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INTRODUCTION

A child development laboratory in a university finds its first justification in its ability to contribute to the education of college students. After this justification has been established, the laboratory has a responsibility for serving the children enrolled in it.

The Child Development Laboratory at Utah State University serves college students in several ways. Students are able to observe and participate in the nursery school laboratory through experiences in various courses. The culmination of their course work comes when, as juniors or seniors, they do student teaching in the nursery school.

Some of the purposes the nursery school attempts to accomplish are to increase the development of students' understanding of children, to help them feel secure and comfortable with children; to make students aware of children's normal growth expectancies and aware of children's needs; to help students learn techniques of guidance so that they may eventually develop their own philosophy of guidance; to help clarify the concept of "freedom within limits"; to increase students' enjoyment of children; and to increase understanding of one's self.

The values of the nursery school to children is perhaps best expressed in the philosophy as it was expressed by Louise Godfrey (7):

We see the nursery school as a place where the child is valued as a real person possessing a spontaneity and a creative sensitivity to life.

We see the nursery school as a place where the child should be able to find a new and oftentimes better image of himself.

We see the nursery school as a place where the child can make his
own discoveries--where he is allowed to solve many of his own problems--whether the discovery or the problem involves constructing a gabled roof of blocks, covering one's arms with fingerpaint, or seeing the result of red poured in blue poured in yellow.

We see the nursery school as a place where the child encounters other human needs and desires and ideas besides his own--where he learns to live with each.

Most importantly, we see the nursery school as a place where the child is allowed to be a child. (7, p. 1)

Throughout the different courses that in which students study the development of children and theories of guidance, attitudes toward child behavior are formed. These attitudes may change as a result of the nursery school student teaching experience where the students have close daily contact with three and four year old children, and are confronted with practical realities and experience.

The words "child development laboratory" and "nursery school" as they are used in this thesis may be considered to be synonymous.

Statement of Problem

The problem of this study has been to determine what change in attitudes toward child aggression and dependency, if any, takes place as a result of student teaching in the nursery school. The study was concerned with the following problems:

1. What are the attitudes of child development laboratory student teachers toward child aggression and dependency before the experience of teaching in the laboratory?

2. Do student teachers' attitudes toward child behavior change as a result of student teaching in the laboratory?

3. If changes in attitudes do occur, what is the nature of the change?
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Few studies have been done concerning attitudes of student teachers in nursery school. None could be found which specifically tested teacher attitudes toward child aggression and dependency. Studies dealing with parental attitudes are purposely excluded from this review. Therefore, this review of literature includes only those studies which deal directly with attitudes of teachers, student teachers, and students in child development. Two main topics are included: (a) studies regarding teacher attitudes and children's behavior, and (b) studies regarding attitudes of students in child development toward preschool children.

Studies Regarding Teacher Attitudes and Children's Behavior

In 1928 a study by E. K. Wickman (24) appeared that has had a profound effect on the development of teacher attitudes. This study first enlisted elementary school teachers' descriptions of behavior problems in children that they had encountered in teaching. From these descriptions of behavior characteristics a list of fifty behavior problems was formulated. Five hundred eleven teachers from Cleveland and Minneapolis then rated these problems as to prevalence and seriousness. In addition, thirty mental hygienists—psychiatrists, psychologists, and social workers—rated the seriousness of the behavior problems.

The directions given to teachers asked them to rate the problem on the basis of the degree to which the presence of a particular behavior characteristic made a child a problem in classroom management. They were given a thirty-minute time limit to complete the ratings. The mental
hygienists were asked to rate the problems on the basis of how seriously the problem characteristics were likely to affect the future of the child exhibiting them. No time limit was imposed on the clinicians for response to the rating scale.

Wickman used the judgements of the clinicians to be accepted as the "good" criterion for adequate and inadequate behavior in children. In general, Wickman found that teachers considered as the most serious behavior problems immoralities, dishonesties, transgressions against authority, and violations of orderliness in the classroom and of application to school work. They considered withdrawing, recessive personality traits as the least serious behavior characteristics. This was quite in contrast with the attitudes of the mental hygienists who considered withdrawing, recessive personality traits as most serious, and as least serious, transgressions against authority and violations of orderliness in class.

Wickman proposed that teachers' attitudes should be influenced to become more like the clinicians, that teacher attitudes be changed by information about child behavior through seminars and other learning experiences, and that teachers' functions be less concerned with intellectual learnings and more with life adjustment.

A few years after Wickman's study appeared, Watson (23) pointed out some serious limitations of Wickman's study. Beilin (2) summarizes Watson's criticisms:

1. The procedures themselves are open to criticism.
   a. The directions given teachers and clinicians were not the same. Teachers were instructed to rank behaviors for present seriousness, clinicians, for future adjustment.
   b. The time given to respond to the questionnaires was not identical. Teachers were under the control of the experimenter; clinicians were allowed an extended period to respond.
c. No definitions were given for the behavioral terms to be rated leaving to each subject the interpretation of the terms and thus further reducing comparability of the results. . . .

2. The choice of mental hygienists' attitudes toward the behavior problems of children as a criterion for evaluating teachers' attitudes toward the same problems is open to question. The Wickman study and others that follow (though not all) accept the clinicians' judgements as a criterion either implicitly or explicitly. Watson observes that there is no reason to suppose clinicians to be "correct" and teachers not, rather than vice versa. Wickman is questioned for not even considering this possibility.

3. There has been too ready an acceptance of a causal relationship between withdrawing behavior in childhood and maladjustment in adulthood. In addition to questioning whether "withdrawing" means the same thing to teachers and clinicians, Watson questioned whether withdrawing behavior in childhood is causally related to, or predictive of, maladjustment in adulthood. (2, p. 12)

Following Wickman's study have come many other studies which use various modifications of Wickman's scale. A study by Yourman (25) reported in 1932 supported Wickman's findings with regard to attitudes of teachers concerning the seriousness of aggressive and withdrawn behavior.

Using Wickman's scale, Bain (1) tested three groups of graduate students at Columbia University in 1932 and compared her findings with three similar groups of graduate students tested by Wickman in 1927. The results of these comparisons showed that teachers in classes in 1932 agreed significantly more closely with the mental hygienists.

In 1936, Stogdill (16), in reviewing the experiments in the measurements of attitudes toward children from 1899 to 1935, included several follow-up studies of Wickman's study.

Ellis and Miller (5) administered Wickman's scale with directions like those originally given to clinicians to 382 junior high and high school teachers in Denver. With this change in directions, ratings of teachers rate much more closely with the mental hygienists. The change,
according to the authors, is the result of increased realizations of the seriousness of withdrawing and recessive personality traits. Teachers in this study agreed with Wickman's teachers in that they considered violations of general standards of morality and general transgressions against authority as being the most serious behavior problems.

Mitchell's study (13) tested 395 teachers and 76 mental hygienists in the same cities where Wickman had made his study thirteen years earlier. These groups were given a modified scale like Wickman's and both groups were given the same directions. Again, teachers' ratings were much closer to those of mental hygienists; however, the mental hygienists ratings were more conservative than were the 1927 clinicians.

Sparks (15) in 1952 attempted to determine whether the difference in directions given to Wickman's teachers and mental hygienists had an important bearing on the comparisons made. He used directions from both the teachers' and mental hygienists' scales. He found that there were differences in teacher ratings when they were asked to rate them from the standpoint of troublesomeness in the classroom and seriousness to future adjustment; however, neither group rated the problems very near the mental hygienists ratings.

In 1951 Schrupp and Gjerde (14) repeated as nearly as possible Wickman's study to determine any changes that may have taken place in attitudes of teachers and mental hygienists over a twenty-five year period. They concluded that teacher attitudes in 1951 agreed more closely with the clinicians' attitudes than did the 1927 teachers.

In Stouffer's 1952 study (18) 481 elementary school teachers were first given a scale like the one given to Wickman's teachers, and then they were given a form with directions like those given to the clinicians.
Seventy mental hygienists also completed the form with directions like those of the 1927 clinicians. Stouffer concluded that while teachers' attitudes toward the behavior problems of children have changed, there has been little change in the attitudes of mental hygienists. These changed teacher attitudes reflected the increased importance attributed to withdrawing and recessive personality traits.

A study by Stouffer (19) reported in 1956 recognizes that differences may exist between teachers of different grade levels. In this study he found that elementary teachers were in greater agreement with the mental hygienists than were secondary teachers.

Hunter (8) in 1957 also showed that teachers had come to agree more closely with mental hygienists in their attitudes toward behavior problems of children.

Studies Regarding Attitudes of Students in Child Development Toward Preschool Children

Following is a review of the research involving attitudes of students in child development and nursery school student teachers toward preschool children.

Brandon (4) studied the attitudes of college students toward selected phases of child development and attempted to determine the effectiveness of a learning program in modifying these attitudes. The first part of her study involved the construction of seven attitude scales designed to measure attitudes toward adopting children; use of corporal punishment; praise as a method of control, self-expression; medical examinations; preschool education; and the amount of supervision a preschool child should receive in spending his money allowance. The study involved, second, the measurement and analysis of the attitudes of
650 college students. In addition to the seven attitude scales developed by Brandon, two attitude scales developed by Ackerley and Ojemann were used. Brandon used as the criterion for maturity the attitudes of ten highly trained judges. The third part of the study, experimental in nature, included the measurement of the effectiveness of a carefully planned learning program in modifying attitudes, the relative effectiveness of the program at various intelligence levels, and the permanency of attitude changes.

In her experimental procedure, Brandon measured the knowledge and attitudes expressed by college students in experimental and control groups; administered to the experimental group a carefully planned learning program; remeasured the knowledge and attitudes of both groups; and determined the changes brought about in both groups.

Subjects for Brandon's study were students registered at Oregon State College. Sixty-one students were used for the experimental unit using the scale relating to adopting children. Approximately ninety students served as subjects for the other six units included in the study. The number of students used in control groups was equal to those in each of the experimental groups. Remeasurements were made of some of the experimental group two years after the close of the learning program.

