5-1961

Differential Responses of Student Teachers to Children in Nursery School

Carroll Carman Lambert
Utah State University

DIFFERENTIAL RESPONSES OF STUDENT TEACHERS TO CHILDREN IN NURSERY SCHOOL

by

Carroll Carman Lambert

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Child Development

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author's sincere appreciation is extended to the members of my graduate committee for their many contributions to the development and completion of the present study. These members are Dr. Glen A. Christensen, Dr. Don C. Carter and Ruby Eames.

And certainly most important of all, appreciation is extended to the children of this study who, though they remain anonymous to the world, are and always will be very real to the author.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Historical background of study

For some time the writer has observed the keen, creative sensitivity with which children respond to their world. She has also observed, however, that many teachers and parents seem to be quite unaware of this sensitivity. An illustration of this lack of awareness is the following experience: One day a nursery school teacher had a painful headache; in fact, it was suggested that she go home for the remainder of the day. Instead of going home, however, she decided to stay, thinking that her headache would soon abate. The teacher was sitting on a chair observing the children, unaware that one child seemed also to be closely observing her. At the conclusion of a ten or fifteen minute period of this mutual observation, the little boy approached the teacher and said, "You don't feel well, do you?" The teacher looked astonished but replied; "Oh yes, I feel all right."

A further illustration of this quality of insensitivity to children is revealed in the practice of calculated diversion. The latter is becoming increasingly popular among both teachers and parents. Thus, when a child is doing something which is presumed to be wrong, or which the concerned adult cannot tolerate, he is diverted, or redirected, from this activity. That is, his attention is drawn to some other area of interest or activity on the assumption that he will forget what he was originally doing. It appears that many adults find this diversionary technique to be both more easily employed and more socially acceptable

than directly telling the child to stop or cease whatever he is doing. Moreover, with such diversion "successfully" accomplished, the adults seem to feel assured that the child's attention to and/or concern about the initial activity has been forgotten.

It has been this writer's experience, however, that children are quite aware of what is really happening when the diversionary technique is being manipulatively used. Further, it has also been her experience that rather than being really diverted from or forgetting their interest in the original activity, children frequently find their attention drawn more firmly to it. Indeed, the activity itself not infrequently begins to assume a problematic quality for the child.

Some common, concrete expressions of childrens' behavior which often result in the utilization of the diversionary tactic are thumb sucking, nose picking, and masturbation. Thus, the parent or teacher may say to the child, "Wouldn't you like to read a book, or paint at the easel?" Or she may say, "Wouldn't you like to tell mommy a story?" The essential purpose or objective of such adult responses is a calculated effort at diverting the child's attention from the unacceptable activity to some other, more acceptable activity. The critical result of such purpose and calculation, however, is an expression by the teacher or parent that is fundamentally untrue of their real reason for their taking recourse to the tactic. The real reason, of course, is seen in the inability of the adult to tolerate or accept the behavior from which they deliberately set out to divert the child. It is not, then, that the adult basically cares about whether the child reads a book, paints at the easel, or tells a story; rather, it is that the child ceases the behavior that is obviously offensive to the adult.

The writer's major concern regarding the entire issue of diversion

addresses itself to the possibilities that potentially inhere in a more honest, sensitive response to both the child and his activity, as well as in the consequences of such a response. Thus, she would conjecture that a potentially more healthy, desirable response to these behaviors would be the response of sensitive, direct honesty. Such a response might simply be, "Gary, picking your nose bothers me. Would you please stop it?" A further consequence of the latter response is that the child is not subjected to the hurtful dispairty of a calculated, insensitive deception.

Theoretical framework of study

The theoritical justification and conceptual framework for the foregoing postulation inhere in and derive from an increasing accumulation of research and experience which are in essential verification of the evidential possibility that the nature and quality of the relationship between child and adult is of greater significance in the promotion and affirmation of healthy, creative growth in the child than is the methodology, the technique, and or the abstract rationale employed in "properly" responding to childrens' actions, behaviors, and expressions. In short, it is not primarily what the adult says to the child that is crucial, but, rather, it is who the adult is to the child. It is especially the latter that constitutes the basis for a relationship that both transcends and supercedes the validity and significance of the paraphernalia of abstract labels, philosophical concepts, logical methodologies, and refined techniques (4, 8, 11).

The experiences and illustrations delineated above, as well as numerous others of a similar nature, have been strategically important in encouraging the writer to personally explore, think about and

question the meaning and implications of such experiences, and to consider the possible impact of both the experiences and their implications on the children who are subjected to them. In fact, the writer has found herself asking such questions as: "Who do adults think they are fooling? Why do they try to put things over on children, when in reality they are deceiving only themselves? How does a child feel when he has been responded to and deceived by adults in this way?"

Much of the same quality of concern and puzzlement in relation to the nature and structure of the various relationships that obtain between children and adults was experienced by the writer during her practicum as a student teacher. Thus, the two quarters that she was in the nursery school as a practice teacher she observed that some student teachers appeared to be quite uncomfortable, and did not seem to enjoy their experience. Nor did they evidence any consistent responses to their experience that were indicative of even the possibility that they may have enjoyed the opportunity of being with the nursery school children. In fact, that which appeared to be most recurrent and prominent in their experience was the problem of enduring the required time. Indeed, simply "putting in time" seemed to most adequately define an essential, central dimension of the nature of their practicum experience. Such a response by these teachers only contributed to the dilemma which the writer was already confronting. It was out of this dilemma, however, that she crystallized some of the initial questions that were later to form the focus of the present study. Indeed, these questions gradually evolved into a specific concern about what, if anything, could be done to make the practice teaching program the kind and quality of experience that would allow more of the practicum students to grow into comfortable, creative relationships with the nursery school children, and to discover

more personally satisfying and fulfilling ways of responding to and utilizing the manifold possibilities inherent in the very structure and nature of the practice teaching program.

Some specific concerns that have gradually evolved, and that are related directly to the general area of concern just delineated, express themselves in terms of a number of questions of vital significance and direct pertienence. One such question is concerned with what might be the nature of the student teachers' responses to and experiences with the children in the nursery school if they were not told specifically how to respond, when to respond, or even if they should respond. A further, if related, question concerns itself with how the student teachers themselves might feel about their practicum program if they were more free to make major decisions in regard to the nature and content of their teaching experiences, rather than having such decisions made for them by the head teachers and by the expectations, definitions, and traditions accruing from past practices and experiences. The essential area and point of concern of such questions is a tentative determination of the contrasting differential possibilities that might inhere in the unstructured, the natural, and the unpredetermined experimental program for practice teachers. Thus, for example, is it possible that the uninstructed, unlearned actions, interactions and personal responses of student teachers might be more creative and meaningful to both teachers and children than responses that are primarily emergents of direct instruction and structured advocation? The nature of a response made in recognition of the latter procedure is illustrated by the following example: A child is hitting another child, and the teacher interferes in order to stop the hitting. She has been instructed to first find out why the child is hitting the other child, and also to use

positive guidance in engineering a satisfactory resolution of such problematic interaction. The latter would include an observation by the teacher that would express such reasoning as, "I know that you sometimes feel like hitting Paul, but it hurts when you hit someone. If you feel like hitting, you may have a turn hitting saggy baggy."

It is the writer's conjecture, however, that such interaction might possibly have been more meaningful to both teacher and child if the teacher had been free to respond in terms of her own self, in terms of her own intrinsic feelings and impulses. If indeed she had such freedom, she might very well have said simply, "Don't hit Paul," or "No, stop that." If the latter responses were in fact more true of the person of the teacher than the initial one, it would also seem to be more affirming of the child as well as being more meaningful for the teacher. Moreover, it would not accommodate any decietful undertones. Finally, it would allow the relationship between the teacher and student to remain intact, undistorted by untrueness, insensitivity, and irresponsible rationalizations.

Statement of problem

It is in recognition of the potential meaning and implications that are indigenous to the questions and concerns delineated thus far that the writer has decided to address herself to the essential issue composing the focus to the present study. Thus, the central problem of the immediate research is an investigation and analysis of the differential responses of two groups of student teachers to the children with whom they work in the nursery school. As developed more fully in the section on methods of procedure, one group of student teachers will receive instruction on various methods and modes of responding and relating to children, whereas the second group will not be so instructed.

Indeed, it is this central, controlled difference in the preparational structuring of the two student-teacher groups that constitutes and defines the essential basis for an analysis of the differential responses of the practicum students to the children in the nursery school.

The study, and its subsequent analysis, will be directed primarily toward five important areas of student-teacher experience and interaction. These include, (a) the nature of and methods employed in the imposition and enforcement of limits, (b) the general nature and usage of words, particularly of an imperative or disciplinary character, (c) the nature and methods of teacher interferences, (d) the imposition of adult stereotypes by the student teachers, and (e) the utilization of the impersonal mode in responding to difficulties and rule infractions.

In regard to the first area of interaction, an attempt will be made to discover some tentative answers to such crucial questions as: How do children react to the enforcement of different limits? Are there obvious differences in the particular kinds of limits imposed by different teachers? Are there obvious group differences in the methods of imposing various limits? What kinds of behavior do student teachers attempt to control? Does such behavior differ in terms of the two different groups of student teachers?

With respect to the second area of interaction, an effort will be made to determine which particular words of an imperative-disciplinary type are most frequently invoked. Also, an effort will be made to discover whether such words are employed more frequently by the instructed (control) group or by the uninstructed (experimental) group.

In connection with the third interactional area, an attempt will be made to study the particular nature and methods of interferences employed by different teachers in their relationships with the children,

as well as the childrens' differential reactions to such interferences.

Insofar as the fourth and fifth areas are concerned, an effort will be made to discover whether student teachers impose adult stereotypes and employ the impersonal mode in attempting to respond to and control the occurrence of various behavioral difficulties, rule infractions, and other problematic episodes. It will be especially important to discover whether or not there are obvious group differences in the imposition of stereotypes and the employment of the impersonal mode.

Methodological procedures

Although they may seem somewhat arbitrary, the essential methodological procedures composing the basic design of, and serving as the major tools in, the present study are primarily emergents of the requirements indigenous to the particular nature of the central problem of the immediate research. Further, however, they are also recognized as being procedures that are methodologically relevant to the type of research that the present study reflects. Moreover, they are recognized as being of acceptable experimental validity and utility (6).

