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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine if there existed significant relationships between 4 and 5 year old children's attitude toward school, their classroom teacher's perception of their attitude toward school, length of time in school, sex, or a composite of these with their achievement on the Pre-School Attainment Record. A random sample of 55 Head Start children completed three instruments. The instruments used in this study were a revised Children's Attitude Toward School Scale (CATSS-R), (Beere, 1970) The Pre-School Attainment Record (PAR), (Doll, 1966) and The Teachers Rating of Attitude of Children Toward School (TRACTS). The results of the multiple regression analysis yielded an R of .517 between the composite variable (CATSS-R and Age) and the PAR achievement measure. This was statistically significant at the .01 level of confidence and explained 26.7% of the PAR variance. The second composite variable consisting of CATSS-R, Age and TRACTS correlated with the PAR achievement variables at .530 and was significant at the .01 level, explaining 28.13% of the PAR variance. The third variable, TRACTS, contributed only 1.3% of the total composite variance explaining PAR achievement. Time in school and sex contributed
even less when included with the other variables in the composite variable. Results of the Pearson-product moment correlation of each of the variables with PAR achievement demonstrated significant correlations for only CATSS-R and Age ($r = .45$ and $r = -.30$) at the .01 level of confidence. However, the $t$ tests between Pearson correlation coefficients of each of the variables' correlation with the PAR achievement revealed four out of a possible 10 significant differences. The ANOVA test showed that the four year olds were superior to the five year olds on the PAR. A brief discussion was given of the implications for education in regard to the vast differences between teachers perception and students own perception of their attitude toward school.
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Introduction

Attitude toward school as it is related to over-all achievement in 4 and 5 year old children is an area devoid of research, although such is not the case of the research on the elementary school child. If educators and school psychologists could meaningfully describe the relationship between attitude and achievement in young children, positive action could be taken to promote the formation of favorable attitudes to aid achievement (McMillan, 1976; Beere, 1973; Roshausen, 1971). Most authors have regarded the concepts of attitude toward school as being important and related to achievement (Ball, 1971; Beere, 1973; Stevenson, H. W., Parker, T., Wilkinson, A., Hegion, A., & Fish, 1976b; Malpass, 1953; Neale, Gill and Tismer, 1970). Young children's attitudes are especially important because they determine the spirit in which the child approaches his future school experience (Ball, 1971). Favorable attitudes toward school is commonly accepted as a desirable objective because attitudes are assumed to have motivational consequences (Neale, Gill and Tismer, 1970).

Recently, attention has been focused upon educational
program objectives designed for 3 to 5 year old children. A common objective of educational programs for pre-school children is developing a positive attitude toward school and learning. For example, the Head Start Program Performance Standards (HEW, 1975) define a mandate that their programs "provide children with a learning environment and the varied experiences which will help them develop socially, intellectually, physically, and emotionally in a manner appropriate to their age and stage of development toward the overall goal of social competence."

However, these objectives, though very important, have been difficult to measure adequately (McMillan, 1976; Ball, 1971). Ball (1971) stated that it is easier to measure a child's achievement in school than it is to measure whether he enjoyed achieving in school.

Some research studies have described the impact of attitude toward school upon children. Ball (1971) indicated that it would be difficult to find children who have not developed attitudes toward school in their first year of school experience. He found that many times this attitude was a negative one. In their 1959 study, Jackson and Getzel state, "it is almost as if dissatisfaction with school were a
perceptual set that colors the student's view of himself and his world." Research has generally indicated that as grade in school increases, attitude toward school becomes more negative (Neale and Proshak, 1967; Maykovich, 1966).

Considering the early development of attitude toward school and the increasing negative attitude as grade in school increases, it was important that the relationship between attitude toward school and over-all rate of achievement be examined in a Head Start school prior to a history of regular public school success or failure. This was the purpose of this study.
Review of Literature

A search of the literature did not produce one study comparing attitude toward school and over-all level of achievement in 4 and 5 year old children. However, there are studies which give information regarding how attitude and achievement are related at an older age. The majority of researchers used academic indicators as the index for achievement and various subjective methods to arrive at attitude scores. These academic indexes account for only a small portion of children's behavior. The academic indexes are limited because they did not account for impairment in perception, communication and over-all rate of development (Doll, 1966).

While reviewing the literature it became apparent that regardless of whether measured attitudes were related to achievement, these measures were clearly not applicable to young children. Therefore, the literature that has been reviewed herein had three components and are discussed in the following order in the paper. Studies comparing attitude and achievement in elementary children are reviewed first. Secondly, literature that was pertinent to achievement
as it related to school in 4 and 5 year old children is discussed. Thirdly, literature relevant to preschool attitude measurement methods and problems are reviewed.

**Elementary Children's School Attitudes and Achievement**

Neale, Gill & Tismer (1970) explored the relationship between attitudes toward school subjects and school achievement in sixth grade pupils. The study was conducted in a suburban school near St. Paul, Minnesota. Attitudes were measured by a version of the Semantic Differential. Scores on each of these 5 point scales were summed to yield a score that ranged from eight (unfavorable) to 40 (favorable). Achievement was measured by SRA achievement series. During the first week of school, the children completed a battery of tests including an attitude measure toward school subjects and achievement tests. The children were tested again at the end of the year on identical attitude measures and parallel achievement forms.

The three purposes to the above study were to determine (1) the relationship between attitude toward school subjects and the measure of achievement in that subject, (2) the predictive role of attitude toward school subjects in achievement, and
(3) What changes occurred over a one year period of time (Neale et al. 1970).

