

Summary  
of  
Evaluation  
Findings

---

Year Two

---



Summary  
of  
Evaluation  
Findings

---

Year Two

---

Staff for this project, *Summary of Evaluation Findings, Year Two*, is as follows:

Evaluation Directors: Caren von Hippel, Ph.D.; Karen C. Cohen, Ph.D.

Evaluation Associates: Susan Bernstein, Ph.D.; Martin Chong; Catherine Cobb Morrocco, Ed.D.; Deborah Moskowitz; Eileen Peters.

Research Assistant: Nancy Ratner

Computer Programmer: Jay Papp

Administrative Assistant: Toby Schneider

Production: Maria Rainho; Patricia Jones.

Cover Design: Jack Dickerson

Copyright © 1976 Education Development Center, Inc.  
All rights reserved.

School and Society Programs  
55 Chapel Street  
Newton, Massachusetts 02160

# Contents

Introduction . . . . .	1
National Field Test . . . . .	2
Evaluation Methods . . . . .	3
Participants . . . . .	7
Student Learning . . . . .	9
Conceptual . . . . .	9
Attitudinal . . . . .	14
Practical . . . . .	20
Implications . . . . .	26
Program Implementation . . . . .	29
Recruitment and Selection . . . . .	29
Implementing Field Work . . . . .	30
Planning and Conducting Class Work . . . . .	31
Teacher Education . . . . .	35
Participation . . . . .	36
Assessment . . . . .	37
RFC Support Services . . . . .	39
Appendices . . . . .	43
Evaluation Documents . . . . .	44
Characteristics of Exploring Childhood and Comparison Group Samples . . . . .	45
Characteristics of Exploring Childhood Teacher Sample . . . . .	48
Sample Questions from Criterion-Referenced Test of Conceptual Learning . . . . .	49
Sample Items from Attitude Questionnaire . . . . .	52
Sample Items from Fieldsite Teacher Practical Skill Rating Forms . . . . .	53



# Introduction

EXPLORING CHILDHOOD is designed to acquaint students with the processes of growth and development in young children, and to engage students in children's lives through readings, films, and work with children. The classroom component of the program, which utilizes ethnographic films, booklets, records, posters, and a range of activities, is divided into three modules: Working with Children, Seeing Development, and Family and Society. Working with Children prepares students to work at fieldsites such as nursery schools, kindergartens, and day care centers for several hours a week. Seeing Development focuses on the processes of growth and development in young children. It draws on common activities such as water play and working with clay to illustrate these processes, and suggests ways students can learn about the needs and abilities of children as they work with them. Family and Society turns from the inner growth of the child to the socializing forces that influence growth. It helps students to understand these influences, and to see that children, who are being shaped by others, are also influencing the behavior of those around them.

Field work with children, which continues throughout the program, gives students direct experience working with and observing children. This practical experience allows students to develop confidence and competence with children, to test ideas raised in class, and to try out activities and ways of behaving that can later be discussed with their peers.

# National Field Test

Between 1973 and 1975, a national field test of EXPLORING CHILDHOOD was conducted in all parts of the United States. During this period, the program's evaluators gathered information for three broad purposes:

- *Implementation.* To inform course developers and users whether the program was providing sufficient guidelines and support for organizing and maintaining the program in schools, and what additional support was needed.
- *Revision.* To inform course developers about which aspects of the program functioned effectively for teachers and students, and which needed revision.
- *Accountability.* To inform school administrators, teachers, and federal and state agency personnel of what students were learning from participating in EXPLORING CHILDHOOD.

## YEAR ONE GOALS

The goals for the first year of the national field test (1973-74) were:

- to ascertain teacher and student responses to program materials and learning approaches;
- to identify aspects of program implementation that were most and least difficult for schools to carry out in the first year of the program;
- to assess the effectiveness of the program's teacher education and support networks.

Findings from the first-year study are outlined in *Summary of Evaluation Findings: Year One*. Those findings were used to inform the revision of materials, to determine the need for supplementary materials, and to strengthen the teacher education program.

## YEAR TWO GOALS

The second-year study provided a follow-up to the suggestive findings of the first year. The second study was designed to



provide more definitive evidence of the educational effects of EXPLORING CHILDHOOD, as well as to examine systematically program implementation and teacher education. Specifically, its goals were:

- to document changes in students' knowledge, attitudes, and skills in working with children as a result of participating in the program;
- to identify program implementation characteristics, and examine implementation differences between new teachers and second-year teachers and between full-year and half-year programs;
- to assess the strengths and limitations of alternative teacher educational models--a regional field coordinator model, which provided teacher training through full-time staff; and a community-based leadership model, in which teachers collaborated with parents in a teacher training program;
- to document program usage in a variety of nonschool settings.\*

This document describes the way information was gathered during the second year and summarizes the major findings and recommendations, building on those of Year One. The full evaluation report, which documents and discusses findings in detail, is available on request from EDC.\*\*

## Evaluation Methods

The second-year evaluation study actually encompassed four topics:

---

\*A discussion of findings related to this topic can be found in "Use of EXPLORING CHILDHOOD Materials Outside of Secondary Schools," *Evaluation Study of EXPLORING CHILDHOOD*, 1974-75.

\*\*The evaluation documents from which this summary is taken are listed in the appendix.

- Student knowledge and attitudes;
- Student practical skills;
- Program implementation by course teachers;
- Teacher education.

Each study was designed somewhat differently.

STUDENT  
KNOWLEDGE  
AND  
ATTITUDES

To examine how EXPLORING CHILDHOOD affected students' knowledge and attitudes of child development, two instruments were employed: a multiple-choice test of conceptual learning, and a questionnaire consisting of several attitude scales. Both instruments were administered in the spring of 1975 to students in 60 EXPLORING CHILDHOOD classes, and also to a comparison group of students from 25 schools who were pre-enrolled to take the course the following year.

The 60 teachers whose students participated in the test were selected from 112 teachers who had indicated willingness to participate (out of a September 1974 population of 410 teachers). Of the 60, 44 percent were first-year teachers and 56 percent were second-year teachers. A total of 934 EXPLORING CHILDHOOD students were involved.

The comparison group consisted of students from 25 of the 60 schools who reported having pre-enrollment lists for 1975-76, and who were willing to participate in comparison-group testing. A total of 285 comparison students were involved.

The effects of EXPLORING CHILDHOOD on student knowledge and attitudes were inferred from differences in the performance of students who had taken EXPLORING CHILDHOOD and of those who were planning to do so in the following year.

STUDENT  
PRACTICAL  
SKILLS

Student learning of practical skills could best be assessed at the fieldsite. Thus, it was not possible to compare EXPLORING CHILDHOOD students to a group that was not currently involved in



a fieldsite placement. Alternatively, a sample of 225 fieldsite teachers (67 percent of those contacted), all of whom were connected with the 60 schools involved in the learning study, agreed to complete a questionnaire rating one or more randomly selected EXPLORING CHILDHOOD students at their fieldsite "in the beginning" and "during the last month" of work at the fieldsite. The students who were rated were asked to complete a questionnaire designed to assess the extent of their involvement in both the classroom and fieldsite components of the course. Inferences about the impact of EXPLORING CHILDHOOD on learning of practical skills were made on the basis of relationships between student course involvement and skill ratings.

PROGRAM  
IMPLEMEN-  
TATION

Of the EXPLORING CHILDHOOD teachers, 173 (38 percent) completed a questionnaire on program implementation, including all teachers whose classes were involved in the learning study. Of the 173 teachers, 43 percent were teaching the course for the first time, 57 percent for the second year. Most (58 percent) were running full-year programs, while about one-third (34 percent) had half-year courses. (About 8 percent reported some "other" program length.) Results of the questionnaire were used to develop a descriptive profile of teachers' implementation of the program and differences between full-/half-year programs and first-/second-year teachers were investigated.