The first dimension of the methodological structure and design of the present research is the inclusion of two groups of student teachers. Both groups will do their practice teaching in the nursery schools operated by Utah State University. The first group, herein defined as the control group, will be composed of students who will do their practice teaching during the Fall Quarter, 1960-61. This group will receive the traditional orientation to and instruction on the general procedures to be followed throughout the teachers' practicum experience. Such orientation and instruction includes material and advice on various, acceptable methods and modes of responding to the nursery school children, as well as the more effective techniques and procedures to employ in

relating to and imposing limits on these children.

The second group of student teachers, herein defined as the experimental group, will be composed of students who will do their practice teaching during the Winter Quarter of 1960-61, but who will not receive the traditional orientation and instruction regarding their practicum experience.

The setting within which the traditional orientation to and instruction on the procedures to be followed by the student teachers throughout their practicum program in the class F. L. C. D. 174, entitled Nursery School Methods. In terms of the present study, then, the control group will enroll in and receive the usual instruction on Nursery School Methods. The experimental group, on the other hand, will enroll in the class, but will not receive the usual instruction. In lieu of this instruction, the content of the class composed of the latter group will consist of considerations of various child development issues, but of a nature unrelated to nursery school methods and procedures.

The essential research tools and techniques to be employed in the prosecution of the present research are of two general types. The first type will be composed of a series of systematic observations of each group of practice teachers, with such observations being focused on the various areas of teacher-child behavior and interaction delineated in the section on Statement of Problem. The observations will be made for a period of eight weeks, and will be recorded both concurrently and immediately following their occurrence.

The second general type of research tool will be the utilization of a brief, semi-structured questionnaire, the major purpose of which will be an acquisition of the more central feelings and attitudes reflected by the practice teachers in regard to and as a consequence of their

practicum experience (see appendix).

The analysis of data will be done primarily in terms of a simple comparative appraisal and essentially subjective, inferential evaluation of the observations. The latter will obtain as a consequence of the researcher's best personal judgement, imputation, and extrapolation. The researcher will attempt to minimize the bias and distortion that may accompany her personnal analysis and evaluation by subjecting such analysis and evaluation to the most dispassionate objectivity of which she is capable, and by introducing a "check" or corrective in the form of at least one other person who, having closely followed the development of the present study, will also make an analysis and evaluation of the data.

There will, then, be no "objective," statistical treatment of the data, though tables of major differences will be presented.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Because of the paucity of literature germane to the present study, it has been deemed desirable to prosecute this review within a two-fold structure. The first dimension of the structure is composed of studies dealing primarily with children's aggressivity in the nursery school, whereas the second dimension is composed of studies dealing primarily with the various attitudes teachers express towards the children with whom they work.

Aggressive behavior in the nursery school

In her research on children's aggressive behavior in various nursery school groups Appel defined aggression as an actual or threatened attack by one child upon the person of another child, interference with another child's activities, or the use of hostile, provocative language (1). Moreover, aggressive behavior can be understood only if the essential motives underlying such behavior are known.

Appel asserts that of the various techniques employed in responding to child aggression "diversion" and "separation" were both highly successful, though the former seemed generally more desirable than the latter. Other techniques that were judged to be both effective and successful were interpretation, explanation, and direct suggestion. Techniques judged to be ineffective and/or undesirable included adult expressions of disapproval, the employment of impersonal injunctions, and the utilization of sterotyped solutions.

In a study of two groups of children, drawn from two nursery schools in Columbus, Ohio, Body discovered that differences and similarities in

patterns of aggression obtained not only between the two groups but also between children within each group (2). The important influences between groups seemed to be indigenous to such situational and environmental differentials as physical plant and equipment of the nursery schools, teacher-child ratio, teaching methods, and group structure. Also differences in past experience, biological make-up, mental development, and reactions of others to each child proved to be important factors in individual patterns of aggression (2).

In her study of the behavior problems of two groups of nursery school children, Campbell discovered that a consistently higher behavior-problem score emerged from the college nursery school group than from the industrial nursery school group (3). The higher scores were especially noticeable in relation to negative responses, responses toward adults, and responses during the lunch hour. Although more problematic behavior was observed in the college nursery school group. Campbell asserts that it cannot be concluded that such a differential was significantly influenced by the socio-economic status of the subjects (3).

Teachers' attitudes concerning children

In their summary research of teacher-attitudes toward children's behavior, Ellis and Miller attempted to study both typical attitudes toward such behavior held by teachers and "ideal" attitudes that should be held, insofar as mental hygiene implications are concerned (5). Their major conclusion is that in general teachers consider violations of general standards of morality and transgressions against authority to be the more serious types of behavioral traits expressed by the children with whom they work. Such violations and transgressions include stealing, temper out-bursts, impudence, impertinence, and

rebelliousness. Thus, assert Ellis and Miller, it is clear that teachers' attitudes toward children's behavior reflect or mirror the normative attitudes held by society, and that such reflection is in the direction of good mental hygiene and social solidarity.

In his study of teacher-attitudes in relation to children's behavior problems, Sparks emerged with conclusions not completely dissimilar from those of Ellis and Miller (12). Thus, after being instructed to rate children's behavior problems in terms of their seriousness for future adjustment, Sparks' subjects rated honesty, social morality, and sexual morality as being of greatest seriousness. From this pattern of rating, Sparks concludes that those traits of virtue which are of greatest concern to society are considered by teachers to be more important than are personality traits which indicate the state of a child's personal adjustment (12).

Taba discovered that adults influence the behavioral orientation of children in numerous, often unknown, ways (13). Thus, both teachers and parents express their feelings, values, and judgments in casual, subtle remarks and observations that have more personal and collective impact than they realize. Indeed, sometimes not more than a ripple in as adult's voice betrays a structured feeling. Moreover, some attitudes and feelings seem to exist almost "in the air," as part of the climate of a home, a classroom, or a community (13).

In his highly important research, Moustakas indicates that in order to establish an alive, personal relationship with a child, a teacher not infrequently has to develop and maintain an attitude of unyielding faith and patience (7, 8, 9, 10). Indeed, there are numerous situations in which teachers will discover that their attitudes of interest and concern for the child are at least temporarily rejected. However, when the

individual teacher maintains faith in and acceptance of the child throughout the relationship, the definite, if unpredictable, growth strivings within each child begin to influence the child's behavior toward more satisfying fulfilling ways of life and behavior in school. Finally, within the structure of such a faith in the child, the teacher will discover that significant growth occurs from expressions of real experience, and not from repetitious, authoritative statements or strivings for approval (7, 8, 9, 10).

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

In the present chapter the writer has prosecuted the presentation and analysis of data writing a two-fold structure. The first section is composed of the presentation and comparative tabular distribution of the major questions reflecting the essential purpose of the research; also, it contains the relevant contents of the 80 cases from which the material and analysis of this section have been derived. Moreover, the analysis has been accomplished essentially through the utilization of tabular methods and narrative expositions.

The second section is composed of a relatively simple comparative, expositional non-tabular analysis of some of the essential, if selected, attitudes and feelings of the student teachers in regard to certain, central dimensions of their practice teaching experience.

Analysis of case observations

The particular modalities of child action and behavior that were adjudged by both groups of student teachers to be of a sufficiently deviant character to merit restriction through the imposition of definite limits are reflected in tables 1 and 2.

It is readily observable that though there are slight differences in the specific number and kinds of objectionable behavior that obtained between the children composing the control and experimental groups, there is, in fact, little difference in the essential essence or nature of such behavior. Thus, in both groups the kinds of behavior that repeatedly elicited an effort at control through the imposition of limits are

seen to fall into three general categories of offense. Such categories include: (a) offenses against nursery school routine, such as turning lights off, climbing on lockers and/or building blocks, refusing to join in regular group activities, and pouring water on the nursery school floor; (b) offenses against the person of the student teacher, such as hitting the teacher with a hammer, spitting at the teacher, threatening to throw building blocks, and using objectionable words; (c) offenses against other children, such as recklessness in the presence of other children, pushing clay into the faces of each other, and taking toys away from each other.

Thus, as seen in tables 1 and 2, it can be concluded that no obvious or marked behavioral differences obtained between the children composing the control and experimental groups.

Table 1. Kinds of children's behavior that student teachers attempted to control through the imposition of limits--control group

Kinds of behavior
A. Striking pounding board too hard
B. Standing up on slide
C. Refusing to join in group activities
D. Painting on own hands
E. Pouring water on floor
F. Recklessness while working with building blocks
G. Mopping table after painting on it
H. Stacking building blocks too high, and climbing on them
I. Climbing on lockers and table
J. Coloring on pillars supporting center part of nursery school
K. Hitting teacher with hammer
L. Painting on newspapers in nursery school
M. Using objectionable words

Certain behavioral deviations on the part of the nursery school children were deemed to be of a sufficient degree of gravity and provocation as to require their subjection to some measure of control

through the imposition of limits by the teachers victimized by such provocation.

Table 2. Kinds of children's behavior that student teachers attempted to control through the imposition of limits--experimental group

Kinds of behavior
A. Pouring sawdust on nursery school floor
B. Putting coat on without teacher's permission
C. One child taking toy from another child
D. Removing picture from wall of nursery school
E. Throwing water on floor of nursery school
F. Hammering nails into building blocks
G. Throwing puzzles into the air
H. Turning off lights in nursery school, and pulling blinds down
I. Taking turtle out of water bowl
J. Running up and down slide
K. Climbing on building blocks in order to see self in mirror
L. Pushing molding clay into the faces of each other
M. Carrying a visitor's purse away
N. Spitting at teacher
O. Eating paint and paste
P. Pouring water on floor from toy duck
Q. Threatening to throw building blocks at other children
S. Standing up on slide

The general nature of the differential limits that were employed by the teachers and imposed on the children is delineated in tables 3 and 4.

Little more than a cursory observation of the data of tables 3 and 4 is necessary to discover that with one exception the actual limits that were utilized by both groups of teachers in an effort to effect some measure of control over the "non-conforming" children are essentially of the same general nature. Hence, such limits as were defined by the actions of requirement, suggestion, diversion, telling, yelling at, and making constitute the entire repetoire of limits utilized by the teachers composing the control group. The repetoire of limits utilized by

teachers in the experimental group included but one additional limit. Such additional limit was a teacher's action of physically extracting a forbidden item from a child's possession.

Table 3. Nature of limits imposed by student teachers in order to control their children's unacceptable behavior--control group

Nature of limits
A. Diverting child by suggesting that he go to another area
B. Requiring child to sit down on slide
C. Requiring child to join in group activities
D. Suggesting that child not paint on his hands
E. Making child mop up the water
F. Telling child to stack blocks in a different direction
G. Suggesting that child climb on climbing box instead of lockers
H. Telling child not to stand or climb on the blocks
I. Suggesting to child that he refrain from mopping on the table
J. Yelling at child, telling him to stop
K. Suggesting that child hit saggy baggy
L. Telling child to paint only on wood
M. Telling child to cease using objectionable words

Again, as in tables 1 and 2, the comparative process yields the conclusion that obvious differences in the nature of the various limits employed by student teachers in an effort to control objectionable behavior obtain only among individual teachers within each group; hence they do not obtain between the two groups of teachers.