In the above study correlations were obtained first between ratings of school subjects on the semantic differential and scores on corresponding sub-tests of the SRA Achievement Series. Significant correlations were observed for boys in social studies ($r = .28$), arithmetic ($r = .23$), and reading ($r = .27$) and for girls ($r = .20$) only in reading. Secondly, achievement at the end of the year was predicted from achievement and attitude scores from the beginning of the year. The semantic differential measure of attitudes contributed significantly to the prediction only in the case of arithmetic in boys. Thirdly, the semantic differential ratings of attitudes compared first of the year attitude scores with the end of the year attitude scores through the analysis of variance procedure. For both girls and boys attitudes were significantly less favorable for school subjects at the end of the year. There was either a modest or a non-significant relation between attitudes toward school subjects and achievement. Boys showed significantly higher correlations than girls on all measures of attitude and achievement (Neale et al. 1970).
Barton, Dielman, and Cattell (1972) attempted to predict school achievement in 6th and 7th grade from personality and intelligence measures. The achievement measure of Educational Testing Services was administered in the areas of mathematics, science, and social studies. Personality factors were measured by the High School Personality Questionnaire. Student's I.Q. scores were obtained using the Culture Free Intelligence Test. This study revealed that only 50% of the variance in achievement can be accounted for by I.Q. Therefore, investigation of personality variables in particular was included to arrive at a better group of predictors.

Barton et al. (1972) concluded that certain personality factors follow a developmental sequence in their relationship to achievement. They found that there was a different set of personality factors that were important for the sixth grade than were for the seventh grade. Correlations between the Educational Testing Service Areas and the Culture Free Intelligence Test ranged from $r = .38$ to $.60$ $p < .01$ for the sixth grade. Educational Testing Service scores and personality factors were less related at the seventh grade level than at the sixth grade level. Correlations of personality
with achievement ranged from $r = -0.62$ to $-0.31$, $p < 0.01$ in the seventh grade. In conclusion, personality factors are related to achievement. Compared to I.Q. as a predictor of achievement, personality factors add substantially toward predicting achievement.

McMillan (1976) assessed recent research factors which have affected the students' formation of attitudes toward subject matter. A review of 124 dissertation abstracts from 1969 to 1975, relating achievement to attitudes, was compiled by McMillan. Of these 124, only 33 found significant results. No pre-school children were included in this review which ranged from elementary grades to college level. McMillan concluded that it is difficult to measure changes in affective growth. Previous attitudes of students are important. Teacher enthusiasm appears to have a greater impact upon student attitude formation than do instructional variables.

Stevenson's et al. (1976a) research agreed with the above finding. McMillan (1976) felt educators should examine teacher attitudes and enthusiasm toward a subject rather than trying to make the material interesting and relevant. The attitudes a student possesses when he approaches a
new subject will interact to influence the new attitude formed. The younger the child the more flexible his attitude. The fact that attitude changes from one grade to another is well supported in research McMillan, 1976; Neale, Gill, & Tismer, 1970; Maykovich, 1966; Barton, Dielman & Cattell, 1972).

Ronshausen (1971) compared the effects of two methods of tutoring on achievement and attitude in mathematics. First grade students in 9 elementary schools yielded three treatment groups: programmed tutoring, directed tutoring and untutored control. Data was analyzed in an ANOVA design.

Programmed tutoring was not shown by Ronshausen (1971) to be more effective than regular classroom instruction in increasing mathematics achievement. Directed tutoring was more effective than programmed tutoring and/or regular classroom instruction in increasing computational skills but not in understanding mathematical concepts. Rosenshausen (1971) concludes that one-to-one instruction was not sufficient to increase achievement in first grade mathematics.

Also, neither method of tutoring was shown by Ronshausen (1971) to be more effective in developing a positive attitude toward mathematics. Tutoring did
not include development of a positive attitude toward mathematics as an objective. It was assumed that this was an objective for the tutor to achieve through the kind of tutoring rapport established. This assumption was not upheld.

Jackson and Getzel (1959) conducted a study of a private midwest high school which displayed above average socio-economic and intellectual representation (mean Binet I.Q.=130) as a group. Using a specially developed school satisfaction questionnaire titled Student Opinion Poll, Getzels and Jackson (1959) measured attitude toward school. Two groups were selected from over 500 students enrolled in grades seven through twelve. These groups were designated "satisfied" or "dissatisfied" with school. Jackson and Getzels (1959) results pointed to the relevance of psychological well being in students rather than their scholastic achievement in understanding which students scored "satisfied with school" or "dissatisfied with school."

However, Brodie (1964) in a replication of the study of Jackson and Getzel (1959) investigated a midwest public high school population with an unusually broad socio-economic and ethical diversity.
Brodie administered the Student Opinion Poll to 550 students of the eleventh grade. Using the following procedure, he classified "satisfied" students as those who scored one and one-half standard deviations above the mean, and "dissatisfied" students as those who scored one and one-half standard deviations below the mean. This procedure yielded 44 "satisfied" students and 48 "dissatisfied" students. Scholastic achievement was then measured by employing the Iowa Test of Educational Development. The satisfied students scored higher on all tests. Brodie (1964) concluded that attitude measures can differentiate groups of students where academic skills are involved. However, Getzels and Jackson (1962) felt that attitude toward school was more important to specific classroom objectives and drill routines but not to general level of achievement.

Also, Shepps (1971) tested sixteen boys and ten girls who were attending the sixth grade to determine if attitudes affected school achievement. School related attitudes and study habits were measured by the Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes. Previously, the Metropolitan Reading Achievement Test and the Iowa Test of Basic Arithmetic Skills had been administered by the school and the results
recorded. Shepps found that both school achievement and Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes total scores predicted the same for reading achievement among boys. Among girls the attitude measure was predictive but for a different criterion — mathematics achievement. Shepps' results supported the basic hypotheses that Survey of Study Habits and Attitude scores would be related to academic performance and could differentiate among groups of students in later elementary grades.

In summary, there is a widely held view that attitude directly influences achievement in regular school and school subjects. A good proportion of documented evidence has supported this view. When predicting achievement, attitude factors and study habits have added as much or more than I.Q. toward the prediction of achievement (Tyler, 1966).

Pre-School Children's School Achievement

Although comprehensive educational activities at the pre-school level for disadvantaged children is a recent innovation, there is little doubt that society has developed certain expectations for these programs. These expectations have focused upon the notion that participation in early developmental programs would alleviate developmental deficiencies
in disadvantaged children (Neale, Gill and Tismer, 1970; Cawley, Burrow and Goodstein, 1971). Therefore, it has been generally expected that participants in early developmental programs would perform significantly higher than non-participants. However, many studies indicate that there is no difference between Head Start participants and the regular students in the first grade.

