ATTITUDES TOWARD CHILDREN:

A COMPARISON OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

by

Delphine Lindemann Senn

Thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Family Development

Approved:

Dr. Michael J. Sporakowski, Chairman

Dr. James E. Montgomery
Department Head

Dr. Mary W. Hicks

June 1973

Blacksburg, Virginia

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The researcher wishes to extend her appreciation to the members of her committee: Drs. Michael J. Sporakowski, James Montgomery, and Mary Hicks. Special thanks are extended to Dr. Michael J. Sporakowski and Dr. J. W. Maxwell. An especial note of appreciation is given to Dr. Richard Hill for his assistance.

Mr. Charles McCormick, principal of Washington Hall, counselors, and participating students of Hayfield Secondary School are gratefully acknowledged.

A special thanks is extended to my husband, Lt. Col. Charles H. Senn, USAF, and to my daughters for their cooperation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Most social psychologists define an attitude as a belief that has an emotional component. For example, everyone agrees with the non-passionate statement that the Atlantic Ocean is a large body of water. But people have strong disagreements about the statement, "Women should be put down." The latter, a controversial belief, is an attitude (Rodgers, 1973).

Can attitudes be changed? Can the attitudes of high school girls toward children be changed after participating in a class of child development?

There are very few high schools in Virginia that offer students an opportunity to study children first hand in a laboratory nursery school. Hayfield Secondary School, Alexandria, Virginia, is a school that offers such a program.

Sophomore, junior and senior girls enroll in a class that meets two class periods a day, five days a week for a school year. A major purpose of the program is to qualify the high school graduate for employment in a day care center. Another purpose is to provide academic students an opportunity to assess and evaluate goals of entering child oriented professions such as teaching and nursing. A further aim of the course from which the majority of students should benefit is preparation for parenthood.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND BACKGROUND OF THE PRESENT STUDY

Review of Literature

A review of the literature indicates that authors believe attitudes can be changed. Using the critical incident technique, Collins (1954) established that attitudes of mothers toward their deaf children changed. A supervised Easter Seal camp provided the setting. Trained counselors worked with mothers to enable them to be more effective with their children.

Masych (1971), comparing the attitudes of child development experts with directors of day care centers and their trained and untrained aides, found attitudes of directors and aides more similar than the attitudes of the directors and child development experts.

Positive attitude changes were found by Nelson (1970) in his study of psychology students working with handicapped children at the University of Michigan. He compared a control group of beginning psychology students with an experimental group of beginning psychology students. The experimental students had field trips to special facilities for handicapped children. They also worked in Saturday programs with these children. His analysis indicated positive attitude changes toward handicapped children in the experimental group when compared with the attitudes of the control group.

Walters and Bridges (1956) in their study of the attitudes of single men toward children found that attitudes of the men were

favorable toward children. The men were single, white, undergraduate men enrolled in seven colleges and universities. The instrument used was the "University of Southern California Parent Attitude Survey." The instrument is a paper-and-pencil, self-inventory device designed for the analysis of patterns of attitudes that are influential in shaping the behavior and personality of children.

Walters and Fisher (1958) found in their study that attitudes toward children continue to change throughout the undergraduate years when instruction in child development and guidance is provided. Walters and Fisher compared the changes in the attitudes of young college-age home economics women toward child guidance over a two-year period.

Walters (1959) in his study comparing attitudes of college students toward children found the experimental group students' attitudes toward children had changed as a result of an introductory course in child development and guidance. The instruments used were the "University of Southern California Parent Attitude Survey" developed by Shoben and the "Child Guidance Survey" by Wiley. Variables controlled for in Walters' study were socio-economic status, scholastic aptitude, rural-urban residence, size of family, ordinal position, academic achievement, and perceptions of childhood happiness.

Background of the Present Study

In the fall of 1970 a child development program was initiated at Hayfield Secondary School, Alexandria, Virginia. This program was instituted to provide a vocational program for students. The philosophy

of the school administrators is that each high school graduate has the ability to enter the work force with at least a minimum skill.

The first year of operation one class was held with twenty-four child development students and fifteen four year old children in the laboratory nursery school. Elaine Creigh was the nursery school teacher and this author was the seminar teacher.

The first year appeared to be very successful. The following year enough high school students had enrolled to start another child development class and laboratory nursery school session. In all of the classes, the girls appeared to enjoy being with the children. When openings for aides in day care centers became available, most child development students who applied were accepted for these positions.

The child development classes have made such a favorable impression in educational circles in Fairfax County that two new secondary schools, Chantilly and Lake Braddock, have been designed with laboratory nursery schools in the home economics departments.

Statement of the Problem

The objective of the present study was to determine whether a difference in attitude toward children exists between child development students and non-child development students. The child development students have had a half year of classroom and laboratory experience.