Tables 5 and 6 contain a series of descriptive statements reflecting the differential reactions of both groups of nursery school children to the various limits imposed on them by their teachers.

In subjecting such differential reactions to the taxonomic process there emerges a structure composed of five distinct, if logically cohering, categories of reactions. Thus, in both control and experimental groups, the children's specific reactions to teacher-imposed limits are seen to be logically grouped under the five following rubrics:

(a) compliance with limits; (b) cessation of activity, or obedience to teacher's assertion of limitation; (c) reluctant acquiesence to teacher's requests or requirements; (d) response to limit resulting in conformity; and (e) refusal to comply with teacher-imposed limit. In relation to the latter reaction, it is interesting to note that there were two such refusals in each group, or a total of four for both groups.

Table 4. Nature of limits imposed by student teachers in order to control children's unacceptable behavior--experimental group

Nature of limits
A. Making child clean up sawdust from the floor
B. Requiring child to wear his coat
C. Suggesting that child find another chair
D. Taking picture from child
E. Lifting child's arm from water container
F. Telling child not to pound nails into the building blocks
G. Yelling at child and telling him to stop
H. Diverting child by standing in front of light switch
I. Yelling at child, telling him to put turtle back into the water bowl
J. Requiring child not to run on slide
K. Lifting child down from blocks
L. Telling children not to put clay on each other
M. Diverting child by suggesting that he go outside
N. Telling child not to spit
O. Suggesting that child not eat the paste
P. Requiring child to stop pouring water on the floor
Q. Telling child not to throw the blocks
R. Diverting children by suggesting they do something else
S. Requiring child to sit down on slide

It is quite clear, then, that the single obvious difference in the reactions to limits of the two groups of children is revealed only in a questionable significant variation in the number of reactions falling into the various categories. To be sure, the two groups reveal no obvious differences in types of categories of reactions to various limits.

Table 5. Reactions of children to limits imposed on them by their teachers--control group

Reaction of children
A. Complied with teacher's suggestion
B. Ceased the activity objectionable to the teacher
C. Acquiesed to teacher's requirement
D. Complied with teacher's suggestion
E. Complied with teacher's requirement to mop up water
F. Refused to comply. Told teachers to do it
G. Obeyed teacher but with resistance
H. Refused to comply with teacher's requirement, blamed teacher for never letting him do anything
I. Complied once to teacher
J. Complied with teacher's requirement
K. Acquiesed to teacher's suggestion by ceasing to hit her
L. Complied with teacher's request
M. Responded to teacher's requirement

Table 6. Reactions of children to limits imposed on them by their teachers--experimental group

Reaction of children
A. Complied with teacher's requirement
B. Acquiesed to teacher's requirement
C. Ceased the objectionable playing
D. Obeyed teacher but with resistance
E. Refused to comply at first, finally complied to teacher's requirement
F. Responded to teacher's requirement
G. Acquiesed to teacher's request
H. Ceased the activity objectionable to the teacher
I. Complied immediately to teacher's requirement
J. Obeyed teacher's suggestion
K. Complied to teacher's request
L. Obeyed teacher's requirement, but with resistence
M. Responded to teacher's suggestion
N. Refused to comply until threatened
O. Acquiesed to teacher's suggestion
P. Acquiesed to teacher's requirement by leaving the area
Q. Responded to teacher's request
R. Complied to teacher's suggestion
S. Acquiesed to teacher's suggestion

As student teachers interact with the children in the nursery school, they sometimes find it necessary to take recourse to imperative or disciplinary type words and/or phrases in an effort to exert a quality of control over the children that is somewhat more threateningly emphatic and stringent than that which normally inheres in either limit impositions or teacher interferences (to be discussed below).

A tabular delineation of such words and phrases is presented in tables 7 and 8.

A careful observation of the tabular distribution of the various imperative disciplinary words and/or phrases reveals the fact that the restrictively prohibitive word, "Don't" is called into service a total of five times per group of teachers. Indeed, such imperative disciplinary terminology is more frequently utilized than any other category of expression. Other imperative-disciplinary related expressions include "No," "You can't," "Stop it," and a small number of not easily classifiable, if obviously germane, terms.

Table 7. Words and phrases of an imperative or disciplinary character utilized by teachers--control group

Imperative-disciplinary words and phrases
A. Don't hit it so hard! Hit it lightly.
B. Sit down on the slide!
C. Build the blocks out in that direction!
D. Don't mop the table; mop the floor!
E. No, Kim, No! Stop that! You know better than that.
F. Don't use such words any more.
G. Find the lost triangle! And begin marching with the rest of the children.
H. Paint on the paper, not on your hands!
I. Mop up the water! And don't pour any more on the floor.
J. You can't climb on the furniture! It is new, get off the tables.
K. It hurts when you hit people; so don't hit them.

Table 8. Words and phrases of an imperative or disciplinary character utilized by teachers--experimental group

Imperative-disciplinary words and phrases
A. You can't pour sawdust on the floor!
B. Stay out one more minute!
C. Don't do that!
D. Don't pound nails in our blocks!
E. Hang your coat and leggings in your locker! And don't run inside!
F. Don't climb on the furniture, John!
G. No, Linda! You will have to put the turtle back.
H. Don't put clay on Paul's face.
I. Charles, no! You'll have to leave her purse alone.
J. You don't spit at people, Kim. Don't spit, Kim!
K. Stop Gary! Are you listening?
L. Kathy! Put the block down.
M. Play with the clay on the table or I'll have to take it away!

In conclusion, it is again clear that there are no obviously significant differences in the essential nature of the imperative disciplinary terminologies and/or phraseologies indigenous to either the control or experimental groups of student teachers.

As student teachers both participate in and contribute to the various activities and projects composing the nursery children's day-to-day program, they find that they not infrequently intercede or interfere in certain of the children's on-going play which they conclude to be not in the best interest of either the individual child or of the larger group of children.

The essential nature and/or methods of such teacher interference is depicted in tables 9 and 10. Thus, it is immediately recognized that despite a somewhat larger number of interferences indigenous to the experimental group, in neither group is there a markedly different pattern or configuration of methods of interference. Indeed, with but a few, exceptions, found in the control group, the general nature of

the particular methods of interference implemented by the student teachers were essentially alike in their central character. Thus, the more common interferences indigenous to both groups of teachers included diversion, disruption, suggestion, direct requirement, disagreement, explanation, asking or telling, and almost forceful insistence.

Table 9. The essential nature and/or methods of teacher interferences in children's activities--control group

Nature and/or method of interference
A. Interference through a suggestion that child hit board less loudly
B. Cautioning child to paint on easel
C. Insisting child sit down on slide
D. Asking child to look for triangle
E. Disagreeing with child's opinion
F. Suggesting various methods of dancing to the children
G. Teacher choosing book herself, ignoring childs obvious preference
H. Ignoring child's selection by telling her she could have it later
I. Interrupting child's play by asking another child to play with him
J. Telling child he was stacking blocks in wrong direction
K. Giving child a choice, followed by ignoring his choice by selecting item herself
L. Disrupting children's dancing by imposing own methods of dancing
M. Disagreeing with child's opinion followed by imposition of personal opinion
N. Questioning child's response by summoning adult answer
O. Ignoring child's question, resulting in disruption of child's concern
P. Changing child's picture by "touching" it up
Q. Telling child to mop only the table, not the floor
R. Diverting child from picking her nose
S. Insisting that child not climb or stand on blocks
T. Insisting on hanging up child's picture in face of child's direct opposition
U. Disagreeing with child over the meaning of child's response
V. Asking child to pick up blocks
W. Suggesting children paint on wood
X. Imposing methods of dancing on children
Y. Requiring children to discontinue using certain words
Z. Disagreeing with child's opinion

Table 10. The essential nature and/or methods of teacher interferences in children's activities--experimental group

Nature and/or method of interference
A. Injecting explanation through imposition of personal opinion
B. Accomplishing diversion by way of suggesting another alternative
C. Interference by direct requirement
D. Commenting on child's assertion by imposing personal opinion
E. Telling child to discontinue his present activity
F. Consistently insisting on helping child
G. Explaining requirement that child must cease present activity
H. Questioning child's assertion by doubting him
I. Diverting child by suggesting another alternative
J. Asking child question, then making personal response
K. Diversion through process of suggesting another alternative
L. Injecting requirement through process of explanation
M. Diverting child by way of suggestion
N. Directly suggesting another approach
O. Making requirement through direct approach
P. Directly telling child to stop present activity
Q. Injecting explanation through imposing personal opinion
R. Making requirement by direct comment
S. Making requirement by explanation
T. Making requirement by explanation
U. Making requirement by direct approach
V. Diverting child by suggesting another alternative
W. Making requirement by subtle suggestion
X. Diverting child through the process of suggestion
Y. Diverting child through the process of suggestion
Z. Diverting child by directly approaching him
A1. Injecting requirement through subtle suggestion
B1. Injecting requirement through explanation
C1. Injecting requirement through explanation
D1. Diverting child by imposing requirement on him
E1. Injecting requirement through direct approach
F1. Diverting child by way of suggestion
G1. Requiring child to cease present activity
H1. Explanation by way of suggestion

Out of the context and contemporaneity of increasingly complex varieties of relationships that unremittingly obtain between nursery school children and practice teachers emerges an inescapable necessity not only for periodic teacher interference in various, disturbing or objectionable actions of the children, but also for the reciprocal

corrollary occurrence of the children's responses to such interferences.

In fact, the latter phenomena are systematically, if only comparatively, delineated in tables 11 and 12.

Examination of the contents and distribution patterns composing tables 11 and 12 reveal that the various types of children's responses to teacher interferences readily and logically reduce themselves to approximately five general categories of response. Thus, the essential or major responses emerging from both groups of children include the following: (a) the child's reluctant, temporary, or willing compliance with his teachers' interferences, whether they be of a request, requirement, suggestion, or diversionary nature; (b) the child's refusal to comply with specific interferences; (c) the child's reluctant and nonresistant acquiesence to the requirement or request character of teacher interferences; (d) the child's not unsuccessful effort at ignoring the requirement implications indigenous to interferences; and (e) the child's contempt for his teacher and her interference, particularly as such contempt is reflected in his effort at mocking or imitating his teacher.