TEACHER  
EDUCATION

The nature and effectiveness of the teacher education programs were evaluated primarily through a two-part questionnaire mailed to all EXPLORING CHILDHOOD classroom teachers during the spring. A total of 198 teachers (48 percent) returned both parts of the questionnaire. Telephone interviews, seminar leaders' logs and journals, and tape recordings of teacher seminars were used to supplement the data. The two operating teacher education models were assessed and compared. The Regional Field Coordinator

(RFC) model represented 51 percent of the teachers in the sample, while the Community Based Leadership (CBL) model represented 9 percent of the teacher sample. Forty percent of the teachers in the sample did not participate in any teacher seminars or workshops during this second year of the program, compared to 50 percent of the total, nationwide group of EXPLORING CHILDHOOD teachers.

DIFFERENCES  
BETWEEN  
FIRST- AND  
SECOND-YEAR  
FIELD TEST  
METHODS

During Year One of the field test, proportionately larger samples of course teachers and students participated. Their perceptions of the course and its impact were tapped repeatedly throughout the year.\* To supplement the questionnaires, interviews and observations were conducted at five "intensive" sites. The study was designed to provide a considerable and rich body of descriptive information about the course through the eyes of the chief participants. All fieldsite teachers were also surveyed once during the year.

The focus of the Year Two study was student learning. Relatively less of the (growing) student population was sampled, but student responses were compared to those of a group who had not taken the course. A sample of fieldsite teachers were asked to assess specific students' performances, rather than to recount their impressions of and experiences with the program. Thus, while placing less burden on respondents, the Year Two evaluation attempted to follow the considerable descriptive data obtained in Year One with information that would provide a firmer basis for inferences about the program's educational accomplishments.

---

\*Students from 100 of the 234 school sites using the program in 1973-74 were sampled (total student sample = 4,140). Students were sent three or six questionnaires. All 234 course teachers were sent six questionnaires.



# Participants\*

## STUDENTS

Students were primarily female (92 percent) and white (80 percent). Approximately 9 percent were black, 4 percent of Spanish heritage, 3 percent Native American, and less than 1 percent of Oriental heritage. Ages ranged from 14 to 21, with the largest proportion (71 percent) being 17-18 years old. Eighty-nine percent were in grades 11 and 12. The majority (59 percent) were of low socioeconomic status (based on student reports of head-of-household occupation and level of formal education). Only 11 percent had parents in major professions (law, medicine, engineering) who were college graduates or had professional training. In contrast to their parents, most students (99 percent) expected to finish high school, 32 percent hoped to graduate from a four-year college or complete other training, and 8 percent expected to go to graduate school or a professional school after college.

Approximately one-third of the students had studied child or human development during the past two years, independent of EXPLORING CHILDHOOD. They had a fair amount of experience with young children, either through baby-sitting (89 percent) or taking care of siblings under seven (about one-third). (Only 21 percent of the group reported having siblings between ages two and six.) While taking EXPLORING CHILDHOOD, 87 percent worked in a preschool or day care center and/or tutored young children.\*\*

As expected, the EXPLORING CHILDHOOD student sample and the comparison group differed in age and grade (since comparison students were planning to take the program, they were approximately

---

\*See Appendices B and C for an analysis of student and teacher characteristics.

\*\*In some cases this work was part of their EXPLORING CHILDHOOD fieldsite work and in some cases it was independent of the course. While fieldsite work is considered an integral part of the program, 23 percent of the teachers reported no fieldsite component in their program.

one grade below the student sample, and had no institutionalized or formal experience with children). For all other characteristics--sex, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, educational expectations, prior course in child or human development, experience with young children--the EXPLORING CHILDHOOD student sample and comparison group sample were highly similar (see Appendix B).

COURSE  
TEACHERS

EXPLORING CHILDHOOD is taught predominantly in home economics departments (79 percent); the majority of EXPLORING CHILDHOOD teachers majored in that subject as undergraduates (83 percent). Over 95 percent of the teachers were women. About two-thirds had children, and of these, the median number of children was two.

On the whole, participating teachers were highly experienced, and had taught for over five years. For teaching experiences outside of school, teachers had considerably more experience with preschool children than with adolescents; contact with both groups occurred through institutional settings. Sixty-five percent had worked in cross-age programs, involving children of different ages working together (see Appendix C).

Most teachers had initiated action that led to teaching EXPLORING CHILDHOOD: 36 percent asked to teach it after hearing about it from other sources, and 15 percent asked to teach it a second year. Thirty percent taught EXPLORING CHILDHOOD after being given the opportunity by their administrators, while only 5 percent were assigned to teach the course without being given a choice. The remaining 14 percent reported a diversity of "other" ways of becoming involved in teaching the program.

# Student Learning

EXPLORING CHILDHOOD aims to help students understand the processes of growth and development in children, what young children are like (how they behave, think, and feel), and how human interactions shape child development; it also aims to teach students techniques of deepening such understanding (e.g., observing, journal keeping). The program addresses both the universal features or patterns of development as well as the individual or unique features contributing to the growth of each child.

## Conceptual

The evaluation of student conceptual learning asked:

- To what extent do EXPLORING CHILDHOOD students understand course-related child-development issues and concepts?
- How appropriate are students' judgments and perceptions in applying this knowledge to specific situations involving children?
- To what extent have students developed systematic methods or techniques of learning about children (e.g., observing, journal-keeping, drawing correct inferences from children's verbal and nonverbal behavior)?

The overall intent of the evaluation was to assess the extent to which the EXPLORING CHILDHOOD program contributed to such understanding, and whether it was more or less effective for different



types of students. A summary of findings follows. The types of questions included in the test of conceptual learning are illustrated in Appendix D.

When students were divided into high- and low-scoring groups, there were significant differences in the total test performances of those taking EXPLORING CHILDHOOD and of those planning to take the course. One-third of the EXPLORING CHILDHOOD sample were low scorers, compared to almost 44 percent of the comparison group; while 38 percent of the EXPLORING CHILDHOOD sample were high scorers, compared with only 23 percent of the comparison group. Overall, then, EXPLORING CHILDHOOD improved students' conceptual understanding of children and of processes of development, and helped them develop techniques of learning about children.

Importantly, EXPLORING CHILDHOOD seems particularly effective in helping students to apply child development concepts to real-life situations (as measured by a paper-and-pencil test), and in equipping students with the necessary skills for learning more about the children with whom they work. Significantly more EXPLORING CHILDHOOD students than comparison-group students attained high scores on subsets of test items involving "skills in working with children" and "ways of learning about children." This latter result is interesting in the light of the Year One finding, based on student reports, that, "on the whole, students had difficulty relating journal-writing assignments to learning about children."\* Our finding of actual student performance in this area seems to belie students' subjective impressions.

On the basis of test results, EXPLORING CHILDHOOD appears less effective in providing students with additional information on "child development concepts and issues" per se than it is in teaching "skills in working with children" and "ways of learning about children." This finding may be an artifact of the particular test used to evaluate conceptual learning rather than a true

---

\**Summary of Evaluation Findings: Year One*, p. 15.

indication of the impact of the program, since both groups displayed high levels of knowledge in this area at the time of testing. Given that both "pre" and "post" test scores in this area were high, there was little room for difference between the two groups; hence, on the basis of test results we cannot determine whether EXPLORING CHILDHOOD was less effective in teaching students "child development concepts and issues" or whether the test as constructed did not provide the opportunity for EXPLORING CHILDHOOD students to display the particular knowledge in this area that they had gained from the program. On the basis of the data available, however, a major contribution to their knowledge was provided by previous courses in child development. In both groups, students who had had previous child development courses generally scored higher on these items than those who had not.

Interpreting these findings, readers should note that findings for specific groups of test items are suggestive rather than definitive, due to their small number.

Year One evaluation findings indicate that students felt they had learned much about how children think and feel, and had developed understanding of a number of child development concepts:

...75 percent of the students in the 100-site sample felt they grew a great deal in this area [understanding of how children think and feel]. That understanding included an awareness that children's needs, emotions, and abilities are different from those of an adolescent or adult. Interviews with intensive site students provided numerous examples of this awareness. Many students described the unrealistic expectations they had initially, particularly of what children of different ages are able to do. One high school girl recalled one child and said, "We were always putting responsibilities on him and always yelling at him...and couldn't realize that he's only three years old!"