Brandon's analysis of the attitudes of the 650 college students showed a tendency for the students to be more favorable toward the use of fear, corporal punishment, and supervision of the preschool child's allowance and less favorable in attitudes relating to adopting children, self-expression, and self-reliance than those of the trained judges. The difference between the students as a group and the trained persons in attitudes toward the use of medical examinations, preschool education, and the use of praise was small. Brandon concluded that maturity in one
attitude could not be relied upon as an index of maturity in other attitudes.

In the third part of the study, the attitude scale measurements for the control group showed changes in attitudes so small they might, in all cases, have been accounted for by chance fluctuations.

On the knowledge test for the control group none of the observed differences was great. The results showed low correlations, indicating a lack of relationship between gains in knowledge and progress toward maturity in attitudes.

In the experimental group the observed differences between the initial and final measurement of the attitude scores showed marked gain in the attitude scales relating to self-reliance, corporal punishment, self-expression, and praise; and some gain in the initial and final measurement was observed in the attitude scale for fear, but the gain shown in the attitude scale for adoption of children was insignificant. In the knowledge test for the experimental group there was evidence of a gain in all of the scales used.

Two years after the completion of the learning program, forty-eight of the subjects in the experimental group were measured in relation to their attitudes toward corporal punishment and self-reliance. Observed changes were still evident. Brandon concluded that not only could a significant shift in attitude be produced through a carefully planned learning program, but also changes in attitudes tended to have some permanence.

Bieri (3) in her investigation attempted to assess the attitudes of college students toward the control of children, to determine if the attitudes held were related to other personal variables and to determine
Three groups were used in this study. Two experimental groups of fifty and sixty-two students enrolled in a course in child development were given the same course work which involved observation and teaching conditions for the study of guidance. One group, however, was exposed to two lessons describing the basis for the permissive, democratic guidance in the observation nursery school; the other group was not given this training. Control groups of 348 other college students were used in studying changes in mean attitude scores of groups of students. Changes in attitudes of all groups were measured by the democratic and loving guidance scales and the harsh, punitive control scales of the Parental Attitude Research Instrument.

The authors of this study concluded that if students beginning a course in child development believe that harsh punishment is a good way to control children, a semester's observation of children in a permissive, democratic nursery school will develop in these students a disapproval of permissive, democratic guidance. The observation will also result in failure of the students to develop discrimination between different aspects of democratic guidance. Changes in attitude depend on the strength of the initial attitude. No change in the average attitude of the class toward punishment will take place. On the other hand, if two lessons interpreting the reasons for the permissive, democratic guidance in the nursery school are added to the student and nursery school conditions, the students will not develop "all or none" relations between attitudes toward democratic guidance and attitudes toward punitive control; they will develop discrimination among their attitudes toward different aspects of democratic guidance; they will maintain their relative class position in the strength of the various attitudes,
despite individual changes; and they will still, as a group, agree that
harsh punishment is a good way to control children.

Townley (20) attempted to examine the attitudes toward children
that a group of adolescent girls expressed before and after experiences
in a laboratory course in child development at the high school level to
determine the nature of the change that took place in their attitudes as
a result of the child development course.

Fifty adolescent girls enrolled in a high school child development
course served as the subjects for this study. Data was secured from a
questionnaire, a home visit, and two themes written by each subject, one
at the beginning and one at the end of the course. The course included
actual experience working with children in the nursery school laboratory.

In the themes the subjects were asked to write down some ideas they
had about how they would like to bring up their children and what kind of
children they would like to have. The statements in the themes were
divided into two groups: (a) what the subjects said they would do or
would not do in bringing up children, and (b) what the subjects stated
about traits they considered important or desirable in children. Six
classifications were set up under the first of these two groups. These
included superficial attitudes, habit training emphasis, culturally
determined standards, health and physical development, socialization and
play, and respect for the child. Under the second group statements were
classified as traits valued by the parent, traits valued in the culture,
or traits of value to children.

The subjects' initial attitudes toward child-rearing and toward
traits preferred in children tended to be similar to the attitudes held
by middle class people in our society. Such attitudes highlighted the
traditional or cultural concept of child rearing which attempts to make children conform to patterns of being neat and clean, obedient and respectful, polite and socially acceptable, respectful and loving toward parents.

Upon completion of the course in child development, which included active participation in a nursery school, the attitudes of the subjects tended to change from the traditional or cultural concept to a more developmental point of view toward child rearing. The developmental point of view is characterized by such concepts as respect for the individual, satisfying personal relationships, pride in growth and development at the child's own pace, and a flexible type of guidance that takes into account the child's level of development.

Of the fifty individual subjects participating in the study, nearly three-fourths increased the proportion of statements they made relative to the developmental approach to child rearing following completion of the course. A small number of the subjects decreased the proportion of such statements made in their last themes, but an analysis of these themes seemed to show some qualitative change in their ideas in the direction of the developmental concept of rearing children.

Walters' (22) study presented evidence as to the difference in attitudes among a selected group of undergraduate college women toward the guidance of children, and the effect upon these attitudes of an introductory course in child development and guidance examined in relation to socio-economic status, intelligence, size of family, ordinal position, academic achievement, and perception of childhood happiness.

Subjects for this study were 156 home economics majors. The experimental subjects were enrolled in an introductory course in child development and guidance. Control subjects had not completed nor were they
currently enrolled in this course. Criteria for selection included such factors as white, single, reared in the United States, seventeen to twenty-four years of age, female, and home economics major. The University of Southern California Parent Attitude Survey developed by Shoben and the Child Guidance Survey developed by Wiley were administered to students prior to the beginning of classes in September, and after the course ended in January.

When the initial mean scores were obtained, the experimental group indicated more favorable attitudes. Significant changes in attitudes concerning the guidance of children between initial and final tests were noted in both the experimental and control groups on both instruments, suggesting that maturity or factors which were uncontrolled in this investigation may have contributed to changes in attitude. Although there was a difference of approximately twenty points at the time of the initial testing between experimental and control groups on the Child Guidance Survey in favor of the experimental group, at the end of the semester there was a difference of approximately fifty points between experimental and control groups, indicating significantly greater gains for the experimental group. Walters concluded that certain attitudes concerning the guidance of children can be modified during the course of a semester.

Walters and Fisher (21) pursued this study further after two years. Twenty-nine of the original subjects who had not taken the introductory course in child development and guidance were given the same tests as in the previous study.

From this further study the authors concluded that attitudes toward children continue to change throughout the undergraduate years when instruction in child development and guidance is provided; attitudes
toward children are not merely a function of maturation, and the benefit of having had a previous experience in completing instruments such as those used in this study were not of such magnitude as to affect the results significantly.

Middleton (12) conducted her study to determine the values to the student to be gained from experience with children in a college nursery school. This experience followed a course in child development which included observations of nursery school children.

Students' gains in developmental attitudes were measured by a scale on self-reliance constructed by Ojemann; a scale on the use of fear as a means of control constructed by Ackerley; and scales on self-expression, corporal punishment, praise, and adoption constructed by Brandon. The difference between the scores on the initial and final tests given at the beginning and at the end of the nursery school experience was considered the students gain or loss in attitudes. A written test on student-child situations devised by Read was used to determine the students' judgement in dealing with different situations.

In addition to the attitude scales, observation of the students' practices in the nursery school was checked on observation blanks constructed by Landreth and supplemented by Moore's scale for scoring verbal contacts and by Middleton's own scale for rating the types of physical contacts. Each student was observed in free play and in routine situations in both initial and final observation periods and a sequential record kept.

Personal data and a self-evaluation of the students were obtained from a questionnaire filled out by each student. Each student was rated by the instructor at the end of the course on the basis of a four-point
improvement scale, and a final term grade was given on the basis of the student's ability in nursery school practice.

Middleton found marked positive relationships between total attitude gain and attitude toward self-reliance, and the attitude toward the use of fear as a means of control, but found no significant relationship between the total attitude gain and each of the other attitudes: self-expression, adoption, corporal punishment, and praise.

Gains in constructive attitudes were shown as a result of nursery school experience; and as students gained in attitude, they improved on the written situation test.

There was apparently no transfer in the learning of attitudes and the improvement of practices, but students choosing work with children as a vocation made good term grades.

Middleton concluded that students tend to change in both attitudes and practices in contacts with children in the actual nursery school situation.

Lambert (9) used open end questions to interview twenty-four student teachers in the nursery school. She found that one of the most important factors in making a nursery school experience meaningful to the student teachers was the permanent head teacher under which they taught. The student teachers used in this study felt that the experience of working with children in the nursery school increased their self-understanding, increased their confidence in their ability to rear a family, and increased their confidence in their ability to teach young children.
Summary and Conclusions of the Review of Literature

This review of literature was intended to cover (a) studies concerned with teacher attitudes and children's behavior, and (b) studies concerned with attitudes of students in child development toward preschool children.

With regard to the first section, Beilin (2) reviewed Wickman's study and those studies which followed it. He summarized the findings of these studies as follows:

1. Differences existed in 1927 between the attitudes of teachers and clinicians. This seems to have been true in spite of the methodological limitations of the Wickman study.
2. Since 1927 there has been a shift in the hierarchy of teachers' attitudes to approximate more closely those of clinicians. This shift is not due to an artifact of research methodology. Those studies which incorporate adequate controls and consistent instructions show even greater congruence between the attitudes of the two groups.
3. There has been some change in the attitudes of clinicians although this is based upon the conclusions of one study.
4. Criteria employed in evaluating the behavior problems of children differ for elementary and secondary school teachers.
5. More boys are identified as maladjusted than girls and the criteria of maladjustment (and adjustment) differ in part for each sex.
7. Studies of the relationship of socioeconomic factors to the evaluation of children's behavior problems are inadequately dealt with in the literature. (2, p. 22)

The following conclusions are indicated by the review of the literature in the second section:

1. Attitudes toward certain subjects related to preschool children can and have been changed as a result of specific learning situations.
2. Attitudes that are changed as a result of these learning situations have some permanency over a period of time.
3. Student teaching experiences in the nursery school with actual contacts with preschool children modify attitudes toward children and increase self-understanding and confidence.
METHOD OF PROCEDURE

A description of the procedure used in conducting this study includes a discussion of the setting for the study, development of the attitude scale, composition of the groups, and administration of the scale.