Hypothesis

The hypothesis is stated in the null form. There are no significant differences in attitudes toward children between child development

students and non-child development students at Hayfield Secondary School, Alexandria, Virginia.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Description of the Sample

High school girls, students at Hayfield Secondary School, were the subjects tested. The forty-seven child development students were in the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grades. They were in four separate classes.

One hour a day, five days a week for a semester these pupils learned about children in the seminar class. For the same amount of time they were involved with fifteen four year old children in the laboratory nursery school. Class work in the laboratory school consisted of planning and participating in activities for the children. Planning and preparing snacks, and playing and talking with the children were vital parts of the laboratory experience. The students were also given instruction in the use of guidance techniques.

At the time of the test, the child development students had completed one semester of class work. The students lived in the communities which this school serves and represented a broad spectrum of socio-economic levels. (See Table I.) There were some families living in the Lorton and Penn Daw area who were on welfare. At the other end of the scale were wealthy families who reside in Wilton Woods. Students whose fathers were in the Army, stationed at Fort Belvoir, lived on post. About twenty percent of the students lived in Hayfield Farms which is an upper middle-class community.

TABLE I

Residence of Subjects

		Child Development		Non-Child Development	
	Community*	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1.	Wilton Woods	1	2.2	2	4.3
2.	Hayfield Farms Harbour View	8	16.9	12	25.5
3.	Fort Belvoir Virginia Hills Pohick Forest	13	27.6	14	29.8
4.	Lorton Newington Glen Alta Franconia	16	34.1	14	29.8
5.	Jefferson Manor Penn Daw Fairhaven Huntington	9	19.2	5	10.6
	TOTALS	47	100	47	100

*These areas of residence approximate social class ranks from upper to lower, Category 1 being highest and Category 5 being lowest.

The control group consisted of an equal number (47) of high school females who were matched to the child development students by age, race, grade and community. (For a further description see Table II.) They had not taken the child development class.

Description of the Instrument

The instrument used for this study was the "Child-Guidance Inventory" developed by T. L. Engle and Louis Snellgrove. (See Appendix I.) The inventory was published by the authors for use with their text, Psychology, 5th edition, 1969. This test was selected because it appeared to be an excellent instrument for measuring attitudes toward children. The students were asked to preface each question with "Would you as a parent _____?" and answer by circling "Yes," "No," or "?". No data on reliability or validity is available for the instrument. Included with the inventory for the students to complete was a personal data sheet. (See Appendix 2.)

Questions Explored

In addition to comparing the total scores of the two test groups on the "Child Guidance Inventory," an item analysis of the test was done comparing the two groups. Also, comparisons were made of Inventory scores based on students' curricula, proximity to grandparents, transience, number of siblings, area of residence and parents' marital status.

TABLE II

Description of Sample

Age

Child Development Students			Non-Child Development Students		
Age	Number	Percent	Age	Number	Percent
15	4	8.5	15	12	25.5
16	20	42.5	16	17	36.2
17	19	40.4	17	12	25.5
18	3	6.4	18	6	12.8
19	1	2.2	19	0	0.0
	47	100		47	100

Grade Level

Child Development Students			Non-Child Development Students		
Grade	Number	Percent	Grade	Number	Percent
10	20	42.5	10	21	44.6
11	17	36.2	11	15	32.0
12	10	21.3	12	11	23.4
	47	100		47	100

TABLE II (continued)

Description of Sample

Race

Child Development Students			Non-Child Development Students	
Race	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Caucasian	44	93.6	44	93.6
Negroid	3	6.4	3	6.4
	47	100	47	100

Curriculum

Child Development Students			Non-Child Development Students		
Course	Number	Percent	Course	Number	Percent
General	20	42.5	General	8	17.0
Business	6	12.8	Business	7	14.9
Academic	17	36.2	Academic	27	57.4
Vocational	4	8.5	Vocational	5	10.7
	47	100		47	100

Description of the Testing Situation

The test was administered to the child development students and non-child development students in the science lecture room of Hayfield Secondary School on Monday, February 26, 1973. A counselor from Washington Hall administered the test.

Statistical Analysis

The statistical analysis used for the major hypothesis was the t-test. The total test scores of both groups were compared. The level of significance was set at 0.05. The item analysis of the Inventory was done using chi-square with a significance level of .05. Analysis of variance was used for the remaining comparisons, also using the .05 level for significance determination.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Test of Major Hypothesis

In order to assess the hypothesis that there are no significant differences between child development and non-child development students' attitudes toward children, it was necessary to examine the t-test analysis of the test scores of both groups. (See Table III.)

There was a significant difference of attitudes between the child development and non-child development groups ($P < .05$). The null hypothesis was rejected.