The essential conclusion emerging from a comparative analysis of tables 11 and 12, then, is that there is an absence of any marked differences in either the number or essential nature of the various responses of the sample children, particularly as such responses are expressed in reaction to interferences that are perpetrated by the student teachers composing both the control and experimental groups.

A central, if not inescapable, consequence indigenous to the essential essence, nature, and structure of the various relationships that repeatedly and unremittingly obtain between nursery school children and practice teachers reveals itself in the elicit imposition of a series of not unimportant destructive adult stereotypes. Moreover,

such stereotypes seem to be most subject to imposition as the student teachers find themselves either without valid, human responses to the nursery school children, or without sufficient personal vision, self-faith, and inner security to stand in the existentiality, integrity, and openness of their respective, personal lives (7).

Table 11. Children's responses to teacher interferences--control group

Children's responses
A. Reluctant, dilatory compliance with teacher's suggestion
B. Willing compliance with teacher's suggestion
C. Willing compliance with teacher's suggestion
D. Willing compliance with teacher's suggestion
E. Unrestrained questioning of teacher's opinion
F. Imitation of teacher's dancing
G. Compliance with teacher's suggestion
H. Refusal to accept teacher's choice
I. Refusal to comply with teacher's suggestion
J. Told teacher to stack blocks herself
K. Some children followed, others refused teacher's suggestion
L. Compliance with the teacher's selection
M. Continued to assert his own opinion
N. Reiterated that his response was correct
O. Compliance with teacher's demand
P. Observed action of teacher, then went outdoors
Q. Compliance with teacher's suggestion
R. Temporary compliance, followed by continuation of initial activity
S. Initially ignored teacher, then defiantly complied
T. Observed action of teacher in a disgusted manner
U. Emphatic denial of teacher's interpretation
V. Deliberate ignoring of teacher's suggestion
W. Compliance with teacher's suggestion
X. Provocational limitation of teacher's movements
Y. Collective compliance with teacher's suggestions
Z. Continued disagreement with teacher, followed by hitting her

A tabular distribution of a number of adult-type stereotypes that were imposed by student teachers composing the control and experimental groups is contained in tables 13 and 14. Thus, as careful analyses of these tables indicate, most contempory adult stereotypes that are subjected to not infrequent impositions address themselves to such

Table 12. Children's responses to teacher interferences--experimental group

Children's responses
A. Left initial play area, moving to another area
B. Willingly complied with teacher's suggestion
C. Cessation of objectionable activity
D. Responded to teacher's comment in serious manner
E. Reticent compliance with teacher's requirement
F. Responded by obeying teacher, though with some resistence
G. Compliance with teacher's requirement
H. Compliance with teacher's requirement
I. Persisted in the assertion that she was right
J. Reluctantly acquiesed to teacher's suggestion
K. Compliance with teacher's opinion
L. Compliance with teacher's suggestions
M. Compliance with teacher's requirement
N. Compliance with teacher's request
O. Cessation of objectionable activity
P. Compliance with teacher's request
Q. Reluctantly complied with teacher's requirement
R. Complied with teacher's requirement
S. Cessation of objectionable activity
T. Compliance with teacher's requirement
U. Refusal to comply with teacher's requirement
V. Reluctantly acquiesed to teacher's requirement
W. Resisted initially, finally complied
X. Reluctantly complied with teacher's requirement
Y. Refused to obey teacher's requirement
Z. Ignored teacher's suggestion
A1. Reluctantly acquiesed to teacher's requirement
B1. Cessation of questionable activity

non-ontological problematics as: (a) adult indulgence in irrelevant, abstract, and status-oriented normative judgments, such as was reflected in one teacher's egotistical asserting, directed to a young child, that she was soon going to marry a medical doctor because, ..."they make lots of money," (b) adult rigidities, insecurity, fantasy neuroses, and loss of individual creativity, as reflected, for example in one student teacher's emphatic denial and near ridicule of a small boy's illuminated assertion that he had bones throughout his entire body including in his hair. It was primarily the latter observation that resulted in the

teachers response of vehement, contempt, and of careless concern regarding the gravity of the small boy's "lying"; (c) adult deceit, adulation of social amenities, and the idolatrous worship of normative, collective standards and longing for belongingness and social acceptance, all of which are reflected in the data composing tables 13 and 14. Indeed, several concrete illustrations of adult deceit are clearly indicated in table 13, of a four year old boy whose vociferous protestations of hate for a little girl in his own group were neither honestly confronted nor openly and caringly encountered by his teacher. In fact, the latter made an effort only at teaching the child to lie about his real feelings. Further, such an effort is succinctly clarified by the teacher's protest, directed at the little girl, "No, he doesn't hate you; we just have lots of fun together." The little boy, however, was thoroughly unimpressed with the fabrications of his teacher.

That the loss of human creativity is not a tragic, indicting, and ubiquitous loss of human creativity is not unimportantly related to contemporary human efforts to live by the tenets of an increasingly growing body of sterile, adult stereotypes is considered to be not only an objective fact, but also a phenomenon of important public awareness. An illustration of the tenaciously, not infrequently utilized stereotypical phenomenon is indicated in table 13. Thus, in response to a child's painting a leaf blue, a student teacher made a specific point of sarcastically asking the little child the question, "Who ever heard of a blue leaf?"

In conclusion, it is clear that the present analysis has revealed that several obvious differences exist between the crucial dimensions of the control and experimental groups. Indeed, the student teachers composing the control group utilized and imposed more than twice as

many adult stereotypes than did the teachers composing the experimental group. Moreover, the control group sample took recourse to stereotypes that were obviously of a more culturally structured, typically adult-type. Hence, they are somewhat more familiar than those utilized by the experiemental group.

Table 13. The nature of adult stereotypes imposed on nursery school children by student teachers--control group

Adult stereotypes
A. In response to child's painting a blue leaf, the teacher objected by asking: Who ever heard of a blue leaf?
B. Teacher: You don't have bones in your hair! You couldn't comb it if you did.
C. What are you making out of that clay?
D. What are you making? It looks to me like a skyscraper.
E. Child says: He hates me! Teacher responds with, No, he doesn't hate you; we just have lots of fun together.
F. In response to child's assertion that if he had a gun he would shoot the teacher, the latter protested, You wouldn't do that would you?
G. Teacher took paint brush and began "touching" up child's picture in order to conform it to her style.
H. In response to one child's deliberate, intentional hitting of another, the teacher said, That was just a love tap wasn't it? to which the offending child argued, No, it wasn't.
I. In response to a little boy's assertion, No, I hate girls, the teacher replied, Oh, you don't either.
J. Upon observing a child's art experiences for a few minutes, a student teacher remarked to her that, It looks like you're pasting leaves on pretty paper.
K. In response to a child's painting of a green sky, a teacher protested that she had never heard of a green sky, and suggested that the painting must be upside down.
L. In response to a child's assertion that she was going to marry a doctor, a student teacher exclaimed, I'm marrying a doctor too, because they make lots of money.

In their numerous, differential relationships with nursery school children, practice teachers must either evolve or inherit at least a medium of personal and/or impersonal modalities of response and reaction.

Table 14. The nature of adult stereotypes imposed on nursery school children by student teachers--experimental group

Adult stereotypes
A. A teacher gave her personal opinion regarding a house which a child had painted. She commented that she didn't think it was a stupid house, that she in fact, liked the house.
B. A teacher told a child that a puzzle piece that was found was a dog's bow tie. The child insisted that it was the dog's tongue, with neither teacher nor child giving in to the other.
C. A child painted a picture, saying that she lived next to Hawaii. The teacher told the child that she didn't live next to Hawaii, despite an ignorance of the meaning of nations to the little girl.
D. A teacher was telling a group of children a story, during which she showed a picture of a lion. One child, however, insisted that it was a kitty cat. The teacher, however, told the child it was a lion, not a kitty cat!
E. One child was telling the other children that she was four years old. However, it was only recently that she turned four, so the teacher insisted she was just four.
F. As the children were eating salt and flour, a teacher also tried it, saying it didn't taste very good. The children disagreed, however, and said that it was very good.

One important dimension of the present study has been addressed to and concerned with the problem of ascertaining even a small amount of reasonably valid understanding of the essential nature of a few, general types of impersonal referents (words and phrases) that the student teachers utilized in responding to such behavioral problematics as interpersonal (teacher-child) difficulties, nursery rule infractions, and related actions.

The results that emerge from the writer's research in relation to this dimension of her study are depicted in tables 15 and 16.

Little or no more than a cursory examination of the data of these tables is required to observe that the control group actively implemented less than half as many impersonal terms, words and/or phrases as did the student teachers composing the experimental group. Of greater research

significance, however, is the fact that in the case of both groups of teachers, the various terminologies or phraseologies can be uniformly, systematically, and logically placed within the context of a taxonomic structure composed of but two, dichatomous categories. Indeed, such categories are almost wholly defined by the presence of several impersonal modalities, all of which are identifiable by two general labels, "Let's," and "We," or "We'll."

Table 15. Types of impersonal referents utilized by student teachers in responding to interpersonal difficulties and rule infractions--control group

Types of impersonal referents
A. When we are inside, we do not stand up on the slide.
B. We paint on paper.
C. Let's read the story, ok.
D. We don't need to mop the table.
E. When we knock blocks down, let's be careful.
F. We can't climb on the furniture. Why don't we get down?
G. We'll have to turn it around.

Thus, it is seen in conclusion that the only obvious difference that obtained between the control and experimental groups is the difference defined by numerical disparity. Hence, and by way of repetition, the experimental group of student teachers employed more than twice as many impersonal modes as did the control group.

Table 16. Types of impersonal referents utilized by student teachers in responding to interpersonal difficulties and rule infractions--experimental group

Types of impersonal referents
A. Let's take the iron over to the ironing board.
B. Let's not pour sawdust on the floor.
C. Why don't we have a hammer on the pounding board?
D. We have a drum to play with.
E. We can't do that at nursery school.
F. You know we don't pound nails in the blocks, don't you?
G. Let's not climb on the lockers.
H. We must not take the turtle out of the bowl.
I. We use our running turns outside.
J. We sit down to use the slide.
K. Let's do something else.
L. Let's not put clay on Paul's face.
M. We'll do this puzzle.
N. Let's try putting some paste on the paper.
O. Should we put the duck up?
P. We don't have any more flags.
Q. We are not going to wrestle inside.

