣本差不多</th>
<th>總是這樣</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. 做出一件事後，他/她不會露出笑容。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 即使困難的肢體活動，他也會嘗試做好。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 要和同年齡的兒童一樣做好一些事情，對他來說有點困難。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. 即使有些事情要花很長的時間，他也會試著去完成。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. 會極力吸引大人來跟他/她玩。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. 喜歡並嘗試做好肢體活動。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. 拿到一個物品或玩具，會探索其各個部分之後再去做別的事。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. 當弄懂一件事的時候，他會很興奮。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. 跟我或其他的大人玩的時候，有很多互動。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. 會做一些對他/她的年紀來說屬於困難的事。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. 當解決一個難題時會顯得滿足愉悅。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. 儘力讓大人了解他/她的意思。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. 會堅持一段長的時間去做困難的事。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. 儘力嘗試去玩因果關係的玩具，譬如拉下去就會有東西彈出來的傑克球。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. 會很投入地和朋友玩扮家家酒或假扮遊戲。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. 反覆練習身體移位的技巧，直到做得不錯為止。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3
### 有關兒童發展學術研究之問卷調查

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>不曾這樣</th>
<th>達到及格程度</th>
<th>同齡孩子差不多</th>
<th>總是這樣</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>反覆練習丟球或接球動作，直到做得不錯為止。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>會極力試著去和其他的小孩交朋友。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>會花一段時間嘗試把東西組合在一起。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>喜歡和別的小孩說話。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>嘗試完成像是拼圖類的玩具，即使這些玩具是困難的。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>看到別的兒童在玩的時候會嘗試加入。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>和大人一起玩時，很快就放棄不想玩了。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>想做某些事而做不到時，會把目光移開。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>當和其他小孩一起時，會盡力讓遊戲持續久一點。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>反覆做一些動作技巧直到做好為止，例如攀爬。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>喜歡和大人玩假扮的遊戲。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>做不好事情就會垂頭喪氣。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>避免和其他兒童互動。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>努力嘗試做好體育活動，像是運動或“舞蹈”。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>做出某件事後，就露出微笑。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>努力嘗試卻失敗後會避免看別人。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>成功完成一件事的時候會表現出興奮的樣子。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
有關兒童發展學術研究之問卷調查

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>句子</th>
<th>不曾這樣</th>
<th>同齡孩子差不多</th>
<th>總是這樣</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44. 當很努力嘗試卻仍無法做到時會感到沮喪。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. 會盡力嘗試將接住物體或接住物體的動作做得更好。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

第二部分

請依照每一題的狀況，從 1 到 6 中圈選最符合您作為父母表現的數字。例如圈選 1，表示您非常不同意；如圈選 6，表示您非常同意。請回答所有問題。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>句子</th>
<th>非常不同意</th>
<th>不同意</th>
<th>有點不同意</th>
<th>有點同意</th>
<th>同意</th>
<th>非常同意</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 當我明白到自己的行為如何影響孩子時，照顧孩子上出現的種種困難都容易解決。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 雖然作為父母是一件賞心樂事，但此刻照顧孩子令我感到灰心喪氣。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 每日我都覺得自己沒有很大作為。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 有時候當我認為事情可以在自己控制之內時，我反而覺得被牽制著。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>非常不同意</td>
<td>不同意</td>
<td>有點不同意</td>
<td>有點同意</td>
<td>同意</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>與我父母相比，我覺得自己沒有做好足夠的準備去做個好父親/母親。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>我認為自己可作為其他父母的榜樣，讓他們學習怎樣當一位好父親/母親。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>我能勝任父母的工作，而任何困難均可迎刃而解。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>爲人父母令我感到很困惑的，是不知道自己做得是否稱職。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>有時候我覺得自己一事無成。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>我認為自己在照顧孩子方面的能力與期望相乎。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>當孩子表現困擾時，我比其他人更瞭解是什麼導致他有此情況。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>我比較有興趣及擅長做其它事情，多於擔任父母的工作。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>我覺得自己能全面瞭解一位父親/母親應有的角色。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>假若照顧孩子的工作充滿樂趣，我會比現在起動一些去做好父母的角色。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>我深信自己擁有作為一位好父親/母親應有的技巧。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>爲人父母令我覺得緊張及焦慮。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>作為一位好父親/母親本身就是一項獎賞。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
有關兒童發展學術研究問卷調查

第三部分

1. 兒童年齡：______ [兒童生日： 年 月 日]

2. 兒童性別
   □ 男 □ 女

3. 你與孩童的關係
   □ 母親 □ 其他（請說明）__________
   □ 父親 □

4. 你的教育程度：
   □ 中三或以下 □ 專上（例如：文憑、副學士）
   □ 中四至中五 □ 學士學位
   □ 預科 □ 碩士或以上

5. 你的配偶教育程度：
   □ 中三或以下 □ 專上（例如：文憑、副學士）
   □ 中四至中五 □ 學士學位
   □ 預科 □ 碩士或以上

6. 你的工作性質是什麼？
   □ 文職 □ 非技術、勞工
   □ 商人、自僱 □ 打理家務
   □ 服務行業（例如司機、侍應） □ 學生
   □ 傳媒、創作、藝術、設計 □ 退休
   □ 專業人士、高級行政人員 □ 待業
   □ 其他技術專業（如理髮師、廚師） □ 其他
有關兒童發展學術研究之問卷調查