Cawley, Burrow, and Goodstein (1971), while evaluating the performance of Head Start and non-Head Start participants in the first grade, concluded that "there were no significant differences among various comparison groups." The standard instruments that were used for this comparison were the Standard Binet (Form L-M) and the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities. The lack of significant difference in intellectual performance among Head Start participants and non-Head Start participants at the first grade level would indicate that society's expectancies are not being fulfilled.

Cawley et al. (1971) compared the performance of Head Start participants in the first grade. There were 128 children in the participation group and 63 children in the non-participant group. The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, Metropolitan Readiness Test,
and the Test of Visual Perception were administered to both groups. Results indicated that there was little difference in the performance of Head Start and non-Head Start participants in the first grade. They accounted for the lack of a difference by maintaining that there was no continuity between education in Head Start and the traditional public school systems.

A 1971 study was made to determine if a significant relationship existed between self-concept and achievement of kindergarten and Head Start children (Noland, 1971). The sample included thirty white private kindergarten children and thirty Negro Head Start children. Scores were gathered using three instruments (1) The Clark U-Scale, (2) The Boehm Test of Basic Concepts, and (3) The Self-Esteem Subtest of the Children's Self-Social Constructs Tests. The Pearson product-moment correlation and the analysis of variance statistical procedure were used in testing the null hypotheses. A significant relationship was found to support the positive hypothesis.

The results from the above study indicate (1) white kindergarten children scored significantly higher in achievement than Negro Head Start children.
and (2) Negro Head Start children and white kindergarten children differed significantly in self-concept when measured by the U-scale. The self-concept test was more predictive of achievement in kindergarten and Head Start than was the self-esteem subtest.

**Achievement Measures Related to Age**

Achievement instruments have been refined to a high degree. One may have a choice of which instrument to use (Sattler, 1974). High standards are maintained in regard to reliability and validity. The reliability for intellectual instruments such as the Stanford Binet vary as a function of age (Sattler, 1974). The two and one-half to five year old group represents the largest standard error of measurement (Sattler, 1974); whereas, the 14 to 18 year old group demonstrates the smallest standard error of measurement. Using standardized I.Q. measurement instruments, 50% or less of the variance can be accounted for in school achievement scores (Sattler, 1974). When predicting achievement scores from personality variables rarely more than 20% of variance can be accounted for (McMillan, 1976). However, very few instruments are available for the assessment of attitude in 4 and 5 year old children when compared to those available for children six years or older (Beere,
Pre-School Attitude Measurement Methods and Problems

Recently, attention has focused upon educational programs designed for 3 to 5 year old children. A common objective of educational programs for preschool children is the development of a positive attitude toward school and learning. Apparently this objective is difficult to measure adequately.

In his overview of the state of the arts in attitude assessment of young children toward school related activities, Ball (1971) concluded that attitudes are often avoided in evaluations because of the problems of assessment. The first major problem has to do with little stability in young children's attitudes. Lacking an extensive background of information from which to draw, children are more likely to be swayed by moment to moment considerations than are older children or their adult counterparts. This lack of stability reduces the confidence of the accuracy of a particular assessment when evaluating an individual child. However, Ball stated that when comparing one group with another on the same attitude assessment, this becomes less problematic because individual error tends to be random, and the mean score for a group will be more stable. He indicated that a...
second problem is that young children lack test taking skills. They are unable to read and write. They find it difficult to follow instructions.

Ball (1971) discussed techniques for assessing children's attitudes. These were (1) teacher ratings, (2) rating children under stimulating conditions, (3) pupil's self-reports, and (4) an unobtrusive non-reactive method. The rationale he used for using teacher ratings as an attitude assessment technique was that the teacher has sufficient knowledge of the child's behavior to be able to make correct inferences about his attitudes.

Also, observing the child under stimulating conditions is a time consuming process (Ball, 1971). Thus, the period of time required for an independent observer to observe each child long enough to infer his attitudes accurately would limit the use of this technique. Further, he felt that this technique is limited in that its user should possess clinical observation skills.

Consequently, Ball (1971) has suggested that a good method for determining a child's attitude is simply to ask him and to use some method intelligible to him. For children 4 and 5 years old a useful self-report variation involves using pictures of
happy and sad faces. By using various sentence stems, attitudes can be given by marking one of the faces representing those attitudes (Beere, 1970).

No technique can be used with confidence if the purpose is to assess the attitude of a single child. A wider margin of error is likely to creep into individual assessment. However, group attitudes of children are more accurately predicted especially if a particular program is designed to create a more positive attitude toward school (Ball, 1971).

Beere (1973) developed a procedure to measure attitudes toward school that functions well with early elementary school children. Her rationale for developing this instrument was that although professional test developers have been successful in developing a reliable and valid instrument to measure cognitive abilities, they have met with little success in measuring non-cognitive dimensions. She stated that there was not a single standardized attitude test that is administered to groups of three to five year old children. The three to five year old child has not developed the test taking skills of reading, writing nor the following of instructions. However, the seven year old child usually possesses these characteristics (Beere, 1973).
The validation sample for Beere's study (1973) was 145 second grade students in a school district in southern Michigan. A pilot study using 22 subjects from four to five years of age revealed that the affect qualities of the 5 faces were clear and understandable to young children.

Beere (1973) obtained two validation measures for each of the subjects in the above mentioned sample. First, individual interviews of each child were conducted by a member of the research team. Second, a rating of the child was supplied by the teacher. The interviewer ratings reflects responses to 30 sentence completion stems and 25 direct questions with a score range from 1 to 5. Teachers' ratings were made using the same criteria for ratings as the interviewers used. Beere performed correlations between teachers' rating scores, student's self-report from the Childrens Attitude Toward School Scale (CATSS), and interviewer's scores. These measures were quite low in their relationship ($r=.14$ and $0.09$). However, the interviewer's scores and the CATSS total test scores were correlated ($r=.34$) significantly (Beere, 1973).

In the above study reliability was found to be $0.93$ for the 40 item instrument (CATSS). Beere
found that the internal consistency and construct validity supported the validity and reliability of this instrument. Predictive or concurrent validity was not studied. She made no attempt to relate responses on the instruments to behaviors of the child.