Setting for the Study

The Department of Family and Child Development at Utah State University has been operating a nursery school or Child Development Laboratory since the 1930's. Through the years, many changes have taken place in policies, practices, philosophy, and location. At present the Child Development Laboratory is located in the Family Life Building on the Utah State University campus. It consists of two nursery school rooms. The older has been in operation since 1954. The newer nursery school room was built recently and began operating in the fall of 1960. Each of the rooms has two nursery school sessions each day with a total of four different groups. Each of the groups has a different head teacher. Each quarter students in child development do student teaching in the laboratory. Three, and sometimes four, student teachers work in each group, and stay the entire quarter with that group, spending three hours each day in the laboratory. Sixteen to eighteen three and four year old children comprise each group. The children attend the nursery school four days each week. Each Friday the head teacher meets with the student teachers to evaluate the past week, determine goals, discuss various topics related to the nursery school, appraise methods of guidance,
and prepare for the next week.

In addition to the student teaching course, the student teachers take a course in nursery school curriculum and methods which meets three days each week for one hour. This course has numerous assignments which include an individual case study on one child, including a visit to the parents' home; preparing and presenting a research report; making a bulletin board; preparing and presenting a flannel board story; helping to plan a parent meeting; discussing various general problems of the nursery school; and preparing various daily assignments such as observing all of the nursery groups and writing evaluations of these observations, and writing goals for the nursery school children.

In the student teaching course, the student teachers spend the first two or three weeks becoming acquainted with the nursery school procedures and with the children. Following this they each take over as head teacher for one week and then each has a second week as head teacher. During their week as head teacher they have complete responsibility for planning, preparing, and conducting activities for the children. They are in charge of the group and are expected to take over completely with the regular head teacher assisting and helping whenever necessary. During the last three weeks of the quarter the student teachers are left on their own a large part of the time while the head teacher observes from the observation booth, has conferences with parents, or takes care of other business. This helps the student teachers sense their responsibility in caring for the entire group of children.

Both the methods course and the student teaching course, where the students are actually involved with children, are included when referring to the nursery school student teaching experience throughout the remainder of this thesis.
Development of the Attitude Scale

An attitude scale similar to the one used by Lehner (10) was developed for use in this study. The first step in developing the scale was to decide what aspects of children's behavior would be used to test teachers' attitudes. Child aggression and child dependency were selected. These two categories were each divided into three more categories, so that finally six classifications of child behavior emerged to appear in the attitude scale; these included (a) dependency on parents, (b) dependency on teachers, (c) dependency on other children, (d) aggression toward parents, (e) aggression toward teachers, and (f) aggression toward other children.

Six open-end questions were written describing situations that sometimes occur in the nursery school. Subjects were asked to describe what they would do to respond to such a situation. This form of the attitude scale was administered to a group of student teachers and, because of the responses given, a decision was made that this type of scale was unsatisfactory. These six questions were revised and twelve others added to develop the attitude scale which was finally used in the study.

In developing the scale, the writer used her own experience and suggestions from other nursery school teachers to describe eighteen situations involving children's behavior that might occur in the nursery school. Possible ways of handling the problems followed each situation. Four members of the staff of the Department of Family and Child Development rated the responses on a three point continuum, high, medium, or low or three, two, or one. From the composite of their ratings the writer formulated the rating of the attitude scale. High ratings were
given to the responses showing an understanding knowledge of the cause of behavior, a positive attitude toward it, and some insight into the feelings of the child. Medium ratings were given where the responses showed some understanding and some indifference. Low ratings were given for responses showing negative attitudes and lack of understanding of behavior. The rating of the attitude scale appears in this study as Appendix B.

Using the suggestions of the four staff members the final form of the attitude scale was devised. This final form of the scale contained eighteen situations, each with nine possible responses. Subjects were asked to choose one of the nine responses. Three situations were included for each of the six classifications of children's behavior—dependency on parents, teachers, and other children, and aggression toward parents, teachers, and other children. A copy of the final form of the attitude scale appears in this study as Appendix A.

**Composition of Groups**

**Experimental Group A**

Two experimental groups were used in this study. Experimental Group A consisted of twelve students, all Child Development majors or minors who did student teaching in the Child Development Laboratory during Fall Quarter, 1961. All of the subjects in this group were girls. Of the twelve, three were married and nine were single. Three were the oldest children in their families, five were in the middle, and four were youngest. These subjects came from families that numbered from two to six children. Their ages ranged from twenty to twenty-two with twenty-one as the mean age.
Experimental Group B

Experimental Group B was composed of thirteen students, all Child Development majors or minors. This group of twelve girls and one man did student teaching in the nursery school during Winter Quarter, 1962. Of this group, two were married and eleven were single. Two were oldest children, six were in the middle, and four were youngest. The families from which these subjects came ranged in size from one to eight children. The mean age for this group was twenty-two with the ages ranging from twenty to twenty-six. One of the subjects in this group, the only male in the study, had an infant daughter of his own.

Control Group

Ten students comprised the Control Group. These students were girls who had taken all of the courses which were pre-requisites to the student teaching experience, but they had not had the experience of student teaching in the nursery school, nor were they currently enrolled in the student teaching course. Of this group, two were married and eight were single. Five were the oldest children in their families, three were in the middle, and two were youngest. Their families were larger than either of the experimental groups with the size of the families ranging from three to ten. Their ages ranged from nineteen to twenty-one with twenty as the mean age.

All of the students in the three groups had previous experience in working with children other than in the nursery school. These experiences involved such activities as baby-sitting, Sunday school teaching, and caring for brothers and sisters.
**Administration of Scale**

The attitude scale was given to the various groups at various times and in various ways. All of the groups were given similar instructions for completing the form. They were encouraged to express their own feelings, to mark the one response for each situation which was most nearly the way they thought they would actually respond to the situation. They were assured that there were no right or wrong answers. In addition to these directions, the experimental groups were assured that their responses would in no way affect their grades for their student teaching. The control group was told to respond as if they were teaching in the nursery school.

The attitude scale was given to Experimental Group A only at the end of their student teaching experience in the child development laboratory at the close of Fall Quarter in December of 1961. The purpose of this group was to determine whether a pre-test would affect scores on a post-test and to use their scores as a comparison with those obtained from the other groups.

Experimental Group B was given the scale at the beginning and end of their student teaching experience in the child development laboratory during Winter Quarter, January to March, 1962. The purpose of this group was to determine the change in attitude that took place as a result of student teaching in the nursery school.

The control group was also given the scale at the beginning and end of Winter Quarter in January and March of 1962. This group did not have the student teaching experience. The purpose of this group was to determine change in attitude over a period of time when students did not have student teaching in the nursery school.
The collection of data could perhaps best be summarized by the following diagram:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental A</td>
<td>Lab → Post-test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To control the effect of a pre-test on post-test scores.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental B</td>
<td>Pre-test → Lab → Post-test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To determine the change in attitude scale scores as a result of child development laboratory student teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Pre-test → No lab → Post-test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To determine change in attitude scores over a period of time without child development laboratory student teaching.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the mean score of this post-test with the post-test mean score of Experimental Group B which took both a pre-test and a post-test. Of the fifty-four points possible on the attitude scale a score of 49.58 was obtained on the post-test by Experimental Group A at the end of the nursery school student teaching experience. The mean total score of Experimental Group B on the post-test was 50.00. This difference of less than one-half of one point shows that the pre-test probably does not influence the score on the post-test. This, then, would indicate that any change in the scores obtained by Experimental Group B is the result of the nursery school student teaching experience, the course in nursery school methods which accompanies the student teaching, or other uncontrolled factors, rather than the experience of taking a pre-test.

The most important contribution of Experimental Group A is in its indication that the pre-test is not a factor to change the scores on the attitude scale. This was the purpose of this group and it served this purpose well.

Experimental Group B

The purpose of this group was to determine student teachers' change in attitude toward child aggression and dependency over a period of time during which they had the experience of student teaching in the nursery school and taking a course in nursery school methods which covered ways of dealing with children's behavior.

Because of the fact that it was structured as it was--pre-test, nursery school experience, post-test--this group was able to make the greatest contribution to the study of any of the three groups. In addition to being able to examine collective scores from these subjects, it was possible to analyze each subject in terms of his scores on the
attitude scale as they were related to his actual growth and development in the nursery school as seen by those who worked with him. A discussion of these individual evaluations appears later.

Control Group

The purpose of the control group was to determine change in attitudes toward child aggression and dependency over a period of time during which the subjects did not have the experience of student teaching in the nursery school. This group contributes to the study in that the scores obtained from this group are compared with those obtained from the two experimental groups to determine the effect of the nursery school experience on changing attitudes.

Analysis of Attitude Scale Scores

Tables 1 through 5 are presented to show a complete picture of each subject's scores on each section of the attitude scale together with totals and means. These tables will be referred to throughout the following discussion. Some of the data shown on these tables will reappear in a different form in Tables 6 through 12.

Attitudes toward dependency on parents

Table 6 presents the scores received on the pre-test and post-test by student teachers in the two experimental groups and the control group on attitudes toward child dependency on parents.