Analysis of student teacher responses

The present section is composed of a non-tabular, expositional analysis of non-exhaustive propositions of the practice teachers' differential attitudes and feelings accruing from and consequent to their program of student teaching.

It should be observed at the outset that the control and experimental groups are composed of a total of 12 student teachers each. Moreover, four groups of nursery school children were in attendance each day, with each group being supervised by and the responsibility of a regularly certified head teacher. Thus, it follows that three student teachers were assigned to each of the four groups of nursery school children, and accomplished their practicum program under the supervision of one of the four permanent head teachers.

In order to prosecute a systematic presentation and analysis of data germane to the present section, the writer has developed five logical, if related, areas or categories of data from which an expositional analysis has been accomplished.

Extent or amount of freedom student teachers experienced during their practicum program. As more developed in Appendix III, the extent to which student teachers felt free to be with and experience the nursery school children differed markedly. Thus, some practice teachers reported feeling completely free to function throughout the quarter in a manner consistent with their hopes, aspirations, and personal preferences. Other teachers, however, amounting to somewhat more than half of the total number, observed that they felt neither completely free nor reasonably comfortable for much of the quarter. A few, however, suggested that they felt increasingly free as the quarter progressed.

A significant conclusion in relation to the amount of freedom enjoyed by the practice teachers is the consistency of the finding that the "felt" presence or absence of such freedom appeared to be more a consequential emergent of the particular head teacher under whom the practice teachers worked than of either the individual student teacher herself or of the particular group in which she did her teaching. Thus, the person of the head teacher served to either free and affirm the practice teachers or to inhibit such freedom and affirmation.

Extent to which student teachers felt free to actively talk to and participate with the children. Not unlike the results discussed immediately above, a significant finding indigenous to the data of the present category reveals that in general the extent to which various practice teachers felt free to talk to, participate with, and idiosyncratically relate to the nursery school children appeared to be quite

directly a function of, or closely associated with, the particular head teacher under whom the student teachers worked. Thus, teachers who indicated that they felt free and comfortable in their practicum experience, as discussed in the section immediately above, also indicated that they felt free to actively talk to and participate with the young children. The converse of this also holds true.

Extent to which student teachers felt limited or confined. Nearly all teachers indicated that they had experienced feelings of being limited or confined.

A central, strategic variable gratuitously served to sensitively differentiate between the teachers' essential expressions regarding the quality and meaning of certain limiting or confining influences. The variable seems to inhere primarily in the not unimportant recognition, derived from an analysis of the actual contents that emerged from the teachers' pertinent responses and expressions, that there is a crucial difference in both the meaning and quality of felt limits. Moreover, such difference seems to be an emergent of the particularity and basic life orientation indigenous to and helping to define the person of each teacher. Thus, while nearly all teachers expressed concern about being limited or confined, only about half of them indicated that they experienced such concern as a consequence of their own personal-experiential fear of doing something in their relationships with the children that could be either potentially or actionally detrimental to the children's well-being.

The remainder of the teachers, however, were unequivocal in their assertions that the major source of their feelings of limitation and confinement were rooted unmistakably in uncomfortably tenuous relationships with their permanent head teacher.

It is clear, then, that while both groups of teachers were required to respond to and utilize the same terminology in describing their experiences in relation to being limited and/or confined were of a vastly different character.

A further finding that is essential to a proper understanding of the data of the present category concerns the specific and/or general factors composing the influences and inhibitions that resulted in the formation of the essential structure of the limits and confining forms that were so inhibiting to many of the teachers' freedom of movement in and experience with the nursery school.

As reported by the student teachers, the most frequently cited factors responsible for limiting and confining their efforts to accomplish a creative job in their practice teaching experience include the following: (a) fear of grade; (b) lack of sufficient freedom to experiment on own initiative; (c) uncomfortable feelings in presence of permanent head teachers; (d) requirement of conformity to rigid schedule of time and place for each activity; (e) the presence of observers, many of whom could be seen by both student teachers and children; (f) presence of too many rules and regulations; (g) presence of and fear in relation to mirrors in observation booth; and (h) conflicting personalities and ideologies.

Teachers' evaluation of personal meaning of practice teaching program. In response to her practice teaching program, each teacher was asked to evaluate the program in terms of its personal meaning and significance, as well as indicating in what way(s) it had been meaningful.

The results of this evaluation reveal that both groups of student teachers considered their student teaching experiences to be either "meaningful," or "very meaningful." Further, the more frequently cited

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The problem

For the past several years, the writer has become increasingly conscious of the young child's unique potential for creating organic relationships and personal responses to the essential essence and evolving structure of his personal, existential, and cosmic world. A recognition of special significance and personal surprise has been the realization that nearly all young children seem quite capable of existing in an alive way in what is commonly referred to as the world of reality.

It has been within the structure of this recognition and in confrontation with the apparent disparity introduced by the nature of adult cognitive, perceptual, and socio-cultural processes and resulting definitions and collective world view that the writer has addressed herself to the problem of the immediate research.

In her effort to prosecute a research project that was amenable to studying the interactions that obtain between small groups of young children and adults, as well as the resulting adult evaluations of such actions and assertions, the writer addressed herself to a research program whose design included two groups of nursery school children and two groups of students who did their practice teaching in the nursery school setting.

The central problem of the present research, then, was a study of the differential responses of two groups of student teachers to the

children with whom they worked in the nursery school.

Methodological procedures

The two groups of student teachers were so constituted as to comprise a control group and an experimental group. The essential variable differentiating the two groups was the elimination of the traditional course content of F.L.C.D. 174 from the curriculum of the experimental group. Such content normally included instructions and advice to student teachers on acceptable types of responses to and normative modalities of interaction with children.

The particular research tools that were employed in prosecuting the present research included a series of non-participant observations and a brief, semi-structured questionnaire. The analysis of data was accomplished through the utilization of tabular comparisons and inferential evaluations.

Summary of findings indigenous to case observations

Some of the more significant findings in regard to the case observations include the following:

1. Although there were slight differences in the specific number and kinds of objectionable behavior that obtained between the children composing the control and experimental groups, there was, in fact, little difference in the essential essence or nature of such behavior. Thus, in both groups the kinds of behavior that repeatedly elicited an effort at control through the imposition of limits fell into three general categories of offense. Such categories included: (a) offenses against nursery school routine, such as turning lights off, climbing on lockers and/or building blocks, refusing to join in regular group activities, and pouring water on the nursery school floor; (b) offenses against the person of the student teacher, such as hitting the teacher with a

hammer, spitting at the teacher, threatening to throw building blocks, and using objectionable words; (c) offenses against other children, such as recklessness in the presence of other children, pushing clay into the faces of each other, and taking toys away from each other.

2. With but one exception, the actual limits that were utilized by both groups of teachers in an effort to effect some measure of control over the non-conforming children were of essentially the same general nature. Hence, such limits as were defined by the actions of requirement, suggestion, diversion, telling, yelling at, and force constituted the entire repetoire of limits utilized by the teachers composing the control group. The repetoire of limits utilized by the teachers in the experimental group included but one additional limit. Such additional limit was a teacher's action of physically extracting a forbidden item from a child's possession.

3. In both control and experimental groups, the children's specific reactions to teacher-imposed limits fell into the following categories: (a) compliance with limits; (b) cessation of activity, or obedience to teacher's assertion of limitation; (c) reluctant acquiesence to teacher's requests or requirements; (d) response to limit resulting in conformity; and (e) refusal to comply with teacher-imposed limit.

4. Of the various imperative-disciplinary type words and/or phrases that were employed by the teachers in an effort to exert a measure of control over the children, "Don't" was more frequently utilized than any other category of expression. Other imperative-disciplinary related expressions included "No," "You can't," "Stop it," and a small number of not easily classifiable, if obviously germane, terms.

5. With but few exceptions, the general nature of the particular methods of interference implemented by the student teachers were

essentially alike in their central character. Thus, the more common interferences indigenous to both groups of teachers included diversion, disruption, suggestion, direct requirement, disagreement, explanation, asking or telling, and almost forceful insistence.

6. The various types of children's responses to teacher interferences readily and logically reduced themselves to five general categories of reaction. The essential or major responses that emerged from both groups of children included the following: (a) the child's reluctant, temporary, or willing compliance with his teacher's interferences, whether they be of a request, requirement, suggestion, or diversionary nature; (b) the child's refusal to comply with specific interferences; (c) the child's reluctant and non-resistant acquiesence to the requirement or request character of teacher interferences; (d) the child's not unsuccessful effort at ignoring the requirement implications indigenous to interferences; and (e) the child's contempt for his teacher and her interference, particularly as such contempt was reflected in his effort to mock or imitate his teacher.

7. The adult stereotypes that were most frequently resorted to by the student teachers included such non-ontological problematics as: (a) indulgence in irrelevant, abstract, and status-oriented normative judgments, such as reflected in one teacher's announcement to a child that she was soon going to marry a medical doctor because, ... "they make lots of money"; (b) adult-rigidities, insecurity, fantasy neuroses, and loss of individual creativity, as reflected in one student teacher's emphatic denial and near ridicule of a small boy's illuminated assertion that he had bones throughout his entire body including in his hair. It was primarily the latter observation that resulted in the teachers response of vehemence, contempt, and careless concern regarding

the "gravity" of the small boy's "lying"; (c) adult deceit, adulation of social amenities, and idolatrous worship of normative, collective standards and longing for belongingness and social acceptance.

8. The control group of teachers actively implemented less than half as many impersonal terms, words and/or phrases as did the student teachers composing the experimental group. In the case of both groups of teachers, however, the various terminologies or phraseologies systematically and logically grouped themselves into the following dichotomous categories: (a) "Let's," (b) "We," or "We'll."

Summary of findings indigenous to student teacher responses

Some of the more significant findings in regard to the student teacher responses include the following:

1. Some practice teachers reported feeling completely free to function throughout the quarter in a manner consistent with their hopes, aspirations, and personal preferences. Other teachers, however, amounting to somewhat more than half of the total number, observed that they felt neither completely free nor reasonably comfortable for much of the quarter. A number of them suggested that they felt increasingly free as the quarter progressed.

2. The extent to which various practice teachers felt free to talk to, participate with, and idiosyncratically relate to the nursery school children appeared to be quite directly a function of, or closely associated with, the particular head teacher under whom the student teachers worked. Thus, teachers who indicated that they felt free and comfortable in their practicum experience also indicated that they felt free to actively talk to and participate with the young children. The converse of this also holds true.