A number of rating scales used to evaluate children show considerable differences in their predictiveness of future academic success. The Keogh and Smith (1970) study asked teachers to rate pupils on a 5 point scale of reading readiness. This gross rating by teachers correlated between .45 to .69 with reading achievement scores in the second through fifth grade. Also, Myklebust (1971) assessed five broad areas of ability in which 24 behavioral characteristics were rated by kindergarten teachers. Correlations between .16 and .53 were found for achievement in reading, arithmetic, and spelling in third and fourth grade students. Myklebust concluded that the one gross rating measure by teachers, as suggested by Keogh and Smith (1970), was more related to reading success than were the summed ratings of 24 behavioral characteristics.

It is not known whether or not a gross rating measure of attitude is a valid approach to attitude
measurement. However, Stevenson et al. 1976b used teacher ratings to successfully predict achievement and personal-social characteristics. Stevenson et al. (1976b) stated the following:

The question remains whether only a small number of rating scales rather than an extensive battery would be sufficient to provide maximal prediction of later academic performance. Moreover, if the scales covered a range of behavioral characteristics, it might be possible to delineate specific skills at one grade that are important antecedents for success at later grades. (p. 508)

Stevenson et al. (1976b) asked teachers to rate kindergarten children on performance in the classroom as well as personal-social traits. Later the teachers of these same students in the second and third grades rated these students. The kindergarten ratings appeared quite useful in predicting the children's later academic achievement.

In retrospect, Stevenson et al. (1976b) found that ratings on personal-social characteristics were generally less highly related to achievement than were the ratings of cognitive abilities.
However, stability in the ratings remained high (r=.50 to .83) even though the ratings were separated by a 2 or 3 year period and were made by different teachers.

The above study also revealed sex differences. Girls received higher ratings than boys. Stevenson et al. (1976b) suggested that this may have resulted because girls adapt better to classroom routine or because of bias on the part of the teachers. Yet, by the end of second grade boys' and girls' achievement in arithmetic and reading did not differ considerably.

In conclusion, Stevenson et al. (1976b) noted these findings to be important in that it implies that teachers, as human as they are and with all their biases, can accurately point out the children that will do well and those who will not do so well. Stevenson et al. (1976b) thus suggested that in the early grades these children could receive individual help and perhaps help to eliminate certain learning problems.

In summary, reviews of literature on attitudes toward school that are related to school achievement have demonstrated mixed outcomes. They have strongly suggested important relationships during the school
years. Literature on this phenomenon in preschool years has been very limited.

The Problem

The problem was to investigate the relationship between socio-economically deprived 4 and 5 year old children's attitude toward school and their scores on the Pre-School Attainment Record (PAR).

In understanding attitudes of young children the following definitions of attitude might be helpful. There are many definitions of attitude, but most of them have certain features in common. By examining these commonalities it is found that attitude is a personal implicit cue, a drive producing response to a socially salient phenomena, and a response which influences selectivity in personal evaluations. Any measure of attitude uses indirect inferences (Ball, 1971).

Hypotheses

Stated positively, it was hypothesized that (1) step-wise multiple regression analysis would yield significant correlations to predict PAR achievement scores from composites of predictor variables. Also, it was hypothesized that (2) the following predictor variables scores on the Childrens Attitude Toward School Scale-Revised (CATSS-R), and on
Teachers Rating Attitudes of Children Toward School (TRACTS), Chronological Age (CA), Sex of the child and whether the child was a "new" or "old" student, would each be significantly correlated to pupil scores on the PAR achievement test. It was also hypothesized that (3) there would be significant differences between the correlations of the various predictor variables as each of them related to the PAR achievement criterion variable. Another hypothesis was that (4) there would be a significant difference between the various subgroups (4 vs 5 year olds, "new" vs "old" students, and boys vs girls) on the dependent variables of CATSS-R and TRACTS and PAR achievement.
Method

Subjects

Children of a Head Start program in two rural counties in North Central Tennessee served as subjects in the study. Families of these students met federal low income guidelines before their children were enrolled. The total population was composed of 133 4 and 5 year old children. A random sample (55 children) was drawn from this population to participate in the investigation. The sample yielded 27 girls which served as subjects, 11 of which were 4 years old and 16 of whom were 5 years old. Twenty-eight boys served as subjects, 12 were 4 years old and 16 were 5 years old. This provided 33, 4 year olds and 32, 5 year olds in this study.

Further distinctions were made regarding the subjects' length of participation in this Head Start program. Students who had been enrolled for 8 months or less were designated "new" students. Students who had been enrolled 13 or more months were designated "old" students. This division yielded 26 "new students" and 29 "old students."

25
Instrumentation

Three instruments were used in this study. A revised Children's Attitude Toward School Scale (CATSS-R) (Beere, 1973) and the Pre-School Attainment Record (PAR) (Doll, 1966) were used. Also the teachers' ratings of children's attitude toward school were recorded by teachers on a scale from 1 to 5 on the Teacher Rating of Attitude of Children Toward School (TRACTS). Each of these is discussed briefly below.

**Children's Attitude Toward School Scale (CATSS-R).** To obtain an assessment of attitude the writer conducted a pilot study to revise the 42 item Children's Attitude Toward School Scale (CATSS) (Beere, 1973). This pilot study was designed to test the feasibility of using this type of instrument with 4 and 5 year old children. Children responded by marking one of five faces appropriate to their attitudes toward school instead of marking numbers on a continuum from 1 to 5. They responded in a discriminating manner, indicating that they could respond meaningfully to this type of test.

The CATSS-R consisted of 32 items. Included in it were three sample items to familiarize the children with the response choices. Items were
given in an oral presentation style (Appendix A). Each item had five possible choices that ranged from happy through neutral to very sad faces.

Each revised instrument response booklet consisted of 11 pages. The first page provided the response choices for the sample items. In each row the order of the faces were identical with the very happy faces at the left and the sad faces at the right. An object familiar to young children (e.g. wagon, telephone) was to the left of five faces. A yellow 2 X 8 inch paper was inserted into each instrument for use as a line guide.

This instrument was administered by the author to separate groups no larger than 20 of the randomly selected subjects. The test was administered as described in the directions for administration (Appendix A).