No real differences exist in the five scores appearing on Table 6, though some interesting changes can be seen by examining Tables 1 through 5.
Table 1. Attitude scale scores of Experimental Group A on the post-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Dep. on parents</th>
<th>Dep. on teachers</th>
<th>Dep. on children</th>
<th>Agg. to parents</th>
<th>Agg. to teachers</th>
<th>Agg. to children</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>8.81</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>8.91</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Attitude scale scores on Experimental Group B on the pre-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Dep. on parents</th>
<th>Dep. on teachers</th>
<th>Dep. on children</th>
<th>Agg. to parents</th>
<th>Agg. to teachers</th>
<th>Agg. to children</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>8.84</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>48.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Attitude scale scores of Experimental Group B on the post-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Dep. on parents</th>
<th>Dep. on teachers</th>
<th>Dep. on children</th>
<th>Agg. to parents</th>
<th>Agg. to teachers</th>
<th>Agg. to children</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
<td><strong>103</strong></td>
<td><strong>97</strong></td>
<td><strong>116</strong></td>
<td><strong>116</strong></td>
<td><strong>108</strong></td>
<td><strong>650</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.46</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.92</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.46</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.92</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.92</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.30</strong></td>
<td><strong>50.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 4. Attitude scale scores of the control group on the pre-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Dep. on parents</th>
<th>Dep. on teachers</th>
<th>Dep. on children</th>
<th>Agg. to parents</th>
<th>Agg. to teachers</th>
<th>Agg. to children</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>48.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Attitude scale scores of the control group on the post-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Dep. on parents</th>
<th>Dep. on teachers</th>
<th>Dep. on children</th>
<th>Agg. to parents</th>
<th>Agg. to teachers</th>
<th>Agg. to children</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>48.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. Means of pre-test and post-test attitude scale scores of experimental and control groups on attitudes toward dependency on parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental A</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental B</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>8.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>8.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each subject's individual score on the section on dependency on parents was high. Experimental Group A scored highest on this section. Experimental Group B's mean score remained the same on both the pre-test and the post-test; however, in examining individual scores on Tables 2 and 3, it can be seen that some subjects' scores improved, while others' scores went down. The control group's mean score went up slightly, but the only change in individuals' scores was in one subject who gained one point.

Attitudes toward dependency on teachers

Attitudes toward dependency on teachers scores appear in Table 7. The two groups who took both the pre-test and the post-test went down in their collective scores on this section of the attitude scale. Here, too, changes occurred with some students improving and others dropping.

One possibility that might account for the drop in scores of Experimental Group B may be that when student teachers are in the nursery school, they become so used to answering children's questions and helping them solve problems that they fail to recognize situations where the child is dependent on them. This possibility can only be speculative,
however, especially when one notes that the control group scores also dropped.

Table 7. Means of pre-test and post-test attitude scale scores of experimental and control groups on attitudes toward dependency on teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental A</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental B</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>7.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>7.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be pointed out that of the six areas tested, scores on this area and the one to follow were lower than any of the other four. Very few students scored nine on either the pre- or the post-test on this area of dependency on teachers.

**Attitudes toward dependency on other children**

Scores on the scale to test attitudes toward children’s dependency on other children appear in Table 8.

Table 8. Means of pre-test and post-test attitude scale scores of experimental and control groups on attitudes toward dependency on children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental A</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental B</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>7.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The lowest scores on any of the six areas tested were in this area. Only five students scored nine on all of the pre-tests and the post-tests and three of these were in the one test taken by Experimental Group A which had the highest mean score. Both of the groups that took both the pre- and post-test increased their mean score with the experimental group making the larger gain.

**Attitudes toward aggression toward parents**

Table 9 shows scores on the section of the scale that tests attitudes toward child aggression toward parents.

Table 9. Means of pre-test and post-test attitude scale scores of experimental and control groups on attitudes toward aggression toward parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental A</td>
<td>8.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental B</td>
<td>8.84</td>
<td>8.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>8.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The individual and group scores on this section of the scale are very high. A large majority of the subjects scored nine. It can be noted, however, that even though the difference is small, the mean score of Experimental Group B increased while the control groups' mean score stayed the same.

**Attitudes toward aggression toward teachers**

A comparison of the means of scores on the scale concerned with attitudes toward aggression toward teachers appear in Table 10.
Table 10. Means of pre-test and post-test attitude scale scores of experimental and control groups on attitudes toward aggression toward teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental A</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental B</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>8.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>8.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On this section of the scale, Experimental Group B scored higher on the pre-test than the other two groups scored on either the pre-test or the post-test and then increased their scores nearly one-half of one point.

This could perhaps indicate that student teachers, after having nursery school experience, become more adept at handling aggression toward themselves. This, too, can only be speculative, however.

Attitudes toward aggression toward other children

Table 11 presents scores on the scale to determine attitudes toward children's aggression toward other children.

Table 11. Means of pre-test and post-test attitude scale scores of experimental and control groups on attitudes toward aggression toward children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental A</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental B</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>8.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>7.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The largest gain in scores on any of the six areas tested was made by Experimental Group B on the section testing attitudes toward aggression toward children. One complete point was gained by this group. The control group's mean score rose slightly, but not nearly so much as the experimental group.

One possibility accounting for this rise in score could be that as the student teachers gain experience in working with children they are better able to know what techniques work best in handling children's aggression toward other children. In the nursery school they are often confronted with children's aggression and they must deal with it. Increased experience may have improved their scores in this area as a result of increased confidence in their own ability to handle situations of this kind or of greater understanding of such behavior.

**Total attitude scale scores**

Table 12 shows total attitude scale scores on the pre-tests and post-tests of the three groups used in the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental A</td>
<td>49.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental B</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>48.10</td>
<td>48.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both Experimental Group B and the control group scored about the same on the pre-test. Experimental Group B increased its score by two
points to a score about the same as the other group that had nursery school experience, Experimental Group A, while the control group increased its score by only one-half of one point. Changes in these scores, though small, may indicate that the experience of student teaching in the nursery school changes students' attitudes toward child aggression and dependency in a direction which suggests a greater ability to find more acceptable methods of control of children when the children manifest aggressive or dependent behavior.

The material presented in Table 12 helps answer the three questions with which this study was concerned:

1. What are the attitudes of child development laboratory student teachers toward child aggression and dependency before having the experience of teaching in the laboratory?

Generally, the student teachers have quite favorable attitudes toward child aggression and dependency before the experience of student teaching in the nursery school. This is indicated by the high initial scores on the attitude scale and may, in part, be attributed to the courses, particularly those dealing with guidance, which are prerequisites to the nursery school student teaching experience. It is interesting to note that when the attitude scale was given to a beginning child development class the scores had a much lower range and a lower mean score than any of the three groups used in the study. The mean score of this beginning class was 45.40. When this is compared with the scores of the experimental and control groups, the indication is that the attitude scale probably is a reliable test of attitudes toward child aggression and dependency because mean scores are higher for students who have had more education in child development and the scores continue to rise as a
result of nursery school student teaching.

2. Do student teachers' attitudes toward child behavior change as a result of student teaching in the laboratory?

Within the limits of this research, student teacher attitudes toward child aggression and dependency tend to change as a result of the student teaching experience.

3. If changes in attitudes do occur, what is the nature of the change?

The nature of the change in attitudes appears consistently to be in a direction of more understanding and acceptance of children's behavior, with more positive attitudes toward children and methods of guiding and controlling children's aggression and dependency. Changes in students' scores in this study were small. This appears to be a result of the extensive background in child development and child guidance of all students who participated in the study. It is probable that beginning students, who scored lower, would respond to the student teaching experience with greater changes in scores.

**Individual Evaluations of Student Teachers**

In an effort to relate changes in scores on the attitude scale on the pre-test and post-test to actual behavior in the nursery school a discussion was held with the head teachers of the nursery school groups and with the head of the Department of Family and Child Development. An evaluation of each student teacher in Experimental Group B was obtained. Experimental Group B was used because the subjects had had a pre-test and a post-test. Also, because they did student teaching during Winter Quarter, during the time of the study, it was possible to get more
accurate ratings of their work in the laboratory. The total scores of individual students appearing in Tables 2 and 3 are used with the evaluations by the head teachers and the department head to compare each individual student's educational growth and the grades he received in the two courses with his scores on the attitude scale. It must be remembered that these evaluations are completely subjective and are only the opinions of the head teachers who worked with and graded the student teachers and of the head of the department who based his opinions on observations of the student teachers in the nursery school.

**Subject A**

Student teacher A scored forty-seven on the pre-test and forty-eight on the post-test, an increase of only one point. She received B's in both the student teaching course and the nursery school methods course. This person was a teacher who did well in the nursery school. She did what she thought she was expected to do, but didn't make any discernible growth in her ability to work with children or in her own self-understanding. Her scores on the attitude scale were fairly good and her work in the nursery school was perhaps comparable, good, but with nothing outstanding one way or the other.

**Subject B**

This teacher obtained a score of fifty on the pre-test and dropped one point to a forty-nine on the post-test. She obtained B's in both courses. This teacher was a quiet-type person who had a difficult time entering into situations, especially into trouble areas. She remained alert to disruptive situations, but rather than stepping in to handle a problem, she found ways to evade the situations. Most situations she
handled as she thought she should rather than as she really felt. This was probably related to her perception of her own self. To her goodness meant being quiet, nice, clean, and so on, with as little show of negative feelings and emotions as possible. This was a teacher, however, who seemed to gain insight into herself in the nursery school situation. In group discussions she was able to talk about her feelings and was able to deal with them. The nursery school helped this teacher in her growth in her own self-understanding, but because of her own needs, she gained relatively little insight into children.