3. Nearly all teachers indicated that they had experienced feelings of being limited or confined. The factors which were most frequently cited as being responsible for limiting and confining their efforts to accomplish a creative job in their practice teaching experience included the following: (a) fear of grade; (b) lack of sufficient freedom to experiment on own initiative; (c) uncomfortable feelings in presence of permanent head teachers; (d) requirement of conformity to rigid schedule of time and place for each activity; (e) the presence of observers, many of whom could be seen by both student teachers and children; (f) presence of too many rules and regulations; (g) presence of and fear in relation to mirrors in observation booth; and (h) conflicting personalities and ideologies.

4. Both groups of student teachers considered their student teaching experiences to be either "meaningful," or "very meaningful." Further, the more frequently cited realms of meaning reduced themselves to three general categories, including increased self-other understanding, increased confidence to rear family, and increased confidence in ability to teach young children.

5. The teachers' specific suggestions for the improvement of the nursery school program in practice teaching were essentially derived from the factors considered to be responsible for and resulting in the limits that were served to inhibit the freedom and effectiveness of the individual teachers. The aggregate of suggestions for program improvement grouped themselves into the following categories: (a) the elimination of a grade as a major source of motivation; (b) the granting of a significantly greater measure of freedom to student teachers in the initial phases of their experience in the laboratory program; (c) the elimination

of rigid schedules; (d) a reduction in the excessive number of rules and regulations; (e) a reduction in the number of observers; (f) alteration in the nature of the observation booth mirrors; and (g) the inauguration of more give and take between teachers and student teachers.

Conclusions and interpretation

One of the more significant general conclusions that emerged from the data composing the case observations is that, contrary to the writer's expectations, no consistent configurational structure of obvious or marked differences obtained between the control and experimental groups. The only exceptions to this conclusion were primarily in terms of the changing quantity of items that composed the various tables. The essential nature of such items differed very little. Indeed, with but two exceptions the items indigenous to both groups consistently fell into the same categories of logical classification.

It is the writer's opinion that the absence of a relatively consistent pattern of differences between the two groups is most logically explained in the probability that the dimension that was assumed to comprise the differentiating variable between the two groups did not actually obtain. Thus, it appears that the course content of F.L.C.D. 174 was essentially the same for both groups of student teachers. Hence, both groups apparently received very similar information and suggestions regarding their practice teaching experience.

A significant conclusion in relation to the amount of freedom enjoyed by the practice teachers is the consistency of the finding that the "felt" presence or absence of such freedom appeared to be more a consequential emergent of the particular head teacher under whom the practice teachers worked than of either the individual student teacher herself or of the particular group in which she did her teaching. Thus,

the person of the head teacher served to either free and affirm the practice teachers or to inhibit such freedom and affirmation.

A central, strategic variable gratuitously served to sensitively differentiate between the teachers' essential expressions regarding the quality and meaning of certain limiting or confining influences. The variable seemed to inhere primarily in the not unimportant recognition that there is a crucial difference in both the meaning and quality of felt limits. Moreover, such difference seemed to be an emergent of the particularity and basic life orientation indigenous to and helping to define the person of each teacher. Thus, while nearly all teachers expressed concern about being limited or confined, only about half of them indicated that they experienced such concern as a consequence of their own personal-experiential fear of doing something in their relationships with the children that could be either potentially or actionally detrimental to the children's well-being.

The remainder of the teachers, however, were unequivocal in their assertions that the major source of their feelings of limitation and confinement were rooted unmistakably in uncomfortably tenuous relationships with their permanent head teacher.

It is clear, then, that while both groups of teachers were required to respond to and utilize the same terminology in describing their experiences in relation to being limited and or confined, such experiences were actually of a vastly different character.

Suggestions for further studies

On the basis of the present study, it is the writer's opinion that similar studies should be done in which a more rigorous controlling of groups is accomplished. It would seem especially desirable that research on the qualitative effects of differentially structured methods classes

or practice teachers be prosecuted.

A type of study that should receive top priority is one that researches the differential experiences of multiple groups of student teachers in which one or more of the groups would not take any classes or nursery school methods or procedures.

A further area of research that should receive attention is the measurement of the impact of more than one head teacher per quarter on the practice teachers.

Finally, studies of the same design and purpose as the present one should be accomplished in other areas of the country. Such a procedure would serve as a check on the generalizability of research

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX I-A

Sample Five Case Observations (Control Group)

While three children were playing in the play house area Janet bumped against Kevin. Kevin's reaction was an immediate assertion, "Ouch, you hit my vaccination," to which Janet responded with the observation that her father gave her a vaccination. Upon hearing the conversation Miss D. asked Janet if her father was a doctor. Janet knodded that he was. Miss D. then suggested that soon she was going to marry a doctor, to which Janet responded by asking why she was going to marry a doctor. Miss D's. answer was, "Because they make lots of money." Jill then joined the conversation by saying, "I'm going to marry a girl," to which Miss D. responded by explaining that she couldn't marry a girl because she was a girl. Jill, however, simply repeated her determination to marry a girl, resulting in no further comment by Miss D.

As Jeff was painting a picture at the easel, the brush he was using happened to touch his hand. He apparently liked the effect, and so proceeded to paint his entire hand green. Miss E., who walked by and noticed that he had painted his hand green, said, "We paint on the paper, not our hands." So Jeff went over and washed the green paint from his hand, then returned to painting his picture.

While Larry was playing with the section blocks which range in size from about 3" x 3" to 3" x 5". Miss D. asked, "What are you making?" "A house," retorted Larry. "Oh," continued Miss D., "It looks to me

more like a New York sky scraper." "Doesn't it look like that to you?" "What is a sky scraper?" asked Larry, to which Miss D. simply repeated, "A tall building like you're making."

Charles was painting a picture at the easel. Upon completing the picture, he approached Miss F., tugged at her skirt, and forced her attention to his picture. Thus, Miss F., accompanying Charles to the easel, looked at Charles' picture. She then took a paint brush and began "touching" up the picture, stepping back periodically to admire the results of her work. When she finally completed touching up the picture, Miss F. said, "It looks better now, doesn't it?"

An item of nursery school equipment that is legitimately used both inside and outside of the school is a slide. This particular slide is large enough to accommodate more than one child simultaneously. During the time of the present incident Harry persisted in standing upright on top of the slide. On seeing him do so, however, Miss A. walked over to the slide and reminded, "When we are inside we do not stand up but we sit down on the slide." Harry acquiesed, and sat down to continue sliding.

APPENDIX I-B

Sample Five Case Observations (Experimental Group)

While dancing to a record, several children were making use of a number of scarfs. Bothered by their particular use of the scarfs, Miss E. told them, both verbally and by demonstration, to dance in such a way as to allow the scarfs to flow through the air as they made their turns. Somewhat discouraged by Miss E's. interference, only a few of the children even tried to comply with her directions. The remainder either quit dancing entirely, or simply began jumping up and down.

A number of children were pasting leaves on paper of various colors. Paul, however, was painting at the easel though he would sometimes step aside from the easel to watch the children paste their leaves on paper. Finally he went to the table, picked up a leaf in his hand and painted both the leaf and his hand blue. As Miss B. was walking past some of the children, Paul held up his leaf to show her how pretty he had painted it. Miss B. responded by asking, "Who ever heard of a blue leaf?"

After playing outside Gary came into the nursery school saying, "I want to hear a story." Miss A. replied that she would read him a story if he would like her to. Thus, the two of them proceeded to the book rack, where upon Gary immediately reached for a book which was on one of the shelves. Miss A. picked out a book however, and asked, "Don't you like this book?" "Let's read this story, ok?" Hence, they both sat down while Gary listened to the story Miss A. had chosen.

On the particular day of this incident, Lynn was wandering around the room, plucking his cheeks with his fingers. As he approached Miss D., he began telling her that his face was made of skin, that, "I've got bones, bones in my arms (as he holds his arms out), bones in my head, and bones in my hair." To the latter, Miss D. said, "You don't have bones in your hair; you can't comb bones." "Oh yes I can," Lynn protested. "No," said Miss D. as she continued, "Our hair is not made up of bones; it is fine and that is why we use a comb to comb it. If our hair was made of bones we couldn't use a comb." With a sigh of exasperation and finality, Lynn replied, "Maybe your hair isn't made out of bones, but my hair is." He then walked away from Miss D.

Three children were sitting at a table playing with the wet, moist clay. Miss F. walked up to the table and asked the children what they were making? To which Gary replied simply, "Just clay." Not yet satisfied, however, Miss F. continued the questioning, "What is that your making out of the clay?" But once again Gary reassured her, "Just clay."

APPENDIX II

Semi-Structured Questionnaire

1. Did you feel free with the children while student teaching in the nursery school?

2. Were you able to talk to the children and to participate with them as you would have liked to?

3. Did you feel limited or confined in your experience because of the fear you might be doing something wrong?

4. Was this a meaningful experience for you? If so, in what particular way was it meaningful?

5. Do you have any suggestions that you think might have made the practice teaching experience more enjoyable and meaningful?

APPENDIX II-A

Student Answers to Questionnaire (Control Group)

Student teacher A

1. No, because I wasn't able to do the things the way I wanted to, and was under too strict supervision. For example, when there was interaction between two children I had to stop it, despite the fact that I would have liked to have let it go on longer.

2. In relation to talking and conversing with them, yes. And I felt pretty free in participating with them I think I did this as freely as otherwise.

3. Definitely. I did feel limited in this experience, fearing that I might do something which the head teacher would not like. Also, the fear of a grade was part of the difficulty, I would have liked to do what I wanted and when I wanted, without being pushed.

4. Yes, I think it was meaningful, but could have been more so. It was meaningful in that you can be with the children and watch them grow. I feel that I have grown by being with children. I understand my own feelings more, as well as understanding the children better. It has also been meaningful to work with a person with whom I had a personality clash, resulting in my having to learn how to work with her. I feel this has been growth promoting on my part.

5. I don't feel it is necessary to have schedules at all. The teachers can look around and go where they are needed. I think we need to look more at developing a philosophy about children and working with them. I don't think we look at this enough.

   I wouldn't like to change in the middle of the quarter as far as the children are concerned. For the teachers, however, I think it would be good to work under another head teacher.

   If the teachers were given more freedom and not so much supervision, it may be more meaningful.

Student teacher B

1. Yes, more so towards the last part of the quarter. Part of the reason for not feeling so much the first of the quarter was because of the head teacher, because I didn't go along with some of her views.

2. Yes, as far as participating in music, and some other areas when I could relate the way I wanted to, when I was sure it would be accepted. At other times I couldn't relate well because I couldn't relate the way I wanted to. For example, I didn't feel we could

follow through with an experience because the head teacher would interrupt and take over.