This difference in attitude toward children appears not to be due to chance and therefore can be attributed to an outside causation. As a consequence, it would appear that the course of instruction in the child development program at Hayfield Secondary School may be a variable influencing attitudes toward children.

The child development students were matched to non-child development students by age, grade, race, sex, and area of residence. The non-child development students did not receive instruction in the child development class or have the work experience in the nursery laboratory school. Their experiences appear to have been a variable that was related to the significant difference between the test scores of the control and non-control group. A combination of instruction and laboratory experience with children may improve students' attitudes toward children as measured in this study.

TABLE III

Comparison of Child Development Students and Non-Child Development Students on Attitudes Toward Children Utilizing the t-Test*

Child Development		Non-Child Development
$\bar{x}$ = 40.89		$\bar{x}$ = 38.87
s.d. = 3.74		s.d. = 5.74
N = 47		N = 47
	t = 2.02	
	d.f. = 92	
	p = < .05	

*For a more detailed frequency distribution of the scores, see Appendix 3.

Item Analysis

Chi-square was used to analyze each item, comparing child development and non-child development groups. (See Appendix 4.) Four test questions significantly discriminated between child-development students and non-child development students.

Answers to the question, "Would you as a parent buy a child tools or utensils that could actually be used rather than play tools or utensils?" were statistically significant. (See Table IV.) The author believes this significance can be attributed to the child development students' experience in the laboratory nursery school. Children use standard size wood working tools and kitchen utensils in their projects. Comments were also made by the instructor that not even an adult could use play tools and achieve satisfactory results.

"Would you as a parent introduce a child to guests just as you would introduce an adult to them?" was a question that discriminated between the two groups. (See Table IV.) The author believes the way each child is treated as an individual in the laboratory nursery school is the reason for this significant response by child development students. Guidance techniques which are taught to child development students are helpful in interacting with children and result in this respect for children.

Item number 41, "Would you as a parent punish a child for making low grades in school?" was another question that significantly discriminated between child development and non-child development students (See

Table IV.) This was a question discussed in the seminar class. Students asked the teacher if her children received rewards for good grades. They were told that they did not receive rewards for good grades but were not punished for bad grades.

Another discriminating question was, "Would you as a parent slap or strike a child in the face?" (See Table IV.) This question significantly discriminated at the .01 level. Child development students observe the effects of positive guidance techniques that students are encouraged to use in the laboratory nursery school. The need for punishment in class is minimized by attempting to assess and change situations that might result in misdeeds by the children. In the seminar, the subject of discipline and punishment is frequently discussed.

Two criticisms of the "Child-Guidance Inventory" deserve discussion. The construction of the question, "Would you as a parent permit and encourage a child to stay at a friend's home overnight?" is relatively inadequate. The use of two dissimilar verbs resulted in a greater percentage of the subjects selecting a negative response. (See Appendix 4.) "Would you as a parent permit a child to muss up your home by having friends visit him or her in the house?" was another item that was questionable. (See Appendix 4.) Because the question was stated in such a way that it did not set limits on the "mussing," an overwhelming number of the subjects answered it negatively.

TABLE IV

Statistically Significantly Discriminating Items

Item Number 15: Buy a child tools or utensils that could actually be used rather than play tools or utensils?

	Positive	Negative	
Child Development	17	30	
Non-Child Development	7	39	
Chi-square = 4.292	d.f.=1		P < .05

Item Number 28: Introduce a child to guests just as you would introduce an adult to them?

	Positive	Negative	
Child Development	45	2	
Non-Child Development	38	8	
Chi-square = 2.923	d.f.=1		P < .05

TABLE IV (continued)

Statistically Significantly Discriminating Items

Item Number 41: Punish a child for making low grades in school?

	Positive	Negative	
Child Development	37	10	
Non-Child Development	25	21	
Chi-square = 5.167	d.f.=1		P < .05

Item Number 44: Slap or strike a child in the face?

	Positive	Negative	
Child Development	46	1	
Non-Child Development	34	12	
Chi-square = 9.195	d.f.=1		P < .05

Comparison of Selected Variables

An analysis of variance comparing students' test scores across curricula resulted in a significant difference: academic students had the highest scores while general, vocational and business students scored lower in that order. This statistical analysis appears to indicate that students in academic curricula have more positive attitudes toward children. It is worthy to note that academic students as a group had the highest score. The non-child development group had a higher percentage of academic students, yet that group had a lower total score than the child development group. (See Table V.) Therefore, it would appear reasonable to infer that the non-child development group was weighted unknowingly by sample selection and somewhat affected the statistically significant difference in test scores between child development and non-child development subjects.

As a result of comments made by child development students, the author believed that proximity of grandparents to subjects might affect attitudes. An analysis of variance of the test scores of the subjects comparing proximities to grandparents was conducted. The result was non-significant. Proximity to grandparents did not appear to affect the subjects' attitudes toward children.