Subject C

A score of fifty on the pre-test was increased to a fifty-one on the post-test by Student Teacher C. This teacher received an A in the nursery school student teaching course and a B in the nursery school methods course. This teacher entered the student teaching situation with an outstanding ability to work with children. She had an understanding of children and a confidence in herself before she entered the nursery school and this feeling of confidence was apparently sensed by the children. They enjoyed her and she enjoyed them. She had a real ability to let herself go and be herself. She had a happiness and a goodness about her that the children enjoyed. This natural ability was somewhat unexpected, however. In a previous course in guidance which involved participation in the nursery school, she left the impression that she overdid things--sang too fast, talked too loud, tried too hard. This difference can partially be accounted for in the difference in the role of the student in the guidance class who is expected to take a more submissive role and not control the situation and the role of the student teacher who must control many situations. This teacher fit the student
teaching role very well, but not the more submissive role of the guidance class. Though good from the start, she was able to strengthen her enjoyment of children. She had an opportunity to respond to children and strengthen her confidence, and she learned to work with children of this specific age group.

**Subject D**

Student Teacher D increased her score on the attitude scale by three points from forty-eight to fifty-one. She received an A from the student teaching course and a B from the nursery school methods course. The high score and good grades are indicative of her ability. She came into the nursery school situation with good insight into children, but still through the experience, she learned many things. In addition to her good insight into children's needs, she had an ability to do something about them. Her real strength as a teacher was in her confidence and ability to meet and deal with troublesome situations and to handle more difficult children. She was, in the words of her head teacher, "fun to have around." This applied not only for the teachers, but for the children as well. She was able to talk about things that happened in the nursery school and her feelings toward them. She had an insight into the feelings of the other teachers and throughout the quarter was able to further gain insight into herself. She was able to plan and carry out activities well.

**Subject E**

The highest increase in scores made by any of the subjects was made by Student Teacher E. She began with a low score of forty-seven which was increased to the highest score of fifty-three, a gain of six points.
She received two B's in the nursery school courses. The change in scores of this teacher was indicative of the progress this teacher made during the quarter. She came into the nursery school with a poor background as far as grades were concerned. The poor background was not known by her head teacher until after the end of the quarter and, upon learning of it, the head teacher was quite surprised because the student teacher did such a good job in the nursery school working with the children. She was able to plan and carry out activities well. Her growth in the nursery school was in her greater perception of her own self and in her increased ability to meet and deal with most situations, including the most troublesome. To those who knew of her previous background, this teacher showed more progress than was anticipated.

**Subject F**

Scores on the pre-test and post-test of Subject F remained the same at forty-nine. She received B's in both courses. This student was one who was very easy-going and never showed anger, even when she became upset. The nursery school situation helped her learn things about herself and her own feelings. She made some growth in handling children, but this was mostly by increasing her confidence in her own ability to do things and handle children.

**Subject G**

Student Teacher G increased her score from forty-eight to fifty-two. She received two A's in the two courses. Both the grades and her increased score indicate the growth that this teacher made during the quarter. She went into the nursery school with little appreciation for children and at first was quite frightened by them. By the end of the quarter, she
felt good about the situation, and felt comfortable around children instead of being afraid of them. She found that she could relate to children, appreciate them, and enjoy them. Her growth appeared not only in an increased understanding of herself, but also in an ability to work with children successfully, and to work with other teachers. She still feels uneasy with new children, but increased experience with children should be able to ameliorate this insecurity.

Subject H

Even though she had had a considerable amount of previous experience in working with children, Case H scored only forty-six on the attitude scale and increased the score by only one point to forty-seven. She received two B's in the two courses. The scores for this student also indicate generally her ability as a teacher. She functioned well in the nursery school, planned and carried out activities well, handled most situations properly, but didn't show any remarkable strength or growth.

Subject I

This student teacher scored high on both the pre-test and the post-test with a score of fifty-one on each of them. She received two B's in the courses. This teacher had, according to her head teacher, "really started to grow in her quiet way." She was a quiet and sincere person and was well-liked by the children. Her nursery school experience helped her to learn a lot about children, herself, and the other student teachers who worked with her.

Subject J

Case J was the only male in the group of student teachers. His scores increased from forty-six to fifty and this, too, is an indication
of his growth. He received B's in both courses. This man went into the nursery school situation fearful, apprehensive, lacking confidence, and wondering why he was there. He started from a weak position, but moved to gaining confidence in himself and his ability to work with children. He grew more aware of the children and their needs, and as the quarter progressed he grew steadily less apprehensive about the children. His head teacher felt that the experience helped him learn about himself. Even though he had a feeling of being alone as a man in a situation primarily oriented to female teachers, the experience meant a great deal to him.

**Subject K**

This teacher made a good gain in the scores on the scale from forty-seven to fifty-one. She received two A's in the two courses. Both the grades and the increase in scores tell of this teacher's real ability to be with children. She was a person with an immense ability to let herself go and enjoy an experience with children. She was a stable person before she entered the nursery school in terms of self-understanding, and this quality and feeling of self and being her own self made it easy for her to be with children. Her greatest area of growth was in learning techniques of handling children. She could have fun with the children in making them do or not do things. She was aware of the group as a whole and could get along with the children individually. She was flexible, uninhibited, and really enjoyed herself.

**Subject L**

This teacher dropped two points from a fifty-one to a forty-nine on the attitude scale. She received a B in the student teaching course and
a C in the nursery school methods course. This was a teacher who didn't progress as some would have expected her to. This may have been accounted for by the outside pressures she faced. She planned activities well but executed plans and followed through poorly. She was involved in extracurricular activities and family problems which left insufficient time for nursery school. She had difficulty adjusting to the nursery school situation at first. In some areas she functioned on a high level, such as rhythm and music experiences, but she had a tendency to avoid troublesome situations; she retired into safe places and seldom moved out of them. During the quarter she gained some self insight, but the problems she faced apparently prevented substantial personal growth.

**Subject M**

This student made less progress than the others, although her increase in scores from forty-four to forty-nine shows a gain. She received a C grade in the student teaching and a B in the methods course. She did fairly well, but seemed to have too much concern for herself. She started out well, but then took the attitude that she didn't care. She made the comment that this experience left her cold. The children made her nervous and left her at loose ends. She didn't seem to enjoy a situation as unstructured as the nursery school. She avoided situations rather than meeting them. Her knowledge of guidance was favorable, but she didn't apply this knowledge well. She didn't make progress as a teacher, but did appear to grow in her own self-understanding.

Generally, the attitude scale scores tend to indicate the quality of the performance of the student teachers. Those students who scored higher were usually the stronger teachers. Those whose scores had the most change showed the most growth during the quarter in self-understanding.
and ability to work with children. Students whose scores remained unchanged or dropped showed the least growth and those who scored lower were usually the weaker teachers. The subjective ratings made by the head teachers seem to support the findings of the test scores and may, in some way, lend some validity to them.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A child development laboratory in a university is justified only in its ability to contribute to the education of college students and serve the children enrolled in it. Students beginning their studies in child development participate in the laboratory through observation. Advanced students use the laboratory for their student teaching after a series of courses in child development and guidance. Attitudes toward child behavior are formed during the study of theories and these attitudes may change or be reinforced as a result of nursery school student teaching experience.

The problem of this study has been to determine what change in attitude toward child aggression and dependency takes place during student teaching in the nursery school. The study has been concerned with the following questions:

1. What are the attitudes of child development laboratory student teachers toward child aggression and dependency before the experience of teaching in the laboratory?

2. Do student teachers' attitudes toward child behavior change as a result of student teaching in the laboratory?

3. If changes in attitudes do occur, what is the nature of the change?

An attitude scale of eighteen questions was developed to determine attitudes toward six areas of child behavior. These areas were (a) dependency on parents, (b) dependency on teachers, (c) dependency on other children, (d) aggression toward parents, (e) aggression toward
teachers, and (f) aggression toward other children. The scale was rated on a three-point continuum with high ratings indicating understanding of causes of childrens' behavior and positive attitudes toward it, and low ratings indicating lack of understanding and negative attitudes.

Two experimental groups and one control group were used in this study. Experimental Group A's purpose was to determine whether a pre-test would effect scores on a post-test. The subjects in this group replied to the attitude scale at the end of Fall Quarter after their student teaching experience in the nursery school. The purpose of Experimental Group B was to determine the change in attitude scores as a result of student teaching in the nursery school. This group was given the attitude scale at the beginning of their nursery school experience Winter Quarter and again at the end of the quarter when they had finished their nursery school student teaching. The control group's purpose was to determine whether attitudes changed over a period of time when the subjects did not have the child development laboratory student teaching. The control subjects were given the scale at the beginning and end of Winter Quarter and had taken the courses which were pre-requisites to the student teaching, but had never had the student teaching experience.

Because of the small number of subjects no definite statements can be made as specific findings of the study. Changes in scores on the six areas tested were not sufficiently great to make any conclusions from them; however, in total scores Experimental Group B's scores improved by two points, while the control group's score increased only one-half of one point indicating that the nursery school experience modified attitudes in the direction of making them more positive and understanding. Students beginning their studies in child development scored considerably lower on the test than those whose background qualified them for the student
teaching experience. This suggests that the student teaching experience tends to reinforce attitudes resulting from earlier study about child development and child guidance.

A discussion was held with the head teachers and department head and individual evaluations of the subjects in Experimental Group B were made. By comparing individual achievement with scores on the attitude scale, it was found that generally the attitude scale scores tended to indicate the quality of the performance of the student teachers. Those students who scored higher were usually the stronger teachers. Those whose scores changed most showed the most growth and those whose scores remained unchanged or dropped showed the least growth. Students who scored lower were usually weaker teachers.

Conclusions

The conclusions of this study answer the three questions with which the study was concerned.

1. Generally child development laboratory student teachers have favorable attitudes toward child aggression and dependency before the experience of student teaching in the nursery school.

2. Student teachers' attitudes toward child behavior tend to change or be reinforced during the time they are in the nursery school as a result of the student teaching in the laboratory.