7. 你的家庭年收入是多少？
   - □ 無入息
   - □ 10,000 或以下
   - □ 10,001 - 20,000
   - □ 20,001 - 30,000
   - □ 30,001 - 40,000
   - □ 40,001 - 50,000
   - □ 50,001 - 60,000
   - □ 60,001 - 70,000
   - □ 70,001 - 80,000
   - □ 80,001 - 90,000
   - □ 90,001 - 100,000
   - □ 100,001 或以上

8. 你的家庭現在有沒有聘用外籍家庭傭工？
   - □ 有
   - □ 沒有 (已完成問卷，請交回幼稚園)

9. 現在聘用的外籍家庭傭工是否需要照顧你的孩子？
   - □ 是 (您已完成「問卷一」。請把此問卷放入附上的「家長信箋」，並邀請您的外籍家庭傭工填寫「問卷二」，完成後，請您的外籍家庭傭工把「問卷二」放入附上的「外籍家庭傭工信箋」並封好。然後，請您一併將「家長信箋」及「外籍家庭傭工信箋」交回幼稚園。)
   - □ 否 (您已完成「問卷一」。請把此問卷放入附上的「家長信箋」，封好後交回幼稚園。)

問卷一
完
Appendix B

College of Applied Social Science
City University of Hong Kong

19 November 2012

Research on Relationship between
Family Environment and Children’s Development

Dear Domestic Helper,

The College of Applied Social Science of the City University of Hong Kong is conducting a research with the ST ANDREW’S CATHOLIC KINDERGARTEN with a view to investigating the effects of family environment on children’s development. The research is primarily aimed at collecting information throwing light on how the parents and foreign domestic helpers affect the children’s mastery motivation.

Information is collected by means of a questionnaire which takes about 15 minutes to complete. Information will then be consolidated and presented in a collective manner which would help family education professionals to design ways to improve the family environment. In this connection, we would like to solicit your participation on a totally voluntary basis. If you are willing to participate, please complete the attached consent form and “Questionnaire II” and put them into the enclosed envelop. You are then requested to submit the sealed envelop to your employer before 26 November 2012.

Please be rest assured that confidentiality will be upheld and all completed questionnaire will be properly disposed of upon the conclusion of the research. Please feel free to contact postgraduate student Mr WONG Jug-tung at 6013 1589 for any enquiries.

Yours faithfully

Postgraduate student WONG Jug-tung
Assistant Professor Bonnie Chow
Questionnaire on Children’s Development

Questionnaire II (To be completed by Foreign Domestic Helper)

I agree to take part in this research about the relationship between family environment and the development of my employer’s children.

Signature : ____________________

Name : ______________________

Date : ______ / ______ / 2012
Questionnaire on Children’s Development

Part I

1. How long you have been taking care of your employer’s child for?
   - ☐ less than 12 months
   - ☐ 12 - 24 months
   - ☐ 24 - 36 months
   - ☐ 36 - 48 months
   - ☐ over 48 months

2. Your nationality
   - ☐ Filipino
   - ☐ Indonesia
   - ☐ Others

3. Your Age
   - ☐ ≤20
   - ☐ 21 - 25
   - ☐ 26 - 30
   - ☐ 31 - 35
   - ☐ 36 - 40
   - ☐ 41 - 45
   - ☐ 46 - 50
   - ☐ >50

4. Your Gender
   - ☐ Female
   - ☐ Male

5. Your Marital Status
   - ☐ Single
   - ☐ Married
   - ☐ Divorced

6. Do you have any children?
   - ☐ Yes (number: _____)
   - ☐ No
Questionnaire on Children’s Development

7. Your Education Level

- □ Form 3 or below
- □ Form 4 - 5
- □ Matriculated
- □ Diploma
- □ Bachelor Degree
- □ Master Degree or above

Part 2.

If you are required to take care of your employer’s child, please circle the number from 1 to 6 to indicate the most suitable behaviour regarding your role as a caregiver. For example, if you select 1, you strongly disagree to the statement describing your behaviours. If you select 6, you strongly agreed to the statement. Please answer all the questions.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The problems of taking care of my employer’s child are easy to solve once I know how my actions affect my employer’s child, an understanding I have acquired.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Even though being a caregiver to my employer’s child could be rewarding, I am frustrated now while my employer’s child is at his/her present age.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I go to bed the same way I wake up in the morning, feeling I have not accomplished a whole lot.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I do not know why it is, but sometimes when I’m supposed to be in control, I feel more like the one being manipulated.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Questionnaire on Children’s Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagreed</th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agreed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. I would make a fine model for a new caregiver to a child to follow in order to learn what she/he would need to know in order to be a good caregiver.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Being a caregiver to a child is manageable, and any problems are easily solved.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A difficult problem in being a caregiver to a child is not knowing whether you’re doing a good job or a bad one.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sometimes I feel like I’m not getting anything done.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I meet my own personal expectations for expertise in caring for my employer’s child.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. If anyone can find the answer to what is troubling my employer’s child, I am the one.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. My talents and interests are in other areas, not being a caregiver to a child.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Considering how long I’ve been a caregiver to my employer’s child, I feel thoroughly familiar with this role.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. If being a caregiver to my employer’s child were only more interesting, I would be motivated to do a better job as a parent.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Questionnaire on Children’s Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagreed</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I honestly believe I have all the skills necessary to be a caregiver to my employer’s child.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Being a caregiver to my employer’s child makes me tense and anxious.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Being a caregiver to my employer’s child is a reward in itself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- End -