Because of the large number of transient residents such as government and military personnel in this county, an analysis of variance was conducted examining this variable. Subjects' test scores were compared based on frequency of change of residence. The result was non-significant. Transience or intransience of subjects does not appear to affect attitudes of subjects toward children.

TABLE V

Curriculum Comparisons on Attitudes Toward Children

	Curriculum	
Curriculum	Mean	Number
General	39.45	29
Business	35.12	12
Academic	40.76	41
Vocational	39.82	11

F = 3.614 d.f.=92 P < .05

The subjects were categorized according to area of residence. These areas were ranked according to value of homes. An analysis of variance was conducted comparing test scores of both groups across area of residence. (See Table VI.) A significant difference resulted at the .05 level. A significant relationship appears to exist between economic status (area of residence) of the subject and his attitude toward children. Apparently, the economic level which allows families to live in more costly homes and communities has a favorable effect on the high school students' attitudes toward children. The student from a lower economic level may be penalized on an attitude inventory because of the lower economic status in that the inventory may favor middle or upper class values. It appears to the author that skills and attitudes acquired by parents of higher economic levels are passed on to their children. These attitudes and skills enable subjects from upper economic levels to attain higher scores on the "Child-Guidance Inventory."

An examination of records of subjects from lower economic levels indicated that some parents had not graduated from high school. If negative attitudes toward school were transmitted to their children, this could penalize their children. If the subjects of lower economic levels did not learn to read with comprehension, they would not understand the questions of the instrument. This also could result in a lower score on the "Child-Guidance Inventory."

As was stated previously, academic subjects as a group scored highest on the "Child Guidance Inventory." A statistical analysis was

TABLE VI

Area of Residence and Attitudes Toward Children Scores

Area of Residence Group Number*	Scores Mean	Subjects N
1	42.00	4
2	40.88	16
3	40.50	32
4	38.93	28
5	36.31	13
F = 2.429	d.f.=92	P < .05

*Communities are ranked according to cost of homes, with number 1 as most expensive and number 5 as least expensive.

1. Wilton Woods
2. Hayfield Farms, Harbour View
3. Fort Belvoir, Virginia Hills, Pohick Forest
4. Lorton, Newington, Glen Alta, Franconia
5. Jefferson Manor, Penn Daw, Fairhaven, Huntington

run comparing the curriculum of the subject and his area of residence (a measure of socio-economic status). The result was statistically significant at the .01 level. (See Table VII.) A relationship exists between the curriculum of the subject and the area of residence. Subjects enrolled in an academic curriculum from a higher economic status have better attitudes toward children than subjects enrolled in the other curricula from all economic levels. An examination of Table VII shows that more academic students lived in homes located in upper income levels than students from the other curricula. Also note that more subjects enrolled in the general, vocational and business curricula reside in the lower economic communities.

If the assumption can be made that academic subjects are also from a higher socio-economic status, it would appear that high school students acquire better attitudes toward children as a result of belonging to a family from a higher socio-economic level. Likewise, subjects enrolled in vocationally oriented curricula may belong to a lower socio-economic level. These subjects appear to hold attitudes toward children that are not as desirable as indicated on the "Child-Guidance Inventory."

A statistical comparison of the parents' marital status and attitudes toward children scores did not result in a significant difference. Marital status of parents did not seem to affect subjects' attitudes toward children. Total number of siblings, either older or younger, similarly did not affect subjects' attitudes toward children.

TABLE VII

Chi-square Analysis Comparing

Subjects' Curriculum to Area of Residence

	1,2,3*	4,5	
Academic	29 (22.7)	12 (18.3)	41
Combined Curriculum**	23 (29.3)	30 (23.7)	53
	52	42	94

$X^2 = 6.99$ d.f.=1 $P < .05$

*1,2,3 Upper economic areas; 4,5 Lower economic areas

**Business
General
Vocational

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of the study was to ascertain whether any difference in attitudes toward children existed between child development students and non-child development students at Hayfield Secondary School, Alexandria, Virginia.

Forty-seven high school females who had completed a semester of child development seminar and laboratory nursery school were matched by grade, age, race, and community to forty-seven females who had not studied child development in high school.

The hypothesis tested was stated in the null form: there are no significant differences in attitudes toward children between child development students and non-child development students at Hayfield Secondary School, Alexandria, Virginia.

A "Child-Guidance Inventory" (Engle and Snellgrove, 1969) was administered to child development and non-child development students on February 26, 1973, in the Science Lecture Room at Hayfield Secondary School.

A statistical analysis utilizing the t-test was applied to the total score of each group. The level of significance was set at .05. The results proved statistically significant and the null hypothesis was rejected. There appears to be a difference in attitude of students who have taken a course in child development and those

students who have not taken this course, the child development students holding more positive attitudes towards children.