3. The nature of the change in attitudes is in the direction of being more understanding and accepting of children's behavior and toward more positive attitudes toward children.
Suggestions for Further Research

Student teachers in a nursery school are subjects for further research and there are many aspects of their experience that could and should be studied. A comparison between student teachers' actual behavior in the nursery school and their scores on an attitude scale such as the one used in this study could be made. This could be done by using observations of the student teachers as they work with children and comparing these observation ratings with scores on the attitude scale.

Two factors learning situations were affecting the attitudes of the student teachers used in this study, the laboratory experience of student teaching and actually working with children and the experience of participating in a class concerned with nursery school curriculum and methods. Further research could determine whether the change in attitude was due to the laboratory experience or the classroom experience.

The sampling for this study was small and limited to one setting. Further research needs to be done using a larger number of student teachers.

Studies of changes in attitudes resulting from classroom study rather than the laboratory experience need to be made. A study such as this could be made using students in such courses as child development, psychology, education, and sociology at various points of educational progress.
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ATTITUDE SCALE

General Information:

Name __________________________________

Age ________ Male ________ Female ________ Married ________ Single ________

Ages of children: Boys ______________ Girls ______________

Ages of brothers and sisters: Brothers __________ Sisters __________

Give any experiences you have had in working with children other than in the nursery school, i.e., church, baby-sitting, etc. ____________________

Following are situations that might occur in the nursery school. After each situation are various responses that you might make to the behavior described. For each situation, check one response which you feel would be closest to your way of meeting the situation.

When a child enters the nursery school his mother may stay as long as he needs her. Usually the mother stays a few days and then the child is able to stay by himself. One child, however, doesn't feel that he can let his mother go. Each day she comes with him and, if she attempts to leave, he cries or threatens to cry. What would you do?

____ Ignore his protests and have the mother leave anyway because the child will soon become fascinated by the nursery school activities and forget his mother.

____ Eventually give the child a choice. Let him decide whether he would rather come to nursery school and stay without his mother or stay at home with her.

____ Feel that he is too young for nursery school and take him out for awhile.

____ Have the mother around where the child has access to her, but not in the nursery school room.

____ Tell him that he must be a big boy like the other children.

____ Have the mother leave for a short time each day explaining to him that she will be back and then make sure she returns when she said she would.

____ Let the mother handle the situation because she knows her child better than you do.

____ Do whatever things are necessary to make the child feel more secure.

____ Have the mother sit quietly in the background where the child can see her and then slip out when he is happily busy and not looking at her.
It is early in the year in the nursery school. A boy in his first year at the school is very dependent upon one of his older neighborhood friends who has been in the nursery school before. The younger of the two follows the older everywhere and will not attempt to play with others, nor will he begin anything on his own. What would you do?

- Try to gain his confidence and friendship and get him to build a relationship with you and then bring other children into your relationship.
- Try to encourage him to play with others, but not push the issue, hoping that time will take care of the matter.
- Attempt to get his interest at every opportunity.
- Separate the two so the dependency will not grow worse.
- Give the younger as many opportunities as possible to do things for himself.
- Talk to his mother and see what she could do to help the situation.
- Tell him he must learn to play with others.
- Use many ways of making him feel important with the idea in mind that when he is ready to advance, he will, but not until he is ready.
- Allow them to play together until the younger feels more secure.

Inside, several children are playing in the water in the water trough. One child begins pouring water on the floor and you tell him to keep the water in the trough. Instead of doing as you say, however, he picks up a cup of water and throws it at you. What would you do?

- Say to him, "You threw the water at me because you were angry when I told you to keep the water in the trough. Now let's mop it up."
- Ignore him and mop up the water yourself.
- Make him get the mop and help him mop up all of the water he has spilled.
- Ask him why he threw the water at you.
- Say, "That's enough of that. Now let's get a mop and I'll help you wipe it up."
- Make him leave the water play area and tell him he must play by himself.
- Try to find out the reasons for this child's behavior before doing anything.
- Tell him to be a big boy and not throw water anymore.
- Say to him, "I'll let you throw water at me."
A group of children is playing together in the playhouse area. Another child has attempted to enter their play, but each time he has tried the group has rejected him. The child comes to you, saying, "Make them let me play." What would you do?

- Try to find the reasons for the group's rejection of the child.
- Tell the group of children that they can't play if they won't let the other child play.
- Encourage the child to make his own way into the situation and let the children settle it themselves.
- Tell the child to get a new toy and ask the children in the group if he could play with them and bring the new toy.
- Try to find something about the child which the other children will accept him for.
- Show the children something that the child could do in helping them.
- Take the child to the area and tell the other children to let him play.
- Go to the group and introduce the child as a new character.
- Tell them that in nursery school everyone has to share.

A number of children are playing in the sandpile. You are standing nearby watching them. Two children suddenly begin to fight over a toy that both of them want. In anger, one child throws sand into the face of the other who immediately cries. What would you do?

- Try to get the children to agree on which one will play with the toy first and which one later.
- Not make a big scene about the sand-throwing because it was a reaction to a building frustration.
- Ask the child who threw sand if he thought it hurt the child when he threw sand in his face.
- Step in and stop the sand-throwing and comfort and console the crying child.
- Tell him that if he cannot leave the sand in the sandbox, he will have to play somewhere else.
- Talk calmly to the children and ask the one child if he was sorry.
- Help the child understand that it hurts when sand is thrown in one's face and serious damage may result.
- Let the punishment of seeing the other child cry be punishment enough.
- Throw sand into the face of the child who threw sand so he would know how it feels.
A child, accompanied by his mother, has brought a toy to nursery school. While his mother is still there you tell him that he will either have to leave the toy in the office or send it home with his mother. His mother takes the toy away from him and he retaliates by hitting her. What would you do?

___ Bring a toy from the nursery school and get his attention away from the toy he brought from home.
___ Let him keep the toy that day and then tell him not to bring it again.
___ Motion to the mother to get the toy out of sight and try to interest him in other things.
___ Tell the child that he must love his mother, not hit her.
___ Ask the child what he would like to do with the toy--leave it in the office or let his mother take it home with her.
___ Tell the child to hit the punching bag instead of his mother.
___ Tell him that this is not how a gentleman acts in nursery school.
___ Ask him if he would like to come in and see the nursery school toys.
___ Say to the child, "I know that you are angry because you cannot have the toy, but maybe we can find some other toy for you to play with."

One child has no difficulty putting on his coat, boots, and other outdoor clothing during the middle of the day; however, when it is time for his mother to come he refuses to put them on until she comes in and helps him. What would you do?

___ Have the child put his things on well in advance of his mother's coming and play outside until she comes.
___ Have the mother wait until the other children have gone, then tell him that maybe she got so tired of helping him that she decided to wait long enough for him to get ready when she came.
___ Tell him to be a big boy like the other children.
___ Put his clothes on for him.
___ Suggest that the mother let him do it himself with her encouragement.
___ Put him in another section of the room until he is willing to cooperate.
___ Let him wait each day for his mother to help him.
___ Hope that in time he will stop this behavior.
___ Make a game out of putting the clothes on.
One child in the nursery school is quite withdrawn and seldom makes any effort to enter the play of other children or join in any activity of the group unless specifically asked by a teacher. He spends much of his time just watching other children at play unless a teacher encourages him to join the group. He further displays his dependency on the teachers by asking them often to read to him, another activity which takes up much of his time. What would you do?

- Ask him why he won't play with the other children.
- Quit encouraging him to join in because sometimes he doesn't respond to your suggestions.
- Make an effort to find out why this child is so dependent on teachers and doesn't join in group activities.
- Feel that this may be a situation where the child is not yet ready for social contacts with other children and just let time take care of the matter.
- Continue to respond to his demands that you spend so much time reading to him.
- Continue to read to him.
- Spend as much time as possible with this child in an effort to give him an opportunity to build a warm relationship with an adult before forcing him to relate to children.
- Feel that this child needs help in developing his social capabilities and think of methods to encourage him to relate more with other people.
- Continue to encourage him to join in group activities.

A child is especially engrossed in his painting when his mother comes early to take him home. She tells him he must hurry. He turns and shouts, "I don't want to go! I want to stay here!" and attempts to throw paint at her. What would you do?

- Feel that it serves the mother right for coming early and trying to make him hurry.
- Tell him to be nice to his mother.
- Another time, find out what days the mother will come early and plan the activities so this child will be ready to go when the mother comes.
- Tell him that you know he would like to stay, but his mother is in a hurry.
- Tell him that he will have to keep the paint on the paper and in the containers.
- Tell him that this isn't the way a big boy acts.
- Ask the mother if she could wait until he has finished his painting.
- Take him away from the painting and start getting him ready to go.
- Let the mother handle the situation.
Some of the children have taken off their shoes and, because it is nearing time for them to go home you tell them that they will have to put them back on. One child says, "I won't put them on unless you help me." What would you do?

___ Say, "Oh, I'll bet you don't even know how to put your shoes on."
___ Sit the child down and put his shoes on him.
___ Help him, but let him do as much as he can by himself.
___ Say, "I'll put one on and you put the other on."
___ Tell him that you will tie them if he puts them on.
___ Say to the child, "I'll help you as soon as I have a minute. See if you can put them on all by yourself while you are waiting for me."
___ Say, "You put those shoes on and put them on right now."
___ Find out if this child really does need help.
___ Tell him you will not help him because he knows how to do it himself.

One child in the nursery school has a very difficult time making decisions. Whenever a situation occurs in which he is forced to make a decision, he tries to get another child to tell him what to do. What would you do?

___ Tell him to make his own decisions.
___ Try to find out why this child feels so dependent on others.
___ Try to assure the child that he will not be punished for doing as he wants to do.
___ Ask him specifically when no one else is around what he would like to do about a certain situation.
___ Be aware of, but not anxious about, his inability to make decisions with the idea that he will gain more self-confidence as he feels more secure in the nursery school.
___ Reward him in some way whenever he does decide something for himself.
___ Just let the other children make his decisions for him.
___ Give the child as many opportunities as possible to make decisions.
___ Tell him he must be a baby if he can't make up his own mind.
One child is pulling others in a wagon. Another child, riding a tricycle bumps into the back of the wagon, knocking down the child pulling it. You reprimand the child on the tricycle. He immediately starts kicking and hitting you, shouting, "I hate you, I hate you!" What would you do?