3. Yes, the first part of the quarter; the last part of the quarter I haven't cared. Maybe because I've been able to relate to the children more so at the end of the quarter. Did more of what I wanted to do and didn't listen to her.

4. Yes, I think it was a meaningful experience because of being able to be with the children directly and not through a text book. So many things are realized through direct experience that aren't even brought out in a text book. It makes you realize things aren't so simple with children.

5. I feel the only way you can learn something is to do it, whether the head teacher feels you should or not. Let the teachers try out more things on their own and find out for themselves.

Student teacher C

1. At times I felt limited, and felt that I did not have the opportunity to carry out my activities as I would have liked to. Most of the time, however, I felt free.

2. I think so, yes. I felt like I could talk with them and participate with them as I wanted to.

3. It wasn't that I felt I was doing something wrong, I just felt I would have let certain situations continue on a little longer than they were allowed to.

4. Yes, I felt it was a very meaningful experience, because you can read all the books and say how you would carry out an experience, but only when you're involved and participating in one do you really learn. I become more aware of individual differences in children and their ages, such as social, physical, etc.

5. I think the program is fine; the only thing I can suggest is for the head teacher to give the practice teachers more freedom, and to keep in mind that they learn through experience.
   I like staying with one group of children all quarter and would advise this. Through associating with them, the children benefit by this as much as do the teachers.

Student teacher D

1. It depends. Somedays I felt freer than I did other days, and I felt freer toward the last of the quarter than the first. This, I think, would also depend on how the day had gone for the children.

2. Now I'm more able to participate as I would like to. At first it was more in trying to get the children interested in nursery school. Also, I think I felt freer because we were able to wear slacks, and were permitted to participate with the children in all kinds of activities.

3. At first, yes; but now I do what I think and how I feel. I now respond not so much to what others think. I felt uneasy for fear I wasn't giving the positive point of view at first.

4. Nursery School was a very meaningful experience to me. Even though I've been around children, I've never had to teach them in an indirect manner. It has broadened my point of view about children, and has made me realize more than ever that each child is an individual and should be treated as such.

5. The idea of changing practice teachers in the middle of the year is a good idea from the practice teachers' point of view, but not from the child's point of view. I think they are starting to feel comfortable and beginning to test the teachers out in terms of limits.

   Also feel it would be a good idea to observe the other head teachers and find out their philosophies.

Student teacher E

1. As free as I thought I could, as free as I'm able to be with children.

2. I think I have. I've been able to participate as I wanted to, more even than I thought I would be able to when I started.

3. Yes, at times, especially when the children wouldn't listen to you and you didn't want to create too much comotion by forcing them. And I feel limited when I know Mrs. Lewis is observing.

4. It has been real meaningful. I've gotten to know alot of different children and how they are different. Also, I've discovered that direct discipline isn't the only way of understanding all children, that there is a different way for each child. And I feel that it will help me in my student teaching with elementary children.

5. It might be a little more meaningful to change in the middle of the quarter in order to get two different teaching technique points of view.

Student teacher F

1. Yes, and more so as long as I knew no one was in the booth.

2. Yes, after awhile. One reason I think it took me longer is because I've never been around children before in my life. Most of the time I can participate with most of the children very well, except for a couple of children.

3. At first I did. Now I don't, except when Mrs. Lewis comes around, It depends on what I'm doing; sometimes I know I'm doing things that are wrong, but I know they are wrong.

4. Yes, mostly I guess because I've gotten over my fear of being around children.

5. Better preparation before we start student teaching, such as having more experience with the children before beginning to teach, and having classes more practical in orientation.

I don't like the idea of changing teachers in the middle of the quarter because we are just getting to know the children.

Student teacher G

1. Yes, quite free. I think I felt free because of the head teacher being liberal in her philosophy of teaching. I also felt free because we worked so closely together with the head teacher.

2. Yes, very free. The head teacher encouraged us to do this. I was able to talk to the children, and to try out my own ways without fear of being critized. We can find out only by doing things by and for ourselves.

3. No, definitely not. Our head teacher let us try our own ways. We were able to evaluate and discover our own mistakes.

4. Well, it was meaningful in the sense of working with children and in having the opportunity of being with young children. I have never been around young children before and feel that this has helped me to establish a philosophy of child development. Being exposed to different teachers, to the liberality of the head teacher, and to the freedom to try out my own methods was most helpful.

5. Devote more times to evaluation. I also think it would be a good idea to have the opportunity of having Mrs. Lewis, Dr. Carter and Dr. Christensen talk to us, and tell us what bothers them rather than having to learn about it through the grapevine.

Student teacher H

1. Yes, the head teacher allowed us the freedom to carry out our ideas and to learn by personal experience.

2. Yes. I felt that I could participate and talk with the children whenever I wanted to; in fact, we were encouraged to do this.

3. Yes, I felt some fear in the sense that I might handle some situation wrong, not because of the observation booth or the head teacher but because of the fear that I might be hurting the child in some way.

4. Yes, it was definitely a meaningful experience; a good experience in learning how to redirect children, to get to know children, and to watch their personalities develop. It was also a good experience in getting to know your self more fully. Further, we got an actual chance to try out for ourselves what children can and can't do, rather than taking it for granted from a book.

5. It would be helpful if there were some way we could know more about the background of the child on whom were doing our individual study.

Student teacher I

1. Yes, I felt at home. I've been around children a lot; consequently, I felt free with them. I think I felt less free during my head teacher week. Also, I felt freer toward the end of the quarter than I did at the beginning. I think the reason I felt more free later in the quarter was because I had gotten used to the observation booth.

2. I think so, yes.

3. Well, I don't think so; though I sometimes hesitated to do things because I didn't know how far to let the children go before setting limits.

4. It was very meaningful for me; for I now have a greater understanding of children, can now more fully understand their feelings, and have also learned alot about myself.

5. I feel it may be more meaningful to be under two different teachers, though not necessarily more enjoyable. I have some question about how this would effect the children, however; but I feel the teachers are here to learn.

Student teacher J

1. Yes, really. I felt like I had all the freedom I needed to do what I thought was right. I felt completely at ease.

2. Yes, I was. I feel I have been especially free to talk and dance with Jean. But I have felt comfortable with all of the children in other ways.

3. I never once felt my actual fear of doing something wrong, I sometimes wondered if the children might be doing something they shouldn't do--like using straws in the water tank. But I was never afraid to express how I felt.

4. Oh, yes. It has been really meaningful. I felt like I was able to get close to the children, and to really help them. It gave me a better understanding of children and the ways they grow up.
   The experience was completely what I wanted it to be. I feel it will help me in my future relationships with children.

5. I didn't like schedules. I like to feel that I can do what is right when I'm needed, and not have to confined to a certain place at a certain time. I don't have any other complaints and wouldn't change my experience at all. When I was head teacher I felt that I was completely in charge; and what could be more meaningful than that?

Student teacher K

1. Yes, I did. It varied, however, with how I felt, but for the most part I did feel free.

2. Yes. I know I did and said alot of things that were wrong, but this is how I learned. When I did things wrong, I was able to analyze them, and to learn from the experience.

3. I did one week because I had been told by another head teacher how to handle various situations, what to say, and how to do it. After I got over this I was alright, and didn't worry about doing anything wrong.

4. Yes, it was. I felt like I was doing it myself, like it was me doing it. Also, I enjoyed the children and the experience of being with them.

5. I feel it is a good idea to stay in one group all quarter. In fact, I feel like I'm just now beginning to know the children.

Student teacher L

1. Yes, I think I really did more than if I had been in another group because I related well with the head teacher.

2. With some of the children I did more so than others. I feel I related alot more to boys than girls; I don't try to relate to girls as much as I should.

3. Well, I don't feel that I was limited. Sometimes I felt I wasn't doing things right, and felt uncomfortable for that reason. Often I felt I could do it better if I could think about it for a minute. Never feared I was doing anything wrong, but sometimes didn't like the way I was handeling things.

4. Well, I think it was the most meaningful experience in my child development training. I think practical experience has done alot more for me than any reading I've done.

5. I think that before one begins to student teach in the nursery school she should have had the experience of being with a certain group of children regularly; also, she should have had the opportunity of leading a group in some such activity as telling a story, science experience, or music.

   I also think the teachers need to wear an apron with a large pocket in which they could carry a small notebook and pencil to use for jotting down things that happen during the day, and which can be discussed later during evaluation. I believe this procedure would benefit those who haven't been able to actually observe the activities. Through this procedure the various teachers would more fully recognize growth, goals and progress of the children, and find goals to set up themselves. This way they could be looking for things and not just happening to notice them.

APPENDIX II-B

Student Answers to Questionnaire (Experimental Group)

Student teacher A

1. Yes, except I sometimes felt stumped in not knowing what to say or do in response to some of the things that children say to you.

2. In general I was able to talk to the children and to participate with them as I wanted to. The one exception to this was in relation to dancing.

3. Yes, to some extent. The booth was a source of concern to me, as was my grade. I was afraid that the latter might be influenced by my mistakes. Also, I think one always feels somewhat limited and confined as a consequence of feeling under supervision.

4. Yes. I was able to learn more about what children are like at this particular age, and to discover the things they are able to do. I've always liked children; and I feel apart of them and enjoy being around them.

5. Yes. I don't feel we get enough out of Friday. Only the hour we spend in preparing for the following week seems justified. I think we should spend more time expressing how we feel, rather than spend-so much time on how the teacher feels.

Student teacher B

1. Yes, but especially after the week the head teacher was absent. Following that experience I was able to be more free with the children. It was up to us and we did what we thought was best. And as the quarter progressed, I felt I gained more confidence and was more free.

2. Yes, I think so. I enjoyed being with them. When I had my peddle pushers on I felt I could participate more comfortably. It seemed too, that the children were more comfortable then.

3. Yes, at first. But as time progressed, I felt less limited and confined. My greatest worry was that I might hurt a child's feelings. Also, I worried some about my grade. I feared that if I did something wrong it might be reflected in my grade. This, then, was limiting.

4. Yes. I love to work with children. At first, however, I didn't know whether I wanted to come the next day or not. But the fact that each child is different and special to you made it possible to

enjoy each day more as the quarter progressed. I feel I can now talk to a child and enjoy this, without having to worry about or guess what to say.

5. Yes. I felt that there was a little too much strictness, too much teacher guidance. We were not as free as we should be in order to find out for our own selves.