An item analysis of the test questions indicated that four questions were statistically significantly discriminating. These items could be classified as questions of discipline, play and respect for the child.

Test scores of both groups were compared using variance analysis on area of residence, marital status of parents, number of siblings, transience, proximity to grandparents and curriculum. Two analyses that indicated significant differences were the areas of residence and curriculum. Students from a higher economic level scored significantly higher on the child guidance inventory than those students from a lower economic level. Students enrolled in an academic program in high school scored significantly higher test scores on the instrument than students in the other curricula. Scores by curriculum were ranked in this order (high to low)--academic, vocational, general and business.

Statistical analysis reveals that a significant number of academic subjects reside in upper socio-economic levels. It appears that academic subjects from upper socio-economic levels have more favorable attitudes toward children than non-academic subjects from lower economic levels as indicated by test scores on the "Child-Guidance Inventory."

Marital status of parents, proximity to grandparents, number of siblings and transience do not appear to affect subjects' attitudes toward children.

Conclusions

As good as the "Child-Guidance Inventory" appeared upon first examination, in its use as a device to compare attitudes of child development students to non-child development students, it proved less effective than expected. Many items failed to discriminate between the two groups. One reason was that some questions were of such a general nature as to have fairly obvious answers. This had the effect of lowering the number of questions that would discriminate between the control and non-control groups. Another failure of the instrument was that it was not specific enough in its description in some questions so that either "yes" or "no" could be correct; this is the case in question number 11. The question reads, "Would you as a parent tell a child well in advance that he is going to have a baby brother or sister?" The question is, how long is "long in advance"? A test other than the "Child-Guidance Inventory" might be more useful in comparing high school students' attitudes toward children.

Recommendations

The analysis indicated a statistical difference exists between attitudes of child development and non-child development students. Therefore, it would appear desirable to pursue this type of evaluation. This can be achieved by administering the test to students in high schools with child development programs or to subsequent child development classes at Hayfield Secondary School. The use of a larger sample might also be desirable.

If the study were to be replicated, it would be desirable to match subjects, not only by sex, age, race, grade, and community, but also by curriculum. By controlling this variable, it would appear that a more accurate assessment of attitudes toward children would be made.

Additional research should be undertaken by comparing attitudes of child development students with attitudes of their parents. This information would prove beneficial because it would examine the relationship of students' attitudes and those of their parents, and the degree to which their attitudes are changed as a result of experience in a child development program.

REFERENCES

Collins, Marjorie G.
1954 A Study of Parent Attitudes on Child Management Before and After Training, Utilizing the Critical Incident Technique. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Pittsburgh. Abstracted in Dissertation Abstracts, Volume 14.

Engle, T. L. and L. Snellgrove
1969 Psychology. 5th ed. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc.

Masych, Harold Eugene
1971 Child Care Paraprofessional: Characteristics for Selection. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of North Carolina. Abstracted in Dissertation Abstracts, Volume 32B.

Nelson, Otis Nicholas
1970 Positive Attitude Changes Toward Handicapped Children and Special Education in a Beginning Psychology Class. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Michigan. Abstracted in Dissertation Abstracts, Volume 31A.

Rodgers, Carl
1973 "On becoming a person." Forum--J. C. Penney (Spring-Summer) 3+

Toole, Dorinne M.
1972 A Comparison of Attitudes of Day Care Aides and Authorities in Child Development Toward Selected Child Rearing Practices. Unpublished doctoral thesis, State University of New York at Buffalo. Abstracted in Dissertation Abstracts, Volume 33A.

Walters, James and Barbara Bridges
1956 "Attitudes of single men toward child guidance." Journal of Home Economics 48 (February): 109-113.

Walters, James and Clara Fisher
1958 "Changes in the attitudes of young women toward child guidance over a two year period." Journal of Educational Research 52 (November): 115-118.

Walters, James.
1959 "The effects of an introductory course in child development on the attitudes of college women toward child guidance." Journal of Experimental Education 27 (June): 311-321.

APPENDIX 1

THE FAMILY GROUP

A Child-Guidance Inventory

Each of the following questions should be prefaced by "Would you as a parent _____" and should be answered by circling "Yes," "No," or "?".

Yes No ? 1. Make fun of a child's fears?

Yes No ? 2. Punish a child for stuttering?

Yes No ? 3. Permit and encourage a child to stay at a friend's home overnight?

Yes No ? 4. Punish a child in front of his friends so as to make the punishment more effective?

Yes No ? 5. Permit a child to "help" you around the home even though in doing so he made you extra work?

Yes No ? 6. Tell a child that you wish he or she had been born the other sex if you really feel that way about it?

Yes No ? 7. Punish a child if he came home using a "bad" word that he had just heard?