- Reflect his feelings back to him by saying, "I know you are angry, but I can't let you hit me."
- Say to the child, "That is okay if you hate me, but you must not run into the other children and hurt them."
- Just let the child go because trying to talk to him would be useless in his angered state.
- Try to get the situation back to normal by asking all of the children involved to join in some other activity.
- Let him punch on the punching bag.
- Ask one of the other teachers to deal with him so that both of you could have a chance to calm down.
- Stop his hitting and kicking by physically holding him down.
- Take him away from the rest of the group and try to calm him down by softly talking to him.
- Explain to him that he could have hurt the child who was pulling the wagon.

Several children have been diligently building a block house for quite some time. Suddenly another child runs to the block area and knocks down the house, then runs away. What would you do?

- Have the child help the other children rebuild the blocks.
- Separate him from the group until he can treat the other children better.
- Wait until he is building with the blocks sometime, then knock them down so he will know how it feels.
- Tell him that he must not knock down the blocks of other children.
- Ignore the child and let the children handle it themselves.
- Try to find out why the child acted in this way.
- Quietly stop him and tell him that the other children don't like to have their blocks knocked down.
- Take him outside to let him wear off his excess energy.
- Interest him in something else.
A child who rides in a car pool never has any problems coming to nursery school except when it is his mother's turn to drive and on those days he clings to her and has a very difficult time letting her go. What would you do?

- Have the mother leave anyway with the idea that as soon as the child gets into the nursery school he will be all right.
- Tell him that if he is not a good boy she might not come back.
- Ignore the child's behavior.
- Tell the mother to try to make arrangements so she doesn't ever bring the children to nursery school.
- Let the child make a decision—either he can stay at nursery school without his mother or go back home with her.
- Ask the mother to stay with the child until he can let her go.
- Let the mother decide how to handle the situation.
- Have the mother stay with the child until he is playing and then leave after giving him a kiss and telling him she'll be back later.
- Talk to the mother to try to determine reasons for this child's behavior.

Two children in the nursery school appear to be very good friends in that they play together constantly. One child, however, is constantly telling the other what to do. Actually they are quite dependent upon each other—one to have someone to tell him what to do; the other to have someone to give orders to. What would you do?

- Just let the situation continue as it is.
- Encourage them to let other children join in their play.
- Encourage each of them individually to play with other children.
- Feel that no problem exists.
- Separate them so they will become less dependent on each other.
- Take advantage of a day when one of them is absent to introduce the other into a new group play situation.
- Put them into situations where they must play roles just the opposite of what they have with each other.
- Tell them they must learn to play with other children.
- Feel little concern and let time take care of the problem.
Some of the children are in the waiting room waiting to be checked by the nurse. One child, who has not yet been checked, runs into the nursery school. His mother follows him and when they return she is holding him by the arm and he is kicking and shouting, "Leave me alone." What would you do?

Tell him that if he can't behave he will have to go back home with his mother.
Say to him, "You are really anxious to get into the nursery school today, aren't you? But you need to be checked first."
Disregard the child's behavior and tell him to stand in line for the nurse to check him.
Tell the child that his mother won't love him if he doesn't behave.
Try to find out why the child is acting this way before doing anything.
Quietly stop him and tell him that it hurts his mother when he kicks her.
Tell him that you know he is angry, but he must wait until he is checked before going into the nursery school.
Tell him to tell his mother he's sorry.
Quietly but firmly pick the child up and take him away from the group until he has quieted down.

After painting, a child has taken off his apron and thrown it onto the floor. You tell him to pick it up and put it where it belongs. He retorts by shouting, "You can't boss me!" What would you do?

Say, "I am not trying to boss you. I just want you to know what you must do in nursery school."
Ask him who can boss him.
Ignore him and pick up the apron yourself.
Take him away and tell him he has to play by himself.
Say, "Yes, I can boss you; I am your teacher."
Separate him from the other children until he can think about having respect for equipment and teachers.
Try to find out why this child acted as he did.
Say, "Can you boss yourself and tell yourself to put the apron where it belongs, or shall I help you put it away?"
Say, "It makes you angry if you think someone is trying to boss you, doesn't it? You feel like being left alone. We will leave the apron there and you hang it up when you feel like it before we go home."
Two children are playing on the slide. At the top one child pushes the other down the slide. The child who was pushed runs to you crying, "Teacher he keeps pushing me." What would you do?

- Suggest that he tell the other child that he doesn't like to be pushed.
- Ask him if he had been bothering the one who pushed him by saying, "Did he have a reason to push you?"
- Tell the children that they're too big to fight.
- Ask them if they could figure out a way so they could both slide.
- Tell them they will both have to get off the slide.
- Ask the child who pushed why he pushed the other child down the slide.
- Tell him to go back to the slide; then wait to see if they can solve the problem themselves.
- Feel that this child needs help in handling situations on his own and think of ways to help him do this.
- Tell him to solve his own problems because you don't like tattletales.
APPENDIX B
### Dependency on Parents

When a child enters the nursery school his mother may stay as long as he needs her. Usually the mother stays for a few days and then the child is able to stay by himself. One child, however, doesn't feel that he can let his mother go. Each day she comes with him and, if she attempts to leave, he cries or threatens to cry. What would you do?

1. **Ignore his protests and have the mother leave anyway because the child will soon become fascinated by the nursery school activities and forget his mother.**
2. **Tell him that he must be a big boy like the other children.**
3. **Let the mother handle the situation because she knows her child better than you do.**

One child has no difficulty putting on his coat, boots, and other outdoor clothing during the middle of the day; however, when it is time for his mother to come he refuses to put them on until she comes in and helps him. What would you do?

1. **Put him in another section of the room until he is willing to cooperate.**
2. **Hope that in time he will stop this behavior.**
3. **Have the mother wait until the other children have gone, then tell him that maybe she got so tired of helping him that she decided to wait long enough for him to be ready when she came.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Have the mother around where the child has access to her, but not in the nursery school room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Have the mother leave for a short time each day explaining to him that she will be back and then make sure she returns when she said she would.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Do whatever things are necessary to make the child feel more secure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eventually give the child a choice. Let him decide whether he would rather come to nursery school and stay without his mother or stay at home with her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Let the mother handle the situation because she knows her child better than you do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Feel that he is too young for nursery school and take him out for awhile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ignore his protests and have the mother leave anyway because the child will soon become fascinated by the nursery school activities and forget his mother.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tell him that he must be a big boy like the other children.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RATING OF ATTITUDE SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Have the child put his things on well in advance of his mother's coming and play outside until she comes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Suggest that the mother let him do it himself with her encouragement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Make a game out of putting the clothes on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Put his clothes on for him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Let him wait each day for his mother to help him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hope that in time he will stop this behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Have the mother wait until the other children have gone, then tell him that maybe she got so tired of helping him that she decided to wait long enough for him to be ready when she came.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tell him to be a big boy like the other children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Put him in another section of the room until he is willing to cooperate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A child who rides in a car pool never has any problems coming to nursery school except when it is his mother's turn to drive and on those days he clings to her and has a very difficult time letting her go. What would you do?

3 Ask the mother to stay with the child until he can let her go.
3 Let the child make a decision--either he can stay at nursery school without his mother or go back home with her.
3 Have the mother stay with the child until he is playing and then leave after giving him a kiss and telling him she'll be back later.
2 Have the mother leave anyway with the idea that as soon as the child gets into the nursery school he will be all right.
2 Let the mother decide how to handle the situation.
2 Talk to the mother to try to determine reasons for this child's behavior.
1 Tell him that if he is not a good boy she might not come back.
1 Ignore the child's behavior.
1 Tell the mother to try to make arrangements so she doesn't ever bring the children to nursery school.

Dependency on Teachers

Two children are playing on the slide. At the top one child pushes the other down the slide. The child who was pushed runs to you crying, "Teacher, he keeps pushing me." What would you do?

3 Suggest that he tell the other child that he doesn't like to be pushed.
3 Tell him to go back to the slide; then wait to see if they can solve the problem themselves.
3 Feel that this child needs help in handling situations on his own and think of ways to help him do this.
2 Ask him if he had been bothering the one who pushed him by saying, "Did he have a reason to push you?"
2 Ask them if they could figure out a way so they could both slide.
2 Ask the child who pushed why he pushed the other child down the slide.
1 Tell the children that they're too big to fight.
1 Tell them they will both have to get off the slide.
1 Tell him to solve his own problems because you don't like tattle-tales.
Some of the children have taken off their shoes and, because it is nearing time for them to go home you tell them that they will have to put them back on. One child says, "I won't put them on unless you help me." What would you do?

3 Help him, but let him do as much as he can by himself.
3 Say, "I'll put one on and you put the other one."
3 Find out if this child really does need help.
2 Sit the child down and put his shoes on him.
2 Tell him that you will tie them if he puts them on.
2 Say to the child, "I'll help you as soon as I have a minute. See if you can put them on all by yourself while you are waiting for me."
1 Say, "Oh, I'll bet you don't even know how to put your shoes on."
1 Say, "You put those shoes on and put them on right now."
1 Tell him that you will not help him because he knows how to do it himself.

One child in the nursery school is quite withdrawn and seldom makes any effort to enter the play of other children or join in any activity of the group unless specifically asked by a teacher. He spends much of his time just watching other children at play unless a teacher encourages him to join the group. He further displays his dependency on the teachers by asking them often to read to him, another activity which takes up much of his time. What would you do?