...Understanding more about how children think and feel included not only an awareness of the differences between children and older people but also the realization that no two children are alike: each responds differently because of his or her values, home life, and experiences. Students realized that initially they had



expected children, particularly children of the same age, to be alike. Both the student sample as a whole and the interview groups expressed surprise at discovering wide differences in the vocabulary, physical development, and social ease exhibited by the children they worked with.\*

Students who had taken a prior course in development had higher total test scores than students who had not. This effect was stronger for comparison group students than for EXPLORING CHILDHOOD students: Comparison group students who had taken some prior development course did considerably better than comparison group students who had not (the latter having had no development course at all); in contrast, the difference between total test scores of EXPLORING CHILDHOOD students who had or had not taken a prior development course was negligible, indicating possibly that the test of conceptual learning used did not tap any differences in what students learned conceptually from EXPLORING CHILDHOOD as distinct from what they had learned in their prior development course. In sum, however, the effect of having taken a prior course in development for students in the comparison group, in increasing their total test scores considerably more than the scores of EXPLORING CHILDHOOD students, contributed to the relatively small difference that was found in average test scores for the two groups. (In particular, the differential effect of prior development course experience on EXPLORING CHILDHOOD and comparison group students was reflected in the set of test items concerned with "learning about children." In this case, comparison-group students who had taken a prior course in development did better than comparison-group students who had not; however, EXPLORING CHILDHOOD students who had or had not taken a prior development course did equally well in this area.) Other experience with children, whether formal or informal, was not associated with test performance.

---

\**Summary of Evaluation Findings: Year One*, pp. 12-13.



EXPLORING CHILDHOOD seems particularly to benefit the performance of female students in the area of "working with children." For example, in the comparison group about the same proportion of girls as boys (28 percent versus 25 percent) received high scores on "working with children" items. Among EXPLORING CHILDHOOD high scorers, however, 42 percent were girls while, again, 26 percent were boys.

Although representation from various ethnic minority groups was relatively small, the course appears to have had a differential effect on students from diverse backgrounds: black students benefited more from taking EXPLORING CHILDHOOD than did white, Spanish heritage, or Native American students. For example, the proportion of black students attaining high scores on the total test was 35 percent in the EXPLORING CHILDHOOD group, in contrast to only 6 percent in the comparison group. The corresponding differences between EXPLORING CHILDHOOD and comparison group high scorers for other ethnic groups were smaller: 38 percent versus 29 percent among white students; 27 percent versus 15 percent among Native American students; and 19 percent versus 10 percent among students of Spanish heritage.\*

A positive relationship was found between students' socioeconomic status and their total test scores for both EXPLORING CHILDHOOD and comparison-group students. Hence, on the whole, EXPLORING CHILDHOOD did not seem to have a differential effect on students of varying socioeconomic position. The relationship found for both groups was that, in general, students with parents of high socioeconomic status scored proportionally higher, while students with parents of low socioeconomic status scored lower.\*\* No relationships were found between student test scores and other

---

\*There were no students of Oriental heritage in the comparison group, so that no analysis of the effect of EXPLORING CHILDHOOD for this group could be carried out.

\*\*Socioeconomic status was measured by the Hollingshead Social Position Index.

background variables. In addition, no associations of students' scores were found with program length or with teacher experience in the program.

## Attitudinal

What we know about child development can affect our feelings and attitudes toward children. By helping students discover and apply knowledge about development through class and field work, EXPLORING CHILDHOOD aims to affect students' ways of perceiving and feeling about children.

One focus of the program is students' attitudes about children and how to care for and work with them. The program encourages students to be accepting of children, to respect the child's activity and initiative rather than assume the child is passive. EXPLORING CHILDHOOD encourages students to value the child's ability to express ideas and feelings, rather than to expect the child to respond solely to adult authority.

EXPLORING CHILDHOOD also focuses on adolescents' attitudes toward themselves. The program attempts to help students develop confidence in their ability to understand children and to support their growth, and it encourages an interest in working with children as parents and personal child-care professionals. At the same time, the program tries to foster a sense of competence and worth and to develop students' awareness of their own development process.

With these program goals in mind, the Year Two field test investigated the following questions:

- How does the program affect students' views and feelings about children and caring for children?
- How does it affect students' views and feelings about themselves, as caregivers and as individuals?

Rating scales in the student questionnaire tapped attitudes toward child-care issues and toward fieldsite participants (see Appendix E for illustrative items):

Child-care Issues

- Communicating with children about their feelings
- Expressing tenderness toward children
- Accepting their ideas and opinions
- Allowing them to express aggression
- Punishing and controlling children
- Encouraging children's independence and autonomy

Fieldsite Participants

- Young children
- Adults who work with children
- The student in a care-giving role
- The student as an individual

GENERAL  
EFFECTS  
OF THE  
PROGRAM

EXPLORING CHILDHOOD students favored *expressing tenderness* and affection openly, allowing children to *express some aggression, using mild rather than harsh forms of punishment, and encouraging the child's autonomy and independence* somewhat more frequently than students who had not taken the course. We could not measure whether being in the program contributed to students' views about communicating with children about their feelings, or about accepting children's ideas and opinions, because close to 100 percent of students in both groups (pre- and post-test scores) felt that children should be encouraged to express ideas and opinions that differ from those of adults (see Appendix E for examples of items from attitudinal scales).

Data from Year One evaluation indicated that students themselves perceived changes in their own attitudes and understanding of young children, particularly with respect to ways of approaching child behavior that might be "undesirable":



Students expressed an awareness that they were learning not to attribute adult motives (particularly aggressive ones) to rough play behavior. One boy said, "They would just get on my nerves by the things they'd be doing.... I used to hate them. But now I can put up with it and I know that because I'm older than them, I should be trying to teach them instead of...stopping them from doing things. When they mess up, they just do it because they enjoy it...."

...Students...mentioned that the fieldsite provided a setting for practicing alternative ways to work with children. Many students in the interview group had discovered that joining a child's work in a supportive way could motivate them more effectively than telling or forcing them. One girl recounted that at the beginning of her field work she would get angry or ignore the children if they became difficult to handle. She would say, "If you're going to act that way, I'm just not going to work with you." After a while she discovered that, "If I just try to start doing writing with them, then they usually calm down." Another student said that early in the year if "the kid gets smart... gets into something they're not supposed to do, I would have whipped him.... But now...I'll just sit down and talk to him or make a little game out of it and then he'll understand it better than getting the whipping."

...many students in the interview group could describe this kind of change from directive to supportive behavior....\*

The attitude scale used in Year Two indicated that the course did not have a measurable effect on students' global attitudes toward young children, adults, or themselves in the fieldsite situation. In contrast, Year One findings suggested that students became more understanding of young children, and that "by the end of their participation in the program, close to half of the student sample felt they had learned a great deal about themselves as a result of the program." Findings from Year One suggested that increased learning about themselves took two forms:

One was an awareness of what they were doing and feeling as they work with children. In interviews, students gave examples of "discovering" their own

---

\*Year One, pp. 12 and 14.

assumptions and personality characteristics in the process of working with children. For example, one student said: "If a kid does something wrong, I get mad.... It's normal for you to get mad, but I think I need to do something about my temper. If you have a bad day, talk it over with someone, and you won't take it out on the kids." Students also became aware of ways they "project" their own self-critical attitudes onto children: "When kids didn't want to act right it used to get to me. I used to say *there must be something wrong with me*. I realized they got moods just like we do. Sometimes they just don't feel like doing it...still gives me trouble." Together the quotes suggest a struggle that seemed typical: students' efforts to understand how their behavior may affect the children they work with, without *exaggerating* the degree of their influence on the children.