Yes No ? 8. Ask a child to assume responsibility for regular home duties, such as wiping dishes or making his bed, as soon as he or she is able to do such work?

Yes No ? 9. Call a child a liar in case you caught him telling an untruth?

Yes No ? 10. Tell a child that a bogeyman will get him if he goes into a room that you do not wish to have disturbed?

Yes No ? 11. Tell a child well in advance that he is going to have a baby brother or sister?

Yes No ? 12. Teach a child that he is never to question your commands or decisions?

Yes No ? 13. Punish a child for taking his toys apart and thus ruining them?

Yes No ? 14. Tell the child that you will not love him if he disobeys you?

Yes No ? 15. Buy a child tools or utensils that could actually be used rather than play tools or utensils?

Yes No ? 16. Insist on the literal story of Santa Claus after a child has developed a questioning attitude as a result of remarks he has heard from playmates?

Yes No ? 17. Punish a child for crying whenever you leave him with a baby sitter?

Yes No ? 18. Allow the child to settle for himself most of the arguments or fights that he might have with his playmates?

Yes No ? 19. Tell a child that a policeman will get him if he does not behave?

Yes No ? 20. Play games with or read to the child?

Yes No ? 21. Punish a child for using his left hand instead of his right hand?

Yes No ? 22. Say "shame on you" when the child does something of which you do not approve?

Yes No ? 23. Permit a child to help select his or her own clothing even though he or she does not fully appreciate values?

Yes No ? 24. Allow a child to develop friendships with children of other religious beliefs?

Yes No ? 25. Attempt to cure a child of his fear of the dark by locking him in a dark room?

Yes No ? 26. Tell a child that his stories about imaginary playmates are something like the stories in storybooks?

Yes No ? 27. Talk "baby talk" to a child?

Yes No ? 28. Introduce a child to guests just as you would introduce an adult to them?

Yes No ? 29. Permit a child to muss up your home by having friends visit him or her in the house?

Yes No ? 30. Tell a child fairy stories about a witch who captured and tortured children who did not mind their parents?

Yes No ? 31. Talk with visitors or the other parent, in the presence of a child, about the faults of the child?

Yes No ? 32. Tell a child that if he does not behave you will have the doctor give him some bitter medicine?

Yes No ? 33. Ever hug a child or in other ways show your love for him?

Yes No ? 34. Tell a child about how much trouble you had with your teachers when you were in school?

Yes No ? 35. Visit the child's school occasionally?

Yes No ? 36. Tease a child about his social interest in members of the other sex?

Yes No ? 37. Send a child to bed without giving him his supper in order to punish him for some misdeed?

Yes No ? 38. Encourage a child to take part in family discussions and plans?

Yes No ? 39. Delay punishment until the other parent comes home to administer it?

Yes No ? 40. Encourage an older child to assist in feeding, bathing, and caring for a younger brother or sister?

Yes No ? 41. Punish a child for making low marks in school?

Yes No ? 42. Decide for a child what profession or voaction he or she is to follow?

Yes No ? 43. Threaten to send a child away from home or sell him if he does not behave?

Yes No ? 44. Slap or strike a child in the face?

Yes No ? 45. Make it a practice to tell a child what to do rather than tell him what not to do?

Yes No ? 46. Give a child an allowance or some kind of pay for odd jobs?

Yes No ? 47. Give a child money or some other reward for behaving when company is present?

Yes No ? 48. Suggest to a child that he is now big enough to put away his own clothing rather than command him to do so?

Yes No ? 49. Tell a child that it is all right to do some things that are forbidden by the other parent?

Yes No ? 50. Feel it necessary to keep your promises to a child even after the need for the promises has passed?

"A Child-Guidance Inventory" is reproduced by permission of the publishers from RECORD OF ACTIVITIES AND EXPERIMENTS for use with PSYCHOLOGY, Fifth Edition by T. L. Engle and Louis Snellgrove, 1969, by Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

APPENDIX 2

PERSONAL DATA

Sex_____ Age_____ Grade_____

Curriculum: General_____ Business_____ Academic_____ Vocational____

Baby sitting experience _____

_____

Number of brothers and sisters_____ Older_____ Younger_____

My parents are married_____ divorced_____ separated_____

My community is_____

My hobbies and outside interests are_____

_____

_____

My occupational goal is _____

APPENDIX 3

DISTRIBUTION OF SUBJECTS' SCORES
ON THE "CHILD-GUIDANCE INVENTORY"

Scores	Number of Child Development Students	Number of Non-Child Development Students
50-48	0	1
47-45	9	6
44-42	16	13
41-39	8	7
38-36	10	7
35-33	4	6
32-30	0	4
29-27	0	1
26-24	0	1
23-21	0	1
	47	47

APPENDIX 4

CHI-SQUARE ITEM ANALYSIS OF TEST ITEMS[1]

	POSITIVE[2]	NEGATIVE	
1. Make fun of a child's fears?			
Child Development	44	3	
Non-Child Development	45	1	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=0.239	N.S.
2. Punish a child for stuttering?			
Child Development	47	0	
Non-Child Development	42	4	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=2.419	N.S.
3. Permit and encourage a child to stay at a friend's home?			
Child Development	27	20	
Non-Child Development	27	19	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=0.008	N.S.
4. Punish a child in front of his friends so as to make the punishment more effective?			
Child Development	39	8	
Non-Child Development	32	14	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=1.633	N.S.