3 Make an effort to find out why this child is so dependent on teachers and doesn't join in group activities.
3 Spend as much time as possible with this child in an effort to give him an opportunity to build a warm relationship with an adult before forcing him to relate to children.
3 Feel that this may be a situation where the child is not yet ready for social contacts with other children and just let time take care of the matter.
2 Feel that this child needs help in developing his social capabilities and think of methods to encourage him to relate more with other people.
2 Continue to encourage him to join in group activities.
2 Continue to respond to his demands that you spend so much time reading to him.
1 Ask him why he won't play with the other children.
1 Quit encouraging him to join in because sometimes he doesn't respond to your suggestions.
1 Quit reading to him.
Dependency of Other Children

It is early in the year in the nursery school. A boy in his first year at the school is very dependent upon one of his older neighborhood friends who has been in the nursery school before. The younger of the two follows the older everywhere and will not attempt to play with others, nor will he begin anything on his own. What would you do?

3 Try to encourage him to play with others, but not push the issue, hoping that time will take care of the matter.
3 Give the younger as many opportunities as possible to do things for himself.
3 Allow them to play together until the younger feels more secure.
2 Try to gain his confidence and friendship and get him to build a relationship with you and then bring other children into your relationship.
2 Talk to his mother and see what she could do to help the situation.
2 Use many ways of making him feel important with the idea in mind that when he is ready to advance, he will, but not until he is ready.
1 Attempt to get his interest at every opportunity.
1 Separate the two so the dependency will not grow worse.
1 Tell him he must learn to play with others.

One child in the nursery school has a very difficult time making decisions. Whenever a situation occurs in which he is forced to make a decision, he tries to get another child to tell him what to do. What would you do?

3 Try to find out why this child feels so dependent on others.
3 Ask him specifically when no one else is around what he would do about a certain situation.
3 Be aware of, but not anxious about, his inability to make decisions with the idea that he will gain more self-confidence as he feels more secure in the nursery school.
2 Try to assure the child that he will not be punished for doing as he wants to do.
2 Reward him in some way whenever he does decide something for himself.
2 Give the child as many opportunities as possible to make decisions.
1 Tell him to make his own decisions.
1 Just let the other children make his decisions for him.
1 Tell him he must be a baby if he can't make up his own mind.
Two children in the nursery school appear to be very good friends in that they play together constantly. One child, however, is constantly telling the other what to do. Actually they are quite dependent upon each other—one to have someone to tell him what to do, the other to have someone to give orders to. What would you do?

3 Encourage them to let other children join in their play.

3 Take advantage of a day when one of them is absent to introduce the other into a new group play situation.

3 Feel little concern and let time take care of the problem.

2 Just let the situation continue as it is.

2 Encourage each of them individually to play with other children.

2 Put them into situations where they must play roles just the opposite of what they have with each other.

1 Feel that no problem exists.

1 Separate them so they will become less dependent on each other.

1 Tell them they must learn to play with other children.

---

Aggression Toward Parents

A child, accompanied by his mother, has brought a toy to nursery school. While his mother is still there you tell him that he will either have to leave the toy in the office or send it home with his mother. His mother takes the toy away from him and he retaliates by hitting her. What would you do?

3 Bring a toy from the nursery school and get his attention away from the toy he brought from home.

3 Ask the child what he would like to do with the toy—leave it in the office or let his mother take it home with her.

3 Say to the child, "I know that you are angry because you cannot have the toy, but maybe we can find some other toy for you to play with.

2 Let him keep the toy that day and then tell him not to bring it again.

2 Motion to the mother to get the toy out of sight and try to interest him in other things.

2 Ask him if he would like to come in and see the nursery school toys.

1 Tell the child that he must love his mother, not hit her.

1 Tell the child to hit the punching bag instead of his mother.

1 Tell him that this is not how a gentleman acts in nursery school.
A child is especially engrossed in his painting when his mother comes early to take him home. She tells him he must hurry. He turns and shouts, "I don't want to go. I want to stay here." and attempts to throw paint at her. What would you do?

3 Ask the mother if she could wait until he has finished his painting.
3 Tell him that you know he would like to stay, but his mother is in a hurry.
3 Another time, find out what days the mother will come early and plan the activities so this child will be ready to go when the mother comes.
2 Tell him that he will have to keep the paint on the paper and in the containers.
2 Let the mother handle the situation.
2 Feel that it serves the mother right for coming early and trying to make him hurry.
1 Tell him to be nice to his mother.
1 Tell him that this isn't the way a big boy acts.
1 Take him away from the painting and start getting him ready to go.

Some of the children are in the waiting room waiting to be checked by the nurse. One child, who has not yet been checked, runs into the nursery school. His mother follows him and when they return she is holding him by the arm and he is kicking and shouting, "Leave me alone!" What would you do?

3 Say to him, "You are really anxious to get into the nursery school today, aren't you? But you need to be checked first."
3 Tell him that you know he is angry, but he must wait until he is checked before going into the nursery school.
3 Quietly but firmly pick the child up and take him away from the group until he has quieted down.
2 Disregard the child's behavior and tell him to stand in line for the nurse to check him.
2 Try to find out why the child is acting this way before doing anything.
2 Quietly stop him and tell him that it hurts his mother when he kicks her.
1 Tell him that if he can't behave he will have to go back home with his mother.
1 Tell the child that his mother won't love him if he doesn't behave.
1 Tell him to tell his mother he's sorry.
Aggression Toward Teachers

Inside, several children are playing in the water trough. One child begins pouring water on the floor and you tell him to keep the water in the trough. Instead of doing as you say, however, he picks up a cup of water and throws it at you. What would you do?

3 Say to him, "You threw the water at me because you were angry when I told you to keep the water in the trough. Now let's mop it up."
3 Say, "That's enough of that. Now let's get a mop and I'll help you wipe it up."
3 Say to him, "I can't let you throw water at me."
2 Make him get the mop and help him mop up all of the water he has spilled.
2 Ask him why he threw the water at you.
2 Try to find out the reasons for this child's behavior before doing anything.
1 Ignore him and mop up the water yourself.
1 Make him leave the water play area and tell him he must play by himself.
1 Tell him to be a big boy and not throw water anymore.

One child is pulling others in a wagon. Another child, riding a tricycle bumps into the back of the wagon, knocking down the child pulling it. You reprimand the child on the tricycle. He immediately starts kicking and hitting you, shouting, "I hate you, I hate you!" What would you do?

3 Reflect his feelings back to him saying, "I know you are angry, but I can't let you hit me."
3 Say to the child, "That is okay if you hate me, but you must not run into the other children and hurt them."
3 Take him away from the rest of the group and try to calm him down by softly talking to him.
2 Let him punch on the punching bag.
2 Stop his hitting and kicking by physically holding him down.
2 Explain to him that he could have hurt the child who was pulling the wagon.
1 Just let the child go because trying to talk to him would be useless in his angered state.
1 Try to get the situation back to normal by asking all of the children involved to join in some other activity.
1 Ask one of the other teachers to deal with him so that both of you could have a chance to calm down.
After painting, a child has taken off his apron and thrown it onto the floor. You tell him to pick it up and put it where it belongs. He retorts by shouting, "You can't boss me!" What would you do?

3 Say, "I am not trying to boss you. I just want you to know what you must do in nursery school."
3 Say, "Can you boss yourself and tell yourself to put the apron where it belongs, or shall I help you put it away?"
3 Say, "It makes you angry if you think someone is trying to boss you, doesn't it? You feel like being left alone. We will leave the apron there and you hang it up when you feel like it before we go home."
2 Ask him who can boss him.
2 Ignore him and pick up the apron yourself.
2 Try to find out why this child acted as he did.
1 Take him away and tell him he has to play by himself.
1 Say, "Yes, I can boss you; I am your teacher."
1 Separate him from the other children until he can think about having respect for equipment and teachers.

Aggression Toward Other Children

A group of children is playing together in the playhouse area. Another child has attempted to enter their play, but each time he has tried the group has rejected him. The child comes to you, saying, "Make them let me play." What would you do?

3 Try to find the reasons for the group's rejection of the child.
3 Encourage the child to make his own way into the situation and let the children settle it themselves.
3 Try to find something about the child which the other children will accept him for.
2 Tell the child to get a new toy and ask the children in the group if he could play with them and bring the new toy.
2 Show the children something that the child could do in helping them.
2 Go to the group and introduce the child as a new character.
1 Tell the group of children that they can't play if they won't let the other child play.
1 Take the child to the area and tell the other children to let him play.
1 Tell them that in nursery school everyone has to share.
A number of children are playing in the sandpile. You are standing nearby watching them. Two children suddenly begin to fight over a toy that both of them want. In anger, one child throws sand into the face of the other who immediately cries. What would you do?

3 Not make a big scene about the sand-throwing because it was a reaction to a building frustration.
3 Step in and stop the sand-throwing and comfort and console the crying child.
3 Help the child understand that it hurts when sand is thrown in one's face and serious damage may result.
2 Try to get the children to agree on which one will play with the toy first and which one later.
2 Tell him that if he cannot leave the sand in the sandbox, he will have to play somewhere else.
2 Let the punishment of seeing the other child cry be punishment enough.
1 Ask the child who threw sand if he thought it hurt the child when he threw sand in his face.
1 Talk calmly to the children and ask the one child if he was sorry.
1 Throw sand into the face of the child who threw sand so he would know how it feels.

Several children have been diligently building a block house for quite some time. Suddenly one child runs to the block area and knocks down the house, then runs away. What would you do?

3 Have the child help the other children rebuild the blocks.
3 Try to find out why the child acted in this way.
2 Quietly stop him and tell him that the other children don't like to have their blocks knocked down.
2 Tell him that he must not knock down the blocks of other children.
2 Take him outside to let him wear off his excess energy.
2 Interest him in something else.
1 Separate him from the group until he can treat the other children better.
1 Wait until he is building with the blocks sometime, then knock them down so he will know how it feels.
1 Ignore the child and let the children handle it themselves.