Student teacher C

1. Yes, to quite an extent. While there were certain things you could do and certain things you couldn't, I didn't feel free enough to do the things I really wanted to do. When I didn't know what to do, I simply went along with what other people said. One thing that bothered me was the prejudice against guns and running in the nursery school. I would liked to have tried both of these. It was sort of like being able to do what you wanted, but not being able to.

2. No, not as much as I would have liked. Quite often I was told I was doing something wrong. For example, when the children were in the block area, I was told to tell them to get down out of the window. So, I said Miss N wants you to get down. Immediately, however, Miss N said I should have told them I wanted them to get down. But the truth was that I didn't care whether they got down or not. It certainly didn't bother me.

   In a lot of cases I wasn't able to talk to the children very freely. When I got to know them I could talk to them more freely, though I still could not try out the things I wanted.

3. Yes, I did. I wanted to tell a bear story, but my supervising teacher said I couldn't for our flannel story. Also, I felt that if I did what I really wanted to do instead of what I was supposed to do, my grade would be cut. This fear was certainly condining.

4. Yes, I've really enjoyed it. Even though we were limited I feel we can put into practice what we have learned in our work in child development. The experience of trial and error, trying to learn patience, and getting along with children has been meaningful.

5. Yes. I think the head teacher should be easier to talk to and confide in. Also, I wish that we could have had more freedom to try new things out. Finally why do we have to be in a certain place and doing a certain thing at a certain time?

Student teacher D

1. Yes, although I didn't at first because of the observers. I felt I had to handle one child with kid gloves for fear he might explode and create a big scene in front of the observers. I think I felt this way because I had been told about this child before I met him. Consequently, I didn't feel free with him.

2. Yes, except I wish I could have felt more apart of it on someone else's head teacher week. I felt as though I was there solely to help them, rather than feeling like I could initiate something myself.

3. No, not very much at all. I have felt that what I did or wanted to do was acceptable.

4. Yes, because I now feel more free in trying out experiments with them. Also, I have gained more self-confidence with children, and have learned many new creative activities. Also, learning to work with other teachers has been a good experience.

5. Should work it out some way so that one teacher doesn't have a whole week at first. A full week alone at the end of the quarter would be better.

Student teacher E

1. I didn't at first. It was hard to get used to the observation booth, and to get to know the children. After the initial adjustment, however, I have felt quite free, although I still feel freer with some of the children than I do with others.

2. Not at first. It was part of the process of getting used to the nursery school. Now I feel better about participating with the children, although I'm still not as free as I would like to be.

3. I think so, especially at first. Gradually, however, as I gained more confidence in myself, the booth became less and less of a limitation. I normally didn't think about my grade until after I had done something which I felt was wrong.

4. Yes. Even if I were to stop school now, this experience will help so much in rearing my own family. Nursery school helps you to develop that little extra patience that you often think you do not have. Also, it helps you to learn how to get along with other people, both children and adults (teachers).

5. I do think the idea of changing head teachers in the middle of the quarter is good because it gives you more experience in working with people with different points of view. We should spend more of each Friday in preparing for the following week.

Student teacher F

1. I think I felt quite free, although I felt freer on some days than I did on others. Part of this difference was a function of knowing that people were observing you from behind the screens. As time went on, however, I was able to feel more free.

2. Usually. However, I found that I would often stop to assess whether or not I was using positive guidance and acceptable language in talking and relating to the children. Whenever I did this I know that I was not responding in terms of how I really felt.

3. Yes, to a certain degree. I did feel somewhat limited because of the fear of a grade. I never felt a fear of actually doing something wrong, but, rather, that others might think it was wrong. I sometimes felt restricted because of set standards and the

expectation of conformity.

4. Yes, it was very meaningful experience. Frequently I could see myself through these children. Thus, I learned many things about both myself and others that will always be helpful to me. For example, I learned to recognize and understand the needs of children more fully, as well as the importance of the child's home background. Also, I acquired a new respect for children.

5. Yes. I believe that on her head teacher week, the practice teacher should have complete control over and supervision of the entire nursery school. In other words, we should not be given suggestions by others unless we ask for them. We should be left more free to experiment. Also, I think we should not know or be told who is observing us.

When we are not head teacher, I think we should let the other head teachers tell us what to do. We should know when we need help.

Student teacher G

1. At first I really didn't. In fact, I guess it has been only the last couple of weeks that I've felt reasonably free. I didn't know the children, and I guess it just took time. I don't know how this could have been avoided.

2. At first I didn't know how to respond to the children. I knew neither what my limits were nor what my position or role was. Now, however, I feel much more comfortable, and enjoy my relationships more. Some children I have been able to respond to really well, whereas with others I have not.

3. Yes. When one works with children and has had so much theory she often wonders what she should do. For example, I've been told to let children go when I would liked to have stopped them, and vice versa. This inevitably has a limiting effect. Also, I have had some fear of a grade. My biggest fear, however, has been that I might hurt the children. I have never felt that I really knew what was best for them.

4. Yes, it was meaningful. For one thing, I now realize that the best guidance is a good relationship with the children. My feeling of life by being with children has given me better understanding of myself.

5. If I had known my limits at the outset of the quarter, it might have made the experience more meaningful.

Student teacher H

1. I didn't at first, but I do now. In fact, with the passage of time I have felt increasingly free, and have found new confidence in myself and my abilities. Also, my relationships with the children have gradually improved.

2. I don't think one can ever do this at the beginning. But, as I become better acquainted with the children and the new situation, I was able to talk with them more as I wanted to.

3. I felt very limited during the first part of the quarter. The mirrors and fear of my supervisor were particular limiting to me. I did not feel free to express myself in the way I felt was right because of the fear I might be doing something wrong, and the fear of a grade. Sometimes I was uneasy because I felt the head teacher considered herself superior to the rest of us.

4. Yes, it was meaningful. I think one of the biggest things is that I've learned alot about myself, and what is important to me. I've learned about children, and I've come to love and appreciate them more.

5. Yes, I wish we didn't have to have the mirrors. They seem to help create an artificial atmosphere.

Student teacher I

1. Yes. I've been a teacher in nursery school in a junior college before; this may have helped me feel freer than I would have felt otherwise. I did feel a little clumsy at dancing, however.

2. At first I was just feeling my way around. Now, however, I can talk to and participate with the children as I want to.

3. Yes, at first I did. In fact, I would never say anything without first evaluating the appropriateness of what I interpreted saying. Now it comes more naturally, and I don't stop to think about it.

4. Yes, I've never felt more free, especially on Friday. It has helped me to learn how to talk out my feelings and to understand myself better. Also, it has helped me to define my own goals, for both nursery school and my own family.

5. I think our head teacher could have helped us more by assisting us in the preparation of materials, by helping us get started, and by helping eliminate the feeling of competition among the practice teachers.

Student teacher J

1. I didn't at first, though I do now. It was just a matter of gathering the confidence.

2. I couldn't at first. I think I tried to talk too much and reason with the children, rather than trying to see the problem from both sides, mine and theirs.

3. I still fear that I might be doing something wrong, particularly with one child. I don't have any fear of a grade, however, I fear only what I might do to the children.

4. Yes, because I can see how important it is in helping children to think positively. Also, it was meaningful in that it allowed me to see children grow and change.

5. The only suggestion I have is that I would have liked the lab for a full year.

Student teacher K

1. Definitely; I have felt completely free. Throughout my experience I have felt that I was free to use my own ideas and initiative in my relationships and work with the children.

2. Yes, I have felt free to talk to and participate with the children as I have wanted. The only exception to this was when I was head teacher. Then, I felt like I was overlooking the things that needed attention, and that I might have been too hasty in my actions or judgement.

3. I did at first. But within a week I felt completely at ease. The head teacher gave us the feeling that we were important and that our judgements were valid.

4. Yes, it has been very meaningful. I now more fully realize what children do mean. It's so important to know how they feel, why they feel as they do, and what my relationship with them does to both.

5. I think there should be less noise in the observation booth. Also, I do not think we should be told when we are being observed. Finally, I think it would be good to have the head teacher begin and end each quarter as head teacher. This would allow the practice teachers to relate more to the children before they leave.

Student teacher L

1. Very definitely. I don't feel we had any competition between the teachers; for this reason we have felt increasingly free with the children. There was never any worry about what the head teacher was going to think if we did various things with the children. Also, I feel that not having a schedule indicating where, and when, I was supposed to be allowed me greater freedom and confidence.

2. Yes, although I sometimes wondered about how far I should go in entering into their play, since I liked playing with them so much.

3. Only when I felt like I might be doing something wrong. I worried about my influence on the children, for I did not want to hurt them.

4. Yes, very definitely. I feel that the confidence I have gained in working with children means a great deal to me. Also, I liked the opportunity of getting closer to children, as you can do with a small group of children. Finally I feel that the friends I have gained and the experiences I've had with them will help me throughout my life.

5. No, except that I do not like the mirrors in the observation booth. I sometimes felt that I was putting on a show for those in the booth.

LITERATURE CITED

(1) Appel, M. H. "Aggressive Behavior in Nursery School Children and Adult Procedures in Dealing with such Behavior." Journal Exceptional Education 11: 185-199. 1942-43.

(2) Body, Margaret K. "Patterns of Aggression in the Nursery School." Child Development 26: 3-11. March 1955.

(3) Cambell, Reva Edith. "A Study of Aggressive Behavior in Nursery School Children from Families of Two Socio-Economic Levels." Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Tennessee, 1952.

(4) Christensen, Glen A. "Integrity, Responsibility and Psychotherapy." (To be published in forthcoming issue of American Journal of Psychoanalysis.)

(5) Ellis, D. B., and L. W. Miller. "Teachers' Attitudes and Child Behavior Problems." Journal Educational Psychology 27: 501-511. 1936.

(6) Johoda, Marie, et al. Research Methods in Social Relations. Part I. New York: The Dryden Press. 1951.

(7) Moustakas, Clark E. ed, The Self: Explorations in Personal Growth. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers. 1956.

(8) Moustakas, Clark E. ed, The Teacher and the Child: Personal Interaction in the Classroom. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1956.

(9) Moustakas, Clark E. ed, Psychotherapy With Children: The Living Relationship. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers. 1959.

(10) Moustakas, Clark E. ed, The Alive and Growing Teacher. New York: Philosophical Library. 1959.

(11) Rogers, Carl R. Client-Centered Therapy. Boston: Houghton-Miffin Company. 1951.

(12) Sparks, J. W. "Teachers' Attitudes Toward the Behavior Problems of Children." Journal Educational Psychology 43: 284-291. 1952.

(13) Taba, Hilda. "How Adults Influence Children." Childhood Education 36: 200. 1959.