[1]Numbers are unequal as a result of an unusable test. However, the t-test was on the mean.

[2]Positive and negative were based on the test authors' scoring method.

APPENDIX 4 (continued)

	POSITIVE	NEGATIVE	
5. Permit a child to "help" you around the home even though in doing so he made you extra work?			
Child Development	42	5	
Non-Child Development	43	3	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=0.114	N.S.
6. Tell a child that you wish he or she had been born the other sex if you really feel that way about it?			
Child Development	45	2	
Non-Child Development	43	3	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=0.001	N.S.
7. Punish a child if he came home using a "bad" word that he had just heard?			
Child Development	29	18	
Non-Child Development	24	22	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=0.516	N.S.
8. Ask a child to assume responsibility for regular home duties, such as wiping dishes or making his bed, as soon as he or she is able to do such work?			
Child Development	42	5	
Non-Child Development	39	7	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=0.122	N.S.
9. Call a child a liar in case you caught him telling an untruth?			
Child Development	39	8	
Non-Child Development	40	6	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=0.061	N.S.

APPENDIX 4 (continued)

	POSITIVE	NEGATIVE	
10. Tell a child that a bogeyman will get him if he goes into a room that you do not wish to have disturbed?			
Child Development	47	0	
Non-Child Development	44	2	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=0.533	N.S.
11. Tell a child well in advance that he is going to have a baby sister or brother?			
Child Development	33	14	
Non-Child Development	35	11	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=0.164	N.S.
12. Teach a child that he is never to question your commands or decisions?			
Child Development	31	16	
Non-Child Development	22	24	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=2.422	N.S.
13. Punish a child for taking his toys apart and thus ruining them?			
Child Development	27	20	
Non-Child Development	20	26	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=1.299	N.S.
14. Tell the child that you will not love him if he disobeys you?			
Child Development	46	1	
Non-Child Development	43	3	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=0.284	N.S.

APPENDIX 4 (continued)

	POSITIVE	NEGATIVE	
15. Buy a child tools or utensils that could actually be used rather than play tools or utensils?			
Child Development	17	30	
Non-Child Development	7	39	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=4.292	P < .05
16. Insist on the literal story of Santa Claus after a child has developed a questioning attitude as a result of remarks he has heard from playmates?			
Child Development	19	28	
Non-Child Development	24	22	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=0.861	N.S.
17. Punish a child for crying whenever you leave him with a baby sitter?			
Child Development	44	3	
Non-Child Development	39	7	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=1.082	N.S.
18. Allow the child to settle for himself most of the arguments or fights that he might have with his playmates?			
Child Development	37	10	
Non-Child Development	36	10	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=0.039	N.S.
19. Tell a child that policeman will get him if he does not behave?			
Child Development	46	1	
Non-Child Development	41	5	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=1.673	N.S.

APPENDIX 4 (continued)

	POSITIVE	NEGATIVE	
20. Play games with or read to the child?			
Child Development	46	1	
Non-Child Development	46	0	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=0.000	N.S.
21. Punish a child for using his left hand instead of his right hand?			
Child Development	46	1	
Non-Child Development	44	2	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=0.000	N.S.
22. Say "shame on you" when the child does something of which you do not approve?			
Child Development	20	27	
Non-Child Development	12	34	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=2.111	N.S.
23. Permit a child to help select his or her own clothing even though he or she does not fully appreciate values?			
Child Development	33	14	
Non-Child Development	32	14	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=0.025	N.S.
24. Allow a child to develop friendships with children of other religious beliefs?			
Child Development	46	1	
Non-Child Development	45	1	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=0.489	N.S.

APPENDIX 4 (continued)

	POSITIVE	NEGATIVE	
25. Attempt to cure a child of his fear of the dark by locking him in a dark room?			
Child Development	44	3	
Non-Child Development	46	0	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=1.334	N.S.
26. Tell a child that his stories about imaginary playmates are something like the stories in storybooks?			
Child Development	24	23	
Non-Child Development	20	26	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=0.275	N.S.
27. Talk "baby talk" to a child?			
Child Development	45	2	
Non-Child Development	40	6	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=1.303	N.S.
28. Introduce a child to guests just as you would introduce an adult to them?			
Child Development	45	2	
Non-Child Development	38	8	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=2.923	$P < .05$
29. Permit a child to muss up your home by having friends visit him or her in the house?			
Child Development	6	41	
Non-Child Development	11	35	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=1.260	N.S.