Beere (1973) found the reliability to be .93 for her 42 item instrument. The construct validity and internal consistency supported the reliability and validity of this instrument.

Pre-School Attainment Record (PAR). To assess achievement the Pre-School Attainment Record (PAR) was administered by the author with the child's teacher serving as an informant. The administration
manual of instructions for the administration, the
scoring criteria, and the normative data were utilized
(Doll, 1966).

The PAR combined an assessment of physical,
social, and intellectual functions in a global
appraisal of young children. The PAR provided a
descriptive picture of the child's actual attainment
in terms of his usual performance. Doll (1966)
stated, "The Pre-School Attainment Record (PAR)
has not yet been normatively standardized with
reference to associated variables. It does permit
comparisons of child with child . . . and/or
for composing homogeneous groups or for assessing
their comparability." Despite the limits of the
PAR it appears to be a good basic inventory of
the behaviors of young children based on maturation
and social expectations in American culture. The
scale includes motor, social, and intellectual
competencies. Euros (1976) stated that it should
prove useful in the evaluation of the developmental
strengths and weaknesses of young children with
culturally based developmental difficulties.

Teacher Rating of Attitude of Children Toward
School (TRACTS). Teachers rated children on a
scale from 1 to 5. This meant that the larger the
Number marked the more positive was their attitude toward school. The limitations of a 5 point scale for teacher ratings were recognized. Ratings of this sort—though widely used in educational research—have tended to limit the range within which a score would fall. The extremes have been often avoided, causing the mean responses to cluster about the number three on the scale. Within the instructions, steps were taken to minimize this tendency. Instructions were given to teachers in oral and written form regarding how attitude scores were to be assigned to students. Instructions for this instrument were as described below.

Oral Instructions for TRACTS. "Take just a moment and think how (name of child) feels about school. Try to think in terms of the total child, not of isolated behavior, be it desirable or undesirable. For example, think of the child's attitude, which you will rate, as having many components and try to consider the following in your ratings: getting up to come to school, getting on the bus, getting off the bus, entering the building, entering the class, interaction with other children in and out of class, how they like being out of school for vacations and weekends, and how
they interact with adults and older children in school. Do you have any questions? Now take a moment and look over this hand out. We will read it together. Would you please read it aloud?"

Written Instructions for the TRACTS. Evaluate each student on what you think his or her attitude toward school is. Rate each student on a scale of 1 to 5, with "1" being very negative toward school, and "3" being neutral—neither positive or negative.

Data Analysis

A stepwise multiple-regression analysis was performed to obtain the coefficients of correlation of each variable and each composite of variables for the prediction of achievement on the PAR criterion variable. Also, inter-correlations of all the variables were computed. The t test between correlation coefficients was used to test for significant differences between the Pearson product-moment correlations obtained between the various predictor variables and the PAR achievement scores. Point biserial correlations were used between continuous and the dichotomous variables such as sex and "new" and "old" students. The analysis of variance was used to test the significance of difference between the different groups effects on the dependent variables of PAR achievement, CATSS-R and TRACTS.
Results

The multiple regression analysis, the Pearson product-moment correlation, point biserial correlation, the t test between correlation, and the analysis of variance statistical techniques were used to test the various hypotheses of the study. The numbers, means, standard deviations of each subgroup scores on the PAR, the CATSS-R, and the TRACTS are presented in Table 1. The multiple regression coefficients and the Pearson product-moment correlations of the various composite and single variables on the PAR achievement variables are shown in Table 2. The alpha level selected was the .05 level of confidence. In regard to the specific hypotheses tested, the results found from the various analyses are stated below.

Hypothesis one stated that composites of variables would predict achievement scores of the PAR at statistically significant levels. The null hypothesis was rejected at the .05 level of confidence. In Table 2 the influence of various composite variables can be observed. The multiple R for CATSS-R and CA as a composite variable to predict
Table 1

Mean, Number, and Standard Deviation for All Sub-Groups on Three Instruments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CATSE-R</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Students</td>
<td>Old Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age 4</td>
<td>Age 5</td>
<td>ROW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3.687</td>
<td>3.567</td>
<td>3.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>0.702</td>
<td>0.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.395</td>
<td>0.493</td>
<td>0.445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.667</td>
<td>3.482</td>
<td>3.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.331</td>
<td>0.521</td>
<td>0.423</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TRACTS**

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Students</td>
<td>Old Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age 4</td>
<td>Age 5</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>Age 4</td>
<td>Age 5</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PAR**

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Students</td>
<td>Old Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age 4</td>
<td>Age 5</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>Age 4</td>
<td>Age 5</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>105.50</td>
<td>104.67</td>
<td>105.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>104.33</td>
<td>99.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>844.00</td>
<td>314.00</td>
<td>1158.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>313.00</td>
<td>1287.00</td>
<td>1600.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>711.00</td>
<td>99.00</td>
<td>104.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>111.40</td>
<td>95.13</td>
<td>101.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>777.00</td>
<td>792.00</td>
<td>1569.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>557.00</td>
<td>761.00</td>
<td>1318.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>108.07</td>
<td>100.55</td>
<td>104.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.75</td>
<td>97.52</td>
<td>100.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>13.96</td>
<td>11.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.96</td>
<td>12.13</td>
<td>12.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PAR achievement was .517 which was statistically significant at the .01 level of confidence. This explained 26.7% of the PAR variance. The second composite variable consisting of CATSS-R, CA, and TRACTS correlated with the PAR achievement variable at .530 and was significant at the .01 level. This explained 28.1% of the PAR variance. The third variable, TRACTS, contributed only 01.3% of the total composite variance. The fourth composite variable consisting of CATSS-R, CA, TRACTS, and sex of students resulted in a multiple R of .5421 and explained 29.3% of the PAR variance. Sex, as an additional variable contributed only 00.1% to the explanation. The fifth composite variable consisted of CATSS-R, CA, TRACTS, Sex and New or Old students. It yielded a multiple R coefficient of .5428 which explained 29.4% of the PAR achievement variance. The fifth variable, New or Old students, contributed nothing (00.0007%) to the explanation. Therefore, with all five variables acting as a composite variable, roughly 30% of the PAR achievement variance was explained at multiple R of .542 which was statistically significant. However, the last two
Table 2
Correlation Coefficients Between the Predictor Variables and the PAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
<th>Simple R</th>
<th>DF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CATSS-R</td>
<td>0.4470**</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>0.4470**</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA months</td>
<td>0.5173**</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>-0.30*</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRACTS</td>
<td>0.5304**</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>0.5421</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New or Old Student Group</td>
<td>0.5428**</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>5.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:

*p < .05
**p < .01
variables, New/Old students and sex of child, contributed less than .01% to the explanation of PAR achievement variance.

The second hypothesis stated that each single variable would predict achievement scores of the PAR to a statistically significant degree. The null hypothesis was rejected at the .05 level of confidence. Scores on the CATSS-R correlated with the PAR scores (r=.44, p < .01) significantly. Also, Chronological Age (CA) significantly correlated (r= -.30, p < .05) with the PAR scores. However, the correlations between TRACTS and the PAR (r= .15, n.s.) was not significant. The New or Old students correlated in a negative way (r= -.17) but non-significantly. Sex, also, was found to correlate (r= .04, n.s.) non-significantly.

Hypothesis three stated that there would be significant differences between each of the correlations derived from the relationship of the various predictor variables with the PAR achievement scores. These predictor variables were: CATSS-R, CA, TRACTS, New or Old students, and sex. The t test between all possible correlation coefficients resulted in four significant differences as follows: (1) CATSS-R r PAR (.447) and CA r PAR (-.30) yielded a t of
3.845, p < .01; (2) CATSS-R \( r \) PAR (.447) and Sex \( r \) PAR (.04) indicated a \( t \) of 2.096, p < .05; (3) CATSS-R \( r \) PAR (.447) and New or Old students \( r \) PAR (-.17) resulted in a \( t \) of 3.177, p < .01; and (4) CA \( r \) PAR (-.30) and TRACTS \( r \) PAR (.147) produced a \( t \) of 2.30, p < .05. The other six possible permutations of differences between correlations were not significant. Therefore, null hypothesis three was rejected in four parts and accepted in six parts. The four significant differences between correlations which existed indicated differences occurred when the correlations of the variables were negligible or in a negative direction with the PAR. Recognizing that 4 year olds scored significantly higher on the PAR than did the 5 year olds adds some explanation to the differences in these correlations. These differences, whether statistically significant or not, empirically reiterated the findings of the stepwise multiple regression analysis (Table 2) in regard to each of the predictor variables relative power to predict PAR achievement. As shown in Table 2, the relative power of each of the predictor variables to predict PAR achievement was found to be in the following order—listed from the most powerful to the least powerful variable: CATSS-R, CA, TRACTS,
Sex, and New or Old students.

Hypothesis four stated that regardless of chronological age (CA), sex, or New or Old Students (length of time in the program), significant differences would exist between scores on the following dependent variables: PAR, CATSS-R, and/or TRACTS measures. The analysis of variance revealed that hypothesis four—stated in null form—was accepted, except for the dependent variable of PAR score measured between 4 and 5 year olds. The ANOVA test showed significant differences with the 4 year olds scoring significantly higher (Mean square= 1049.748; DF= 1/47; F= 7.398; p < .009). For a comparison of the means and standard deviations between possible subgroups used in the analysis of variance, see Table 1 in this chapter.
Discussion

The results of the testing of hypothesis one (as shown in Table 2) demonstrated that the CATSS-R and CA were the most powerful components of the composite of variables that significantly correlated with PAR achievement in this study. These two variables alone accounted for nearly four-fifths of the PAR achievement's total variance (30%) that was explained by all of the five variables in this study. The TRACTS instrument accounted for the other one-fifth. This suggested that the three most important variables that teachers should consider when teaching pre-school children are (1) how the child really feels toward the various facets of school, (2) what the length of time has been in which the child has been in deprived surroundings—if so be the case, and (3) to a smaller non-significant degree how and what the teacher thinks the child feels about school.

From Table 2 and hypothesis two and three, it can be seen that the CATSS-R was a better predictor of PAR achievement than was the TRACTS. This means that how the child views school is more important to PAR achievement scores than how the teacher thinks
the child views school. Therefore, the view that the teacher's expectancy of their pupils' attitude is more important in determining how a child achieves in school than is the child's own perceptions of school was not supported in this study. Evidently these two perceptions are not exactly synonymous as they do not significantly correlate with each other (r = .21) although each correlated positively with the PAR achievement.

There is some question why chronological age (CA) of a child was significantly correlated (r = -.30, p < .05) with PAR achievement scores, but in a negative direction. The 4 year old children scored higher than the 5 year old children on the PAR achievement. (See Table 1) Did an extra year of deprivation deflate their ability to achieve that much? Or is this difference really due to chance or was there negligible growth as this study's statistics suggest? These questions will have to be answered in further research.

The PAR achievement scores were lower for the Old students than for the New students (Table 1), perhaps resulting from the PAR achievement scores having reflected less descriptive ratings of 4 year old children than did the ratings of 5 year old
children. On the other hand, teachers who served as informants on the PAR may have shown some diminished sensitivity in rating both younger students and those who were New students. Perhaps this lack of sensitivity could have caused higher PAR scores.

This raises the issue of why the CATSS-R and the TRACTS were not significantly related to each other (r = .21) although both of them correlated positively with PAR achievement. Statistically, this means that each test measures a somewhat different facet of attitude toward school. This is a worthy finding as it adds to the understanding of more of the PAR achievement variance that can be explained.

This also suggests that teachers evidently lack information regarding children's attitudes and feelings toward school. In this study it was the children's attitudes toward school and not the teachers' opinions of children's attitudes toward school that were significantly related to the children's PAR achievement scores. If we recognize this fact, it becomes apparent that identifying children with poor attitudes toward school is evidently very important. Therefore, steps could be taken to improve the teacher's sensitivity to the child's actual attitude toward school and,
if it be negative, to know how to improve this attitude.

The data in Table 2 and the analysis of hypotheses one and three demonstrated the superiority of the CATSS-R and the CA variables at predicting PAR achievement. Teacher ratings of attitudes of children toward school and whether a child is a boy or girl were next in importance. New or Old students were of least importance in this regard. This adds scientific support for identifying the types of teacher awarenesses and training needs that may be prevalent now in various pre-school and regular school programs.

There was a greater difference in mean scores on the PAR among 4 and 5 year old children than there was a difference between the PAR scores of boys and girls. However, (Table 1) the analysis of variance revealed the age factor to be the only difference in any of the subgroup means that was significant (Table 1).

New or Old students as a variable was the least predictive of the PAR achievement scores. It accounted for less than one per cent of the total variance (Table 2). Perhaps, age consideration within 4 and 5 year old groups is more important than sex and/or
length of participation in considering pre-school achievement. Research literature indicates differential development of academic skills in older girls and boys (Shepps, 1975) (Neale, Gill, and Tismer, 1970). It is also reported that girls are more attentive and make better grades in elementary school than do boys (Samuels and Turnure, 1974). However, significant sex differences were not detected among the scores on PAR, CATSS-R, and/or TRACTS in this study of pre-school children.

Some limitations and cautions should be noted. Replications of this study should be done before monies are spent to utilize the suggestions of this report. The reliability and validity of the revised CATSS-R and TRACTS need further research. Also, other research is needed to answer the question as to how children might compare with a study of middle or upper class children.

A suggested use of the study might be that pre-school federal evaluations of Head Start programs may beneficially utilize some of the instruments and techniques of this study. Also, evaluations of kindergarten and early elementary programs may include these techniques and approaches in appraising the importance of attitudes in fostering achievement and personality growth.
Appendix A
Appendix A

Children’s Attitude Toward School-Revised (CATSS-R):
Directions for Administration and Sample Response Sheet

I have a booklet of pictures here that I am going to pass out to you. Please clear off your desks so nothing will be in your way. Do not write on your booklet, or turn the pages until I tell you to.

Now listen carefully. Do you see the pictures and faces on my booklet?

They are just like the ones on your booklet. Everyone point to the very first picture on your booklet - right here.

The first picture is of a CAMEL. You should all be pointing to the camel. Next to the picture of the camel are five faces on the same row. Point to them and we will count them together.
ILLUSTRATE WITH YOUR COPY. POINT TO THE PICTURE, THEN WITH EXAGGERATED PRACTICE, POINT TO EACH FACE, IDENTIFYING ITS POSITION FROM LEFT TO RIGHT ACROSS THE ROW.

FLIP THROUGH PAGES OF DEMONSTRATION BOOKLET TO ILLUSTRATE STATEMENT.

One-two-three-four-five.

The booklet is filled with rows of pictures and faces. The pictures are different for each row; to help you keep your place. In each row you will find the same five faces. Each face shows a different feeling.

This first face has a big happy smile. It looks like a bright, cheerful, happy face.

This second face has a pleasant smile. It looks like a glad, satisfied, agreeable face.

The middle face is not smiling but it is not frowning either. It is in-between happy and sad. It looks like someone looks when he is not very happy nor very sad.

The next face looks like it is unhappy about something. It looks a little troubled, or upset, worried.

This end face looks VERY sad and VERY unhappy. It looks sorrowful, blue, VERY troubled, hurt, pained and upset.
Now I am going to ask you some questions about how you would feel if something happened. You are to think about the question, and then mark with an "X" across the one face that shows best how you would feel.

Let's try doing some together.

Now remove your yellow marker from your booklet and place it under the first row - just like mine.

This is a sample row. The question was **HOW DO MOST PEOPLE FEEL WHEN THEY EAT ICE CREAM OR CANDY?** Which of the five faces shows how most people would feel?

Yes, the face with the big, happy smile, so an "X" has been marked on the brightest, happiest, most cheerful face. Now we are ready for the next question.

Slide your marker under the next row, which begins with the picture of the SHOVEL.
The next question is HOW WOULD YOU FEEL, IF YOU FELL AND BROKE YOUR LEG? Think of how you would feel; mark a big "X" on the face that shows best how you would feel.

Did you put an "X" on one face in the row with the shovel in it? Most of you probably marked the end face that looks very sad, hurt, unhappy and troubled. However, if you marked one of the other faces, because you wouldn't feel that bad, it is not wrong. There are no right and wrong answers. You should just mark how YOU would feel.

In each row throughout the booklet the faces are the same. You are to listen carefully to the question I ask and in each row you are to make a big "X" across the face that shows how you feel about the question I ask you.

Remember, these pictures have nothing to do with the question I am going to ask you. They are there only to help you find the right row of faces to mark.

Let's do one more together.

Move your marker to the last row, which begins with the picture of the INDIAN CHIEF. Make an "X" on the face that shows best how you would feel if you didn't feel happy and you didn't feel sad. Which face is not happy and not sad?
Most of you probably marked the middle face. This face is not happy and not sad. Are there any questions about how we will do this?

Let me repeat the directions once more. I will ask you some questions about how you would feel if something happened. Think about the question and then mark the one face that best shows how you would feel. Make a big "X" on the face that shows how you feel. Remember you are to mark only one face in each row. Not everyone will feel the same way about every question, so don’t worry if you don’t mark the same face as your neighbor. There are no right or wrong answers. Listen carefully and follow directions. The pictures at the start of each row are different. This is to help you keep your place. I will tell you which picture to put your marker under.

Now turn the page.

Place your marker under the row of faces that begins with the TREE. Does everyone have the right place?

Now listen carefully and mark the face that shows how you would feel.
SLOWLY.

PAUSE FOR PUPILS TO THINK AND MARK BOOKLET.

How do you feel when you are sitting in your seat in school? Make an "X" on the face that shows how you feel when you are sitting in your seat in school.

Move your marker under the next row, which begins with the DRESS.

Listen to the question.

Someone tells you that school will end forever tomorrow, and you will never go to school again. Mark an "X" on the face that shows how you would feel if school ended tomorrow and you never went to school again?

Now move your marker down to the next row, which begins with an EYE.

How would you feel if you were at home talking to your family and someone asked you to tell them what you did at school today? Make an "X" on the face that shows how you would feel if someone at home asked you what you did at school today?

Next move your marker to the last row which begins with the picture of an ELEPHANT.
How would you feel if the school rules were changed, so that you went to school everyday, including Saturday and Sunday? Make an "X" on the face that shows how you would feel if you had to go to school seven days a week.

Now turn to the next page.

Place your marker under the first row that begins with the picture of a CHAIR.

How do you feel when you get up in the morning and get dressed to come to school? Make an "X" on the face that shows how you feel when you get ready for school in the morning.

Move your marker down to the next row, which begins with the picture of a BOOK.

How would you feel if your teacher told you there would be no more reading classes? Make an "X" on the face that shows how you would feel if you knew you would never have another reading class.

Move your marker to the next row, which begins with the picture of a STOVE.

How do you feel when you are sitting at your seat doing some work and the room is very quiet? Make an "X" on the face that shows best how you feel working at your seat when the room is quiet.
Place your marker under the first row which begins with the picture of a TEACHER. How would you feel if you stayed in the room with the teacher when the other boys and girls left? Make an "X" on the face that shows how you would feel if you stayed inside with the teacher.

Let's turn the page again.

Place your marker under the first row which begins with the picture of a TELEPHONE.

How do you feel when your teacher calls your name, asks you a question and waits for you to answer? Make an "X" on the face that shows how you feel when your teacher asks you to answer a question out loud.

Move your marker down to the next row, which begins with the picture of a BUTTERFLY.

How would you feel if your teacher gave you directions for some work. You started work and then the student next to you began talking to you? Make an "X" on the face that shows best how you would feel if you had started to do your work, and someone began talking to you.

Move your marker to the next row, which begins with the picture of a MAN'S EAT.
How would you feel about being a school teacher when you grow up? Make an "X" on the face that shows best how you would feel about being a school teacher when you grow up.

Move your marker to the last row, which begins with the picture of a WAGON.

How would you feel if your teacher moved away and you got a new teacher? Make an "X" on the face that shows best how you would feel if your teacher moved away.

It's time to turn the page again.

Place your marker under the first row, which begins with the picture of a pair of SCISSORS.

How would you feel if you were in the grocery store, and your teacher walked in and said "hello" to you? Make an "X" on the face that shows best how you would feel if you met your teacher in the grocery store and she spoke to you.

Move your marker to the next row, which begins with the picture of the BUCKET.

How would you feel if your mother said you looked sick, and you had to stay home from school? Make an "X" on the face that shows best how you would feel if you had to stay home from school.
Move your marker to the next row, which begins with the picture of a CAMER.

How would you feel if your teacher were coming over to your house tomorrow? Make an "X" on the face that shows best how you would feel if your teacher were going to visit your home tomorrow.

Move your marker to the last row, which begins with the picture of a RABBIT.

How would you feel if you were in the classroom with your teacher. None of the other boys and girls were in the room, and she was talking to you? Make an "X" on the face that shows how you would feel if your teacher were talking to you in the classroom, with no one else around.

Turn to the next page.

Place your marker under the first row, which begins with the picture of a LADDER. How would you feel if your teacher invited you over to her house? Make an "X" on the face that shows best how you would feel if your teacher invited you to visit her at home.

Move your marker to the next row, which begins with the picture of a SAFETY PIN. How would you feel if the school day were changed, and you only went to school in the morning instead of both the morning and the afternoon? Make an "X" on the face that shows best how you would feel if you only went to school in the morning.
Move your marker to the next row, which begins with the picture of a SHOE. How would you feel if someone told you you had to go to school this summer? Make an "X" on the face that shows best how you would feel if you knew you would spend this summer in school.

Move your marker to the last row, which begins with the picture of a FISH. How would you feel if your teacher told you, you could take your school work home? Make an "X" on the face that shows how you would feel if you could take your school work home.

Turn the page. Pencil.

Move your marker to the last row, which begins with the picture of a pair of EYES. How would you feel if your mother were coming to school this afternoon? She would sit in the back of your classroom. Make an "X" on the face that shows best how you would feel if your mother were coming to visit your classroom this afternoon.

Move your marker to the next row, which begins with the picture of a HAMMER. How would you feel if tomorrow were a holiday and there were no school? Make an "X" on the face that shows best how you would feel if school were out tomorrow.

Move your marker to the next row, which begins with the picture of a DUCK. How do you feel when you are sitting at your seat, and the teacher is in front of the room talking to all the boys and girls? Make an "X" on the face that shows best how you feel when the teacher is talking to the class and you are sitting at your seat.
Move your marker to the last row which begins with the picture of a PEAR. How would you feel if you had to go to a different school and could not attend ________ school any more? Make an "X" on the face that shows best how you would feel if you could not go to ________ school any more and had to go to a new school.

**TURN THE PAGE.**

Move your marker to the next row, which begins with the picture of a STAR. How do you feel when you come to school in the morning? Make an "X" on the face that shows best how you feel when you come to school in the morning.

Move your marker to the last row, which begins with the picture of an UMBRELLA. How would you feel if you had a schoolroom at home? Make an "X" on the face that shows best how you would feel if you had a schoolroom in your house.

**TURN THE PAGE.**

You no longer need your yellow marker, so place it under your booklet. On the rest of the pages we will be paying special attention to the pictures.

The questions will be about the picture on each page. We will still answer the questions by marking one face. As you see, the same five faces are on the page. You are to mark only one face on each page from now on.
Turn to the next page. Look at the picture of the boy and girl standing next to the bookshelves. How do you think they feel? Make an "X" on the face that shows best how the children in the picture feel.

Turn to the next page. Look at the picture of the teacher talking to the girl and boy. How do you think the children feel? Make an "X" on the face that shows best how you think the children in the picture feel.

Turn to the next page. Look at the picture of the child standing in front of the chalkboard. How do you think the child feels? Make an "X" on the face that shows best how you think the child feels.

Now we are all finished. Put your pencils down.

Collect all materials including booklets, pencil, and yellow place markers.

Thank the children for answering the questions for you.
THE FOLLOWING IMAGE(S) MAY NOT BE LEGIBLE DUE TO BEING A COLOR THAT WILL NOT FILM CLEARLY
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