The second area of self-understanding related to parenting: 60 percent of the student sample felt they understood a great deal more about the responsibilities it involved. Although students entered the program with the strong belief that parents have a great influence on children, that belief seemed to become more personalized by the end of the program. What impressed students most was the degree of responsibility involved. When asked how they felt about being parents after taking the course, students typically echoed this student's sentiment: "I know it would be nice to be a parent, but having to watch after them and making sure they grow up right...you need to be really responsible." Most students in the sample expressed a strong interest in parenthood, but almost universally they agreed that it was a serious undertaking, to be off for some time.\*

OTHER  
FACTORS  
RELATED TO  
ATTITUDES

Several factors in addition to EXPLORING CHILDHOOD itself help to explain differences in student scores on the attitude scales used in the study. These include the effect of being in any kind of development course (be it EXPLORING CHILDHOOD or another course), age, educational expectation, sex, and ethnicity. Other factors such as program length and teacher experience with the program appear to have little relationship to students' attitudes toward children and themselves.

---

\*Year One, pp. 18-19.



Experience  
in a  
Development  
Course

Other courses in development taken by students in the sample seemed to have affected their attitudes toward aggression in children as much as EXPLORING CHILDHOOD did. EXPLORING CHILDHOOD apparently had a more positive effect on attitudes toward expressing tenderness, using mild rather than severe punishment, and encouraging independence than did other development courses. Although EXPLORING CHILDHOOD had a clear and positive effect on nonwhite attitudes toward child care (discussed below), other child development courses may have had an equally strong effect.

Students who had taken any course in development evaluated young children more positively than did students who had not taken a course in development, and they rated themselves as more lenient with children.

Though we do not have data on what proportion of "other courses" had a field-work component, it is our impression from past research that most did not. If that is the case, the combination of field work with an academic component may explain why EXPLORING CHILDHOOD students had more positive attitudes toward tenderness, nonsevere punishment, and dependency than did students who had taken other development courses. Data do not indicate that students who had some field-work experience with children, as part of EXPLORING CHILDHOOD or independently, differed from students who did not have that experience. Students with the most field-work experience tended to evaluate adults who work with children more positively.

Age

The older the student, the more he or she tended to encourage children to express differing ideas. Older students also tended to see adults who work with children as less severe than did younger students. The Year One field test found that, "The oldest age group was much more positive than younger students about approaches that allowed them to work outside the classroom: visiting child care centers and talking with experienced adults, for example."\*

---

\*Year One, p. 23.



Educational  
Experience

Students with greater educational expectations tended to see themselves as more lenient in their work with children and to evaluate themselves more highly as individuals than did students with lower expectations. Among white students, those with higher aspirations tended to favor expressing tenderness, using non-severe punishment, and encouraging autonomy in children more than those with lower expectations. No differences according to educational expectation were found among minority students.

Sex

Before taking EXPLORING CHILDHOOD or another development course, more females than males tended to favor expressing their feelings to children and showing tenderness. EXPLORING CHILDHOOD increased the proportion of males who favored expressing tenderness, while EXPLORING CHILDHOOD or other development courses further increased the proportion of females who favored communicating with children.

More male than female students tended to tolerate children's mild forms of aggression before taking the course. After EXPLORING CHILDHOOD or another course, males and females were equally in favor of children expressing mild aggression.

Males saw themselves as more serious and severe as individuals than did females before taking EXPLORING CHILDHOOD. Participating in EXPLORING CHILDHOOD accentuated this difference by increasing females' perceptions of themselves as lenient individuals. The course appeared to have no effect on males in this area, even though a larger proportion of males now approved of expressing tenderness toward children.

EXPLORING CHILDHOOD affected attitudes toward punishment of children equally among male and female students. However, by the end of the course, males still tended to favor harsh punishment and strict rules more than females did. This corroborates similar findings in Year One.

Ethnicity

One of the most consistent findings of the attitude study was the effect of EXPLORING CHILDHOOD on the attitudes of

nonwhite students. The course particularly affected nonwhite students' perceptions of themselves as more lenient individuals. In addition, the course may have affected several care-giving attitudes of these students, although other courses in development appear to have had equivalent impact. Before taking any development course, more white than nonwhite students favored expressing tenderness, allowing aggression, not using severe punishment, and accepting children's ideas. After participating in a development course, white and nonwhite students valued these attitudes equally strongly.

#### SUMMARY

Participation in EXPLORING CHILDHOOD appears to strengthen several attitudes toward child care. Though female and white students tended to hold the attitudes encouraged by the program more frequently than did male and nonwhite students, participation in the program tended to result in more positive attitudes toward child care on the part of males and nonwhite students. Although some of the effects discussed could have been accomplished by other child development courses, EXPLORING CHILDHOOD appears to have had a stronger influence on attitudes toward expressing tenderness toward children, using less severe forms of punishment, and encouraging children's independence and autonomy than did other development courses.

## Practical

The primary purpose of evaluating students' fieldsite activities was to measure students' learning of practical skills--that is, the degree to which students utilized knowledge gained in EXPLORING CHILDHOOD when working with children. Ratings by fieldsite teachers measured two types of student learning in the area of practical skills (see Appendix F for illustrative items):

- The roles students engaged in while working with children.



The skills students acquired in their work with children.

EXPLORING CHILDHOOD encourages students to take active, purposeful roles in their field work (for example, to participate in children's activities in order to support and extend their growth and development) rather than to be simply a friend or playmate to the children. This study attempted to determine whether such active, purposeful roles occurred more frequently. Further, it was hypothesized that the skills high school students acquired while working with children would be related to the kinds of roles they engaged in at the fieldsite. Such relationships would be helpful both in attempting to describe student learning in different skill areas and in helping future teachers organize the program to optimize student learning.

The evaluation of course impact on practical skills had two aspects: to determine where in students' work with children there was the greatest and the least growth and to relate students' work with children to their degree of program involvement. Data on student growth came from fieldsite teachers, who rated students on general skill areas as well as on skills linked to specific units of the program. To learn about the relationship between work with children and program involvement, information was obtained from students about which course materials they used and how much time they spent at the fieldsite. The findings of the practical learning study are summarized below.

FIELDSITE  
ROLES

Students tended to spend less time in activities that involved "teacherlike" responsibility and initiative. They preferred being a friend or playmate to the children to taking on more demanding roles. This finding echoes the Year One evaluation results:

At the end of the course, students did not feel like "authorities," or able to carry out a "teacher" role. They felt less equipped to conduct a class, work with a group, "keep children interested in learning," or

create and carry out group activities than to work in a close, one-to-one way with individual children.\*

However, students who had previously taken child development courses tended to take more active roles with children. This suggests that multiple development courses may increase students' confidence in knowing what to do with a child.

Older students take more active helping roles with children. While the findings from Year One revealed no relationship between student age and roles taken (as reported by students), Year Two fieldsite teacher ratings indicate that eleventh and twelfth graders more often "initiated/planned activities for a group of children" than did ninth or tenth graders. In addition, while 61 percent of all nonwhite students were judged to have frequently "initiated/planned activities for a single child," only 38 percent of white students were so rated. These and all other findings in the area of practical skills related to ethnic group membership should be viewed as extremely tentative, due to the small numbers of students involved (ethnic data were available on only three black, eight Spanish heritage, two Oriental heritage, and eight Native American students, as compared with 104 white students).

GENERAL AND  
SPECIFIC  
SKILLS

EXPLORING CHILDHOOD students improved their practical skills in working with children over the year. This corroborates the findings in 1973-74 of students' reported increased ability to work with children. The Year One evaluation reported that:

Sixty percent of the students in the 100-site sample felt they grew substantially in this area. They felt, for example, that they developed more patience, and could interpret children's needs and reasons for behaving in particular ways more accurately. They attributed this to an increased ability to relate to children on their own level, particularly to talk

---

\*Year One, p. 13.



with and listen to children, and to be able to control children in different situations.\*

The second-year evaluation found greatest increases in practical competence in working with children in general skill areas and in skills specifically related to Working with Children and Seeing Development (see Appendix F for examples of general and specific skills). Nonwhite students were rated higher in general skills more frequently than white students, while students with higher educational aspirations received proportionately higher ratings on specific skills than did those with lower educational expectations.

All fieldsite roles were positively related to end-of-year skill ratings, indicating that the more frequently the students engaged in these roles, the higher their ratings in working with children were. However, the strongest relationships between roles engaged in and end-of-year skill ratings occurred for the more active, participatory roles: "participating in children's activities to promote growth"; "initiating activities for a single child"; "collaborating with the teacher." Students who engaged in these active participatory roles tended to have higher ratings in their skills in working with children. Although it is not possible to infer with certainty that taking on active roles at the fieldsite directly improved student skills, these findings should encourage course and fieldsite teachers to work on helping students undertake more participatory roles.

RELATIONSHIP  
OF ROLES  
AND SKILLS  
TO COURSE  
INVOLVEMENT

Students' reports about their involvement with the reading and film materials parallel EXPLORING CHILDHOOD teachers' reported use and findings, and reveal a pattern of use similar to Year One. Exposure to and discussion of print materials decreased over the three modules in both years, with materials for

---

\*Year One, p. 13.

Family and Society being used least.\* Film exposure was lower than hoped but did improve over 1973-74. The Year One evaluation reported:

Probably because of film-sharing difficulties as well as lack of time, less than half of the students saw any "Children at Home" or "at School" films [for the Family and Society module]. Less than 15 percent saw many of the films [for this module].\*\*

During 1974-75, the number of students who saw the Family and Society films increased greatly: 58 percent saw some "Children at Home" films and 61 percent saw some "Children at School" films. The percentage of students who saw most or all films for each module was: 50 percent for Working with Children, 46 percent for Seeing Development, and 27 percent for Family and Society.

More important than the actual extent of exposure to course materials was the relationship of course work to fieldsite roles and skills. Analyses revealed that the more course booklets were discussed with the fieldsite teacher, the more frequently students engaged in more active, participatory roles with children. However, these were not strong relationships. In general, student exposure to print material correlated with collaboration with the fieldsite teacher; discussion of course material with him/her (which may have been a component of "collaboration") correlated with students' taking on of greater responsibility in their fieldsite work.

Students impressions of the value of course materials and activities were recorded in Year One:

Reading how children develop, trying out children's activities ("If you've never fingerpainted, you're not

---

\*Year One, p. 22.

\*\*This seems to be due largely to a lack of time, given that this unit is the last in the course. (See "Program Implementation: Planning and Conducting Class Work," in this summary, for a discussion of the relative use of different course materials.)



going to know how the kid's feeling"), discussing hypothetical situations with children ("They explain what *might* happen to you"), and viewing films of children and of adolescents working with children were all rated "very useful" by more than half of the sample.\*

Year Two analyses did not indicate a clear relationship between the amount of exposure to course materials and students' degree of competence and practical skills. However, student skill ratings were positively related to the amount of field work they did--both during each week, and in total over the year. These findings, as well as those cited above, relate to contact with the fieldsite, and support the initial impressions offered by students in Year One: that being able to spend more time at the fieldsite would help them in their work with children.

The most universal, persistent complaint was that there wasn't enough time to build continuous, effective relationships with the children. Second, they would have liked to spend more time with the fieldsite teacher discussing the children, clarifying what the teacher expected of them, getting direction and feedback about their work.\*\*

The extent of fieldsite exposure did not correlate with the roles students engaged in, beyond "setting/clearing up the classroom."

The Year Two field test found that students in lab schools (those attached to high schools) scored slightly lower in most skill areas than those who had done their field work in pre-schools, elementary schools, and kindergartens. However, overall competence in specific skill areas improved most for students doing field work at lab schools and preschools.

The finding that students in lab school fieldsites were rated generally lower than students in other types of fieldsites in their "beginning of the year" practical skills, and generally higher in their "end of the year" practical skills, is probably

---

\*Year One, p. 15.

\*\*Year One, p. 15.

best explained by a combination of two factors: (1) Since the lab school teachers are also course teachers, they have a much clearer idea of the practical skill goals of the course and hence may tend to rate students' initial performance more critically. At the same time, unlike the typical fieldsite teacher, the lab school teacher knows the course work intimately, can therefore coordinate course work and field work more easily, and probably works harder at encouraging skill development as described in course material. (2) Some bias is probably reflected in the "greater change" scores of students in lab schools, since course teachers are more likely to want to perceive that their students have learned a lot during the course.

#### SUMMARY

Discussion of EXPLORING CHILDHOOD course materials with the fieldsite teacher may contribute to students' more active engagement at the fieldsite. More participatory involvement on the part of students with children is, in turn, associated with greater end-of-year practical competence. The amount of time spent in field work may in itself directly improve skills (or teachers' perceptions of student competence), but time alone will not influence the types of roles students assume. EXPLORING CHILDHOOD students increased their practical skills in working with children, particularly in general skills and specific skills related to the course modules Working with Children and Seeing Development.

## Implications

Two issues stand out when considering overall student learning. First, EXPLORING CHILDHOOD has its clearest impact on students' abilities to apply their understanding of children to actual interaction with them. This increased ability to work successfully with children is evidenced both in their conceptual



understanding of ways of interacting with children and in their actual behavior with children in students' field work. Attitudes that might have a significant positive impact on their behavior with children also seem to be fostered by the course.

Second, the self-selecting factors that attract students to the course also contribute to a generally knowledgeable and skilled student population, who already hold values espoused by the course. This is indicated by the generally high performance on all measures, along with the relatively few differences between EXPLORING CHILDHOOD students and those planning to take the course. In addition, one-third of the students who came to EXPLORING CHILDHOOD had already taken another course in child or human development. This prior experience significantly affected their performance in most areas, as measured by the particular evaluation instruments used, often as much as or more than EXPLORING CHILDHOOD. Nevertheless, it is notable that although prior course experience was correlated with frequently engaging in one of the student roles at the fieldsite as well as with conceptual and attitudinal gains, it was neither a factor in the improvement of student practical skills, or in their performance on "working with children" test items. The unique strength, then, of EXPLORING CHILDHOOD does seem to be its integration of field and academic work; and its unique contribution seems to be student application of child-development principles to child-care practice.

It is important that the reader not interpret the otherwise overriding or equivalent impact of "other" courses to mean that *any* development course would have effects on knowledge and attitudes equal to EXPLORING CHILDHOOD. It is quite likely that the "other" courses in this case were taught in the same departments and by the same people who are teaching EXPLORING CHILDHOOD classes; this could account for similarity in many respects.

Female students derived somewhat more from the course in knowledge and attitudes than did male students, although, surprisingly, no sex differences were found in practical skills.

Ethnic minority students appear to experience greater gains in EXPLORING CHILDHOOD than their white classmates in the areas of conceptual learning and attitudinal learning. However, the number of students on which this inference can be based is small, and effects may differ among minority groups. Nonwhite students were also found to take on more active roles and were rated higher in general skills at the fieldsite.

Perhaps particular attention in conducting the course is indicated for those students whose educational expectations do not extend much beyond high school. After having taken the course, these youngsters received relatively lower ratings in specific practical skills and evaluated themselves more negatively than did college-bound students.



# Program Implementation

Implementing EXPLORING CHILDHOOD involves organizing a program as well as teaching a course. This fact, more than any other, determined the evaluation focus for 1974-75. The evaluation of EXPLORING CHILDHOOD program implementation was based on data supplied by classroom teachers who responded to questions concerning:

- Recruiting and selecting students,
- Organizing the field-work component,
- Planning and conducting class work.

Patterns and profiles of program implementation were examined for differences (or lack of them) between full- and half-year programs, and between courses organized and taught by first- and second-year teachers.

## Recruitment and Selection

EXPLORING CHILDHOOD encourages course teachers to take an active role in recruiting students for the program. Most teachers in the sample (77 percent) used at least one recruitment strategy, and a majority (64 percent) used three or more strategies. The most frequently used method was informing school guidance programs about EXPLORING CHILDHOOD; more direct methods included announcing the program to classes, advising students to take the course, and making a special effort to interest boys.

Although about half the teachers (51 percent in Year Two; 61 percent in Year One) made a special effort to recruit male students, males remained a small percentage of the students in the programs (8 percent). This very low proportion may be a significant factor in males' relatively poorer performance in conceptual and attitudinal areas.

The Year Two study verified a tentative finding of the first year: that many teachers used a variety of selection criteria to screen potential course participants. Although teachers disseminated information about the program fairly widely, a substantial proportion restricted entry into the program. The most common selection criterion reported (32 percent of programs) was the teacher's opinion (based on records or personal contact) on whether students could handle fieldsite responsibilities. Over one-fifth of the programs could be considered highly selective, with students chosen according to two to four criteria. Other criteria included school attendance record, course prerequisites, and grades. We do not know whether more boys than girls were screened out of the course because of these practices.

## Implementing Field Work

In setting up fieldsites, teachers tended to rely on public school sites (kindergartens and elementary schools). They also used a variety of private and community child-care settings, which indicates that public school teachers are well able to develop collaborative relationships with nonpublic institutions in their communities. A substantial number were able to develop a *diverse* group of field placements, rather than relying solely on kindergartens or preschool placements. Over 40 percent offered three or more different types of site (including Headstart centers, day care centers, and lab schools) to their students.

Teachers found some tasks associated with field work more difficult than others. They experienced only mild difficulty in setting up sites, but found supervising students and keeping field work and classroom experiences parallel more difficult.

One reason supervision was difficult was that teachers had several other objectives in visiting fieldsites. A majority of teachers attempted to accomplish the following tasks, in a decreasing order of importance:

- to familiarize themselves with their fieldsites;
- to maintain contact with the fieldsite teacher;
- to gather data for class discussion;
- to ensure that field activities paralleled class work;
- to understand problems of the fieldsite teacher.

Teachers felt most successful at familiarizing themselves with their fieldsites and maintaining contact with the fieldsite teacher. They felt least successful in ensuring that students' fieldsite activities paralleled class work. It is not surprising that teachers had difficulty achieving the latter objective, given the likelihood that the different fieldsites may have raised different issues and demanded different skills and activities. Presumably, the more diverse the fieldsite, the more challenging the task of relating field and class activities.

Arranging transportation continued to be a difficult problem for many teachers, as in Year One.

## Planning and Conducting Class Work

As in 1973-74, classes covered more of Working with Children and Seeing Development than Family and Society. Teachers used approximately 75 percent of the readings and activities in Working with Children and Seeing Development, but only 57 percent of the Family and Society booklet. The overall use of films was



less than that of booklets, and Family and Society films were used least. Fifty-three percent of Seeing Development films, 43 percent of Working with Children films, and 39 percent of Family and Society films were used, representing an increase in the usage of Family and Society films over the previous year.

The Year One field test could not adequately assess the lower coverage of Family and Society booklets, due to late deliveries of materials. However, 1974-75 field test data tended to support the view that teachers used fewer Family and Society print materials, activities, and films because of insufficient time rather than problems with the materials.

A substantial number of teachers supplemented their programs with materials from other sources. The largest proportion of teachers added films rather than supplemental texts or booklets. On the average, they spent only 10 to 20 percent of class time on other materials. The majority of teachers (70 percent or more) supplemented their programs by expanding on EXPLORING CHILDHOOD materials, rather than replacing them.

Finally, teachers were asked to rate several kinds of responsibility associated with the classroom component of the course. Creating a supportive class atmosphere and adapting materials to local needs were fairly comfortable tasks for course teachers. On the other hand, becoming familiar with materials, relating them to field work, and using the learning strategies of the program remained moderately difficult.

INFLUENCE  
OF PROGRAM  
LENGTH

There were surprisingly few differences between full- and half-year programs on the quantitative indices we used. Teachers of full-year programs used a greater number of recruitment methods to attract students and a greater number of selection criteria in forming their classes. But they did not differ from teachers of half-year programs in types of methods or criteria used. Half-year teachers took on as large a fieldsite

responsibility as teachers of full-year programs: although they had a less diverse group of sites, they had the same number of sites to contact and maintain. Full-year teachers did not use their longer program duration to begin field work later, as might be expected. In fact, full-year teachers actually began field work somewhat earlier than half-year programs (proportional to program length), though they used the field work preparation material (*Getting Involved*) more.

Full- and half-year teachers experienced the same level of difficulty with tasks associated with the fieldsite component. Importantly, however, full-year teachers perceived themselves as more successful in maintaining fieldsite contact and as having accomplished more course-valued objectives for visiting sites.

The two kinds of programs covered essentially the same quantity of materials; half-year programs simply covered them at a faster rate. Full-year programs spent only one or two weeks more than half-year programs on EXPLORING CHILDHOOD materials. Though full-year programs covered somewhat more of Working with Children and Seeing Development, the two programs did not differ in the particular booklets used nor in their film use. Full-year teachers included more materials from other sources in their programs.

It was hypothesized that greater contact with fieldsites and more extensive use of materials in the full-year program would affect student learning. No relationship with program length was found for conceptual, attitudinal, or practical learning. The evaluation was not originally designed to test this hypothesis, and the small number of half-year programs included in the learning sample precludes drawing any conclusions about the effect of program length on student learning.

INFLUENCE  
OF TEACHER  
EXPERIENCE

First- and second-year teachers differed in program implementation in two ways. First-year teachers developed a more diverse set of fieldsites. Whether this represents temporary

enthusiasm, or whether a climate of administrative support for more diversified sites is developing is not clear. However, it is interesting that the overall diversity of fieldsite use declined from Year One (when virtually all teachers were "first-year," at least with respect to the completed course). While 41 percent of the teachers used three or more types of site in 1974-75, 57 percent did so in 1973-74. Without follow-up data on specific teachers, we might still hazard the conclusion that second-year teachers *decreased* the diversity of types of field-sites that they used.

Findings also suggest that teachers with one year's experience may be able to plan their time better and cover course materials more fully. Second-year teachers covered more of the later booklets of Seeing Development and more of the major pieces of Family and Society. Moreover, they expanded on Family and Society materials by adding films. Thus, while the program is long, and does create a time press for first-year teachers (and second-year teachers in half-year programs), experienced, full-year teachers may be able to complete and even supplement most course materials.



# Teacher Education

During 1974-75, teacher education was offered through two channels. Five Regional Field Coordinators (RFCs) based around the country offered a series of professional workshops focusing on the use and implementation of EXPLORING CHILDHOOD, along with performance of other duties (including individual technical and administrative assistance, and dissemination of information about the course to potential users). The Community Based Leadership Program (CBL) involved teams consisting of an experienced EXPLORING CHILDHOOD teacher and a parent. These teams organized and led more frequent, shorter teacher workshops in their own districts. Workshop plans were included in course teacher guides, and were available to all course participants.

The evaluation of teacher education addressed the following questions:

- In what ways do the workshops support and aid teachers in their use and implementation of EXPLORING CHILDHOOD?
- What influences did the different training models have on teachers' attitudes and impressions of the program?

The resulting findings regarding differences in the effectiveness of the two models should be treated as merely suggestive. There was often overlapping influence of the two models in a given geographical area, for the RFC carried on activities that benefitted the CBL teachers both directly and indirectly. In addition, some teachers attended both CBL and RFC seminars. Even though such individuals were not included in the analysis when this information

became known, the study was unable to isolate the unique efforts of each teacher education model.

The sample included not only CBL or RFC participants, but also teachers who attended no workshops during this second year of the program. As might be expected, a significantly greater proportion of second-year teachers (61 percent) made up this latter group, since many of the second-year teachers had already been involved in the teacher education program during their first year. In contrast, only 24 percent of the CBL group and 37 percent of the RFC group were second-year teachers.

## Participation

The majority of CBL teachers were more likely than RFC teachers to have participated in all of the designated EXPLORING CHILDHOOD workshops. Consequently, the CBL program seems to have been more effective in providing curriculum training to teachers insofar as scope of designated topics\* and attendance is concerned. This difference is probably attributable to such differences as frequency of meetings, length, and location. Since RFC seminars were longer (about four hours for a single session) but held less frequently, RFC seminar leaders had to combine several seminar topics into one workshop period. In contrast, CBL seminar leaders, holding more frequent workshops of shorter duration, could focus their attention on one (and not more than two) workshop topics per month. Thus, a teacher missing an RFC workshop would miss several seminar topics. In addition, RFC teachers, participating in a regional or statewide RFC workshop, might have to travel 100 to 300 miles to attend the workshop (in contrast to 25 miles for the CBL workshop), and set aside two days to do so.

---

\*RFCs, in informal communication with evaluators, reported that in this second year of the RFC teacher education program they tended to modify topics of workshops according to what RFCs perceived as the needs of workshop participants.

Teachers most frequently said they attended workshops to learn specific ways to use course materials, to discuss teaching needs and experiences with other teachers, and to review course materials and projects. RFC teachers reported being more interested than CBL teachers in discussing their needs and experiences with other teachers. Responses from the workshop leaders in interview data indicated that CBL teachers were no longer as concerned with discussing teaching needs, since the CBL program gave them adequate opportunity to do so. Workshop leaders felt that RFC teachers, on the other hand, were somewhat frustrated and dissatisfied at being unable to talk more with other teachers about the teaching problems and needs they experienced, due to the time constraints of the RFC seminar.

In general, teachers attending the workshops reported few problems in making the meetings. The most frequently mentioned problems were receiving insufficient notice of the seminar and accommodating their schedules to the workshop schedule (each problem reported by 33 percent of the respondents). Almost none of the teachers reported "lack of usefulness" as a reason for not attending.

## Assessment

Overall satisfaction with the running of the workshops and their structure was very high, similar to the Year One findings. In fact, while "Ninety percent of the teachers in [1973-74] expressed the opinion that the workshop leader should have been more informed about adolescent development,"\* most participants in 1974-75 felt that their leaders were "very knowledgeable" in this area (74 percent of respondents).

Workshops were felt to be most helpful in the way of general orientation, that is, in helping teachers to understand course

---

\*Year One, p. 34.



goals, course content, the conceptual framework, and how individual pieces of material fit together. This finding is consistent with Year One.

Teachers who responded to the implementation questionnaire reported considerable difficulty in using the learning strategies of the course. Those participating in the teacher education program (either model) found the workshops "somewhat helpful" in this respect.

Workshops were considered least helpful in helping teachers learn more about their students, develop a support group in the classroom, arrange for and set up fieldsites, and expand the content beyond the printed materials. However, from implementation data we know that at least the last two areas probably did not cause difficulties, so need for help was not great. More necessary, teachers felt, was help related to supervising field work and integrating field and class work. However, implementation data does indicate a need to help teachers develop a support group in the classroom: about one-third of the teachers reported experiencing moderate difficulty in developing a classroom atmosphere in which students share experiences, a problem that was also felt not to have been satisfactorily met during the 1973-74 teacher education program.

#### INFLUENCE ON TEACHERS

Teachers were asked to comment on the extent to which the workshop program influenced their attitudes, behaviors, or teaching styles. In the area of attitude change, there was great diversity of opinion. Two particular changes are noteworthy, although only 20 percent of the respondents reported them: teachers grew more aware of children as individuals with needs and feelings, and they learned to appreciate high school students' abilities and to give them more responsibility. The latter finding, to the extent that it is borne out by teacher behavior, suggests that fieldsite teachers, too, might profit from

attending workshops. A related finding, that greater effort was needed on the part of both course and fieldsite teachers in encouraging students to assume more responsible roles at the fieldsite, could be addressed by having both teachers attend workshops. Although fieldsite teachers are encouraged to attend, few fieldsite teachers did so in either year of the test. What attendance there was appeared to depend on the encouragement of individual leaders.

Teachers' attitudes toward young children were assessed by scales similar or identical to those used in the student learning study. Virtually all teachers, regardless of workshop attendance, held course-valued attitudes concerning approaches to young children. Thus, the teacher education program cannot be said to have had measurable impact in this area.

A majority of teachers (61 percent) felt they had changed their style of teaching, of classroom organization, or of choice of teaching techniques as a consequence of participating in the workshops. The changes reported most commonly were: increase in the varieties of materials used (24 percent); greater emphasis on the technique of discovery learning and student-oriented instruction (17 percent); better class discussions (14 percent); less dependency on structure and materials; more spontaneity; and less anxiety about preconceived notions of success and failure (16 percent).

## RFC Support Services

In general, teachers tended to report greater need for help in 1974-75 than during the previous year. The need for advice on how to use particular materials rose 35 percent; the need to ask about course materials that did not seem clear rose 20 percent; the need for information on the delivery of course materials, information on the arrival of films, and on dates and/or location of seminars each rose 10 percent.



Teachers were *more satisfied* in the second year with information they received about: delivery of course materials; dates and/or location of workshops; how to use particular course materials; and course goals and philosophy. They were *less satisfied* with information received about: arrival of films; student evaluation and grading; course materials that did not seem clear; teacher's guide material that raised questions; and setting up fieldsites. Thus, as in Year One, problems were both logistical and substantive, although the particular emphases shifted.

No differences in types of reported need were found among RFC, CBL, and teachers not involved in the teacher education program. However, there were differences between first- and second-year teachers. Understandably, first-year teachers reported more need for help in organizing the course, organizing the fieldsite, using particular materials, evaluating and grading students, and answering questions about course materials. Second-year teachers reported more need for obtaining audio-visual materials or equipment from RFCs. These results are consistent with the differences in program implementation found between first- and second-year teachers. The latter were more organized and complete in their course coverage, and used more supplementary films in Family and Society.

The most common recommendation from teachers was for more contact with other EXPLORING CHILDHOOD teachers or with the RFCs. Other suggestions included: more teacher education workshops in their area (30 percent), more RFC visits to their sites (19 percent), and creation of smaller regions in order to reduce travel and allow more frequent contact with other teachers and the RFC in their area (14 percent).

#### SUMMARY

Evaluation indicates that the teacher education program is satisfactorily serving teachers who attend workshops and make use of the RFCs as technical resources. Although teachers have few complaints, there are gaps in service that might be remedied.



There is still a large population of teachers who have not been served. Many teachers do not attend workshops because of time and travel difficulties and lack of incentives. Such teachers might attend workshops if they were held in more convenient locations and at times more suited to their schedules. They might also attend if school systems could be encouraged to provide in-service credit and/or compensatory pay for participants.

First- and second-year teachers differed in the ways that they drew upon resources. First-year teachers drew more frequently on the services of the RFC through both the teacher education programs and the support system, reflecting their inexperience in managing the implementation of the course. This suggests that program developers should strive to improve the focus and delivery of services to first-year teachers. Second-year teachers were more interested in learning how to adapt materials, since they had become familiar with them.

Perhaps somewhat different workshops could be designed for first- and second-year teachers. While teachers new to the program can benefit from meeting experienced teachers, some separate workshops might serve the needs and potential of each group more effectively.

# Appendices

APPENDIX A:  
EVALUATION DOCUMENTS

The present summary is based on the following evaluation documents:

1974-75

<i>Student Learning: Research Methodology</i>	Caren von Hippel
<i>Major Findings in Conceptual Learning</i>	Eileen Peters
<i>Major Findings in Attitudinal Learning</i>	Catherine Cobb Morrocco
<i>Major Findings in Practical Learning</i>	Caren von Hippel and Susan Bernstein
<i>Program Implementation by EXPLORING CHILDHOOD Teachers</i>	Susan Bernstein and Eileen Peters
<i>Relationship of Program Implementation to Student Learning</i>	Susan Bernstein
<i>Teacher Education</i>	Martin Chong
<i>Use of EXPLORING CHILDHOOD Materials Outside of Secondary Schools</i>	Deborah Moskowitz

1973-74

<i>Summary of Evaluation Findings: Year One</i>	Catherine Cobb and Eileen Peters
---	----------------------------------



APPENDIX B:

CHARACTERISTICS OF EXPLORING CHILDHOOD AND COMPARISON GROUP SAMPLES

I. SEX			II. AGE		
SEX	EXPLORING CHILDHOOD n = 932	COMPARISON GROUP n = 285	AGE	EXPLORING CHILDHOOD n = 934	COMPARISON GROUP n = 285
Female	92%	91%	14-15	7%	29%
Male	8%	9%	16	18%	41%
			17	42%	28%
			18	29%	3%
			19-21	3%	-

III. GRADE			IV. ETHNICITY		
GRADE	EXPLORING CHILDHOOD n = 924	COMPARISON GROUP n = 283	ETHNICITY	EXPLORING CHILDHOOD n = 902	COMPARISON GROUP n = 368
9	3%	14%	White	80%	67%
10	9%	37%	Black	9%	18%
11	39%	49%	Spanish heritage	4%	8%
12	50%	0%	Native American	3%	3%
			Oriental heritage	0%*	0%
			Other	3%	3%

\*Actually, 0.3%; there were very few Oriental students in the total EXPLORING CHILDHOOD sample.

V. SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS

STATUS	EXPLORING CHILDHOOD n = 505	COMPARISON GROUP n = 146
1	11%	3%
2	10%	10%
3	19%	19%
4	50%	55%
5	9%	13%

VI. EDUCATIONAL EXPECTATIONS

EXPECTATION	EXPLORING CHILDHOOD n = 922	COMPARISON GROUP n = 274
Not graduate from high school	1%	2%
Graduate from high school	37%	35%
Complete 1, 2, or 3 years college	21%	26%
Graduate from 4-year college	21%	23%
Complete graduate or professional school after college	8%	3%
Complete other training after high school	11%	11%

VII. PRIOR COURSE IN CHILD DEVELOPMENT

PRIOR COURSE	EXPLORING CHILDHOOD n = 931	COMPARISON GROUP n = 279
Yes	32%	32%
No	68%	69%

VIII. HAVING YOUNGER SIBLINGS BETWEEN TWO TO SIX YEARS OLD

YOUNGER SIBLINGS	EXPLORING CHILDHOOD n = 923	COMPARISON GROUP n = 283
Yes	21%	23%
No	79%	77%

IX. TOTAL EXPERIENCE WITH CHILDREN DURING PAST YEAR

EXPERIENCE	EXPLORING CHILDHOOD	COMPARISON GROUP
<i>Working in a Preschool</i>	n = 925	n = 283
Never	28%	81%
Few times during year	11%	8%
Once or twice a month	4%	1%
Once a week or more	57%	10%
<i>Tutoring Children Under Seven Years Old</i>	n = 911	n = 281
Never	58%	77%
Few times during year	6%	8%
Once or twice a month	7%	3%
Once a week or more	30%	12%
<i>Baby-Sitting</i>	n = 925	n = 280
Never	11%	6%
Few times during year	22%	14%
Once or twice a month	25%	31%
Once a week or more	42%	49%
<i>Taking Care of Own Child</i>	n = 892	n = 273
Never	94%	92%
Few times during year	1%	0%
Once or twice a month	0%	1%
Once a week or more	5%	6%
<i>Taking Care of Younger Sibling (Under Seven Years Old)</i>	n = 909	n = 281
Never	68%	66%
Few times during year	4%	5%
Once or twice a month	4%	6%
Once a week or more	24%	23%



APPENDIX C:

CHARACTERISTICS OF EXPLORING CHILDHOOD TEACHER SAMPLE

<u>Course Department</u>		<u>Teacher's Undergraduate Major</u>	
n = 173		n = 275	
Home Economics	79%	English	6%
Social Studies	6%	Education	30%
Family Education	3%	History	4%
Vocational Education	2%	Home Economics	83%
Humanities	0.6%	Psychology	7%
Other	10%	Sociology	9%
		(Joint majors account for total greater than 100%.)	

<u>Extracurricular Contact with Adolescents</u>		<u>Preschool Experience</u>	
n = 198		n = 198	
Camp counselor	37%	Teaching preschool children	56%
Playground supervisor	19%	Working in day-care center	28%
Sports coach	16%	Helping in cooperative preschool	19%
Boy/Girl Scout Leader	25%	Running play groups	30%
4H Leader	25%	Teaching Sunday school	55%
Sunday school teacher	48%	Baby-sitting	77%
(Percentages total more than 100% because respondents checked as many categories of response as applied.)		(Percentages total more than 100% because respondents checked as many categories of response as applied.)	

<u>Sex</u>		<u>Teacher Education Program</u>			
n = 195		CBL	RFC	NONE	TOTAL
Female	96%				
Male	4%				
	First-year teacher	13	62	31	106 (54%)
	Second-year teacher	4	37	48*	89 (46%)
		17 (9%)	99 (51%)	79 (40%)	195 (100%)

APPENDIX D:

SAMPLE QUESTIONS FROM CRITERION-REFERENCED TEST OF CONCEPTUAL LEARNING

Sample Questions on Child Development Issues

A two- or three-day-old infant CANNOT be expected to

- (A) react quickly to bright lights
- \* (B) grasp at objects nearby
- (C) turn his or her head to avoid suffocating
- (D) follow a moving object with his or her eyes

Three-year-old Bennett waved a plastic key set, making noises like a rattle, while five-year-old Mary played guard, walking around locking doors with the key set.

The story shows that five-year-olds are more likely to

- \* (A) get involved in fantasy play
- (B) confuse sex roles when they play
- (C) experiment with new toys
- (D) play more actively

GAME

1. Place a box and a ball side by side in the center of the table.
2. You sit at one side of the table and ask the child to sit at the opposite side.
3. You ask the child to draw the objects as they looked from your side of the table.

It would be most difficult for a four-and-a-half-year-old child to draw the box and ball as they looked to you because the child would

- (A) not want to do this kind of drawing
- (B) have difficulty drawing a circle and a square
- \* (C) not understand that the objects look different from different sides of the table
- (D) rather sit next to you than opposite you

Sample Questions on Working with Children

A four-year-old who says, "I am going to cook my brother in a pot," while she is playing in the kitchen should be

- (A) stopped because she is practicing a cruel behavior that may become a habit
- (B) stopped because older children may copy her
- \* (C) allowed to continue, because play is a good time to work through strong feelings
- (D) allowed to continue because she may resent the interruption and become more aggressive

If a child asked you for help improving his or her drawings of a man and woman, it would be most helpful if you

- (A) asked another child to help do a better drawing
- (B) found a picture in a book for the child to copy from
- (C) told the child the drawing was very good for someone his or her age
- \* (D) worked step-by-step helping the child figure out how to fix what he or she did not like

#### Sample Questions on Learning About Children

The questions below refer to the following reports:

John and Angela sat together, observing a two-and-a-half-year-old boy and girl playing in a sandbox.

In class that afternoon, John reported that the children didn't talk to each other or play together.

Angela reported that the boy sang a song about snow and made a sandball, while the girl made foot- and handprints in the sand.

Which of the following statements best explains the difference between John's and Angela's reports?

- (A) Boys tend to observe in more detail than girls do.
- \* (B) People may focus on different things when observing the same situation.
- (C) The distance of an observer from a situation influences what he or she will see.
- (D) One observer may give a less accurate report than another.

The most correct conclusion for John to draw about the children he observed is that they

- (A) have difficulty playing cooperatively
- (B) probably do not like each other
- \* (C) played separately
- (D) probably do not know each other well



The main reason Angela should NOT conclude that two-and-a-half-year-old boys and girls have different interests is because she did not observe

- \* (A) enough different children
- (B) while she was actually playing with the children
- (C) the children long enough
- (D) when the children did not know she was watching them

APPENDIX E:

SAMPLE ITEMS FROM ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE

Young children are:

Successful	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	Unsuccessful
Severe	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	Lenient
Strong	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	Weak
Serious	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	Humorous

When I work with children I am:

Active	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