APPENDIX 4 (continued)

	POSITIVE	NEGATIVE	
30. Tell a child fairy stories about a witch who captured and tortured children who did not mind their parents?			
Child Development	41	6	
Non-Child Development	38	8	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=0.111	N.S.
31. Talk with visitors or the other parent, in the presence of a child, about the faults of the child?			
Child Development	44	3	
Non-Child Development	44	2	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=0.001	N.S.
32. Tell a child that if he does not behave you will have the doctor give him some bitter medicine?			
Child Development	47	0	
Non-Child Development	43	3	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=1.423	N.S.
33. Ever hug a child or in other ways show your love for him?			
Child Development	47	0	
Non-Child Development	46	0	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=0.000	N.S.
34. Tell a child about how much trouble you had with your teachers when you were in school?			
Child Development	25	22	
Non-Child Development	21	25	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=0.270	N.S.

APPENDIX 4 (continued)

	POSITIVE	NEGATIVE	
35. Visit the child's school occasionally?			
Child Development	45	2	
Non-Child Development	39	7	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=2.065	N.S.
36. Tease a child about his social interest in members of the other sex?			
Child Development	42	5	
Non-Child Development	36	10	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=1.377	N.S.
37. Send a child to bed without giving his supper in order to punish him for some misdeed?			
Child Development	46	1	
Non-Child Development	41	5	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=1.673	N.S.
38. Encourage a child to participate in family discussions and plans?			
Child Development	42	5	
Non-Child Development	42	4	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=0.001	N.S.
39. Delay punishment until the other parent comes home to administer it?			
Child Development	33	14	
Non-Child Development	35	11	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=0.164	N.S.

APPENDIX 4 (continued)

	POSITIVE	NEGATIVE	
40. Encourage an older child to assist in feeding, bathing, and caring for a younger brother or sister?			
Child Development	41	6	
Non-Child Development	40	6	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=0.073	N.S.
41. Punish a child for making low grades in school?			
Child Development	37	10	
Non-Child Development	25	21	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=5.167	$P < .05$
42. Decide for a child what profession or vocation he or she is to follow?			
Child Development	43	4	
Non-Child Development	43	3	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=0.001	N.S.
43. Threaten to send a child away from home or sell him if he does not behave?			
Child Development	47	0	
Non-Child Development	44	2	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=0.533	N.S.
44. Slap or strike a child in the face?			
Child Development	46	1	
Non-Child Development	34	12	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=9.195	$P < .01$

APPENDIX 4 (continued)

	POSITIVE	NEGATIVE	
45. Make it a practice to tell a child what to do rather than tell him what not to do?			
Child Development	27	20	
Non-Child Development	26	20	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=0.014	N.S.
46. Give a child an allowance or some kind of pay for odd jobs?			
Child Development	41	6	
Non-Child Development	41	5	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=0.001	N.S.
47. Give a child money or some other reward for behaving when company is present?			
Child Development	38	9	
Non-Child Development	40	6	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=0.269	N.S.
48. Suggest to a child that he is now big enough to put away his own clothing rather than command him to do so?			
Child Development	46	1	
Non-Child Development	45	1	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=0.489	N.S.
49. Tell a child that it is all right to do some things that are forbidden by the other parent?			
Child Development	31	16	
Non-Child Development	36	10	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=1.190	N.S.

APPENDIX 4 (continued)

	POSITIVE	NEGATIVE	
50. Feel it necessary to keep your promises to a child even after the need for the promises has passed?			
Child Development	38	9	
Non-Child Development	38	8	
	d.f.=1	Chi-Square=0.0002	N.S.

The two page vita has been removed from the scanned document. Page 1 of 2

The two page vita has been removed from the scanned document. Page 2 of 2

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to ascertain if any differences existed in attitudes toward children between high school child development students and non-child development students.

Forty-seven high school females who had completed a semester of child development seminar and nursery laboratory school were matched by grade, age, race, and community to forty-seven females who had not studied child development.

The "Child-Guidance Inventory" by T.L. Engle and Louis Snellgrove was the instrument used to test attitudes toward children.

A statistical analysis, t-test, of the test results indicated that there was a significant difference between the test scores of the two groups. Child development students scored better grades on the instrument. As a consequence it appears that a course of instruction in child development does effecr or influence student attitudes toward children.

An item analysis revealed that questions on discipline, play and respect for the child discriminated the most between the two groups.

A variance analysis indicated a significant relationship between test scores and students' curriculum and community. Students enrolled in academic programs scored higher on the instrument as did students from the upper economic level as indicated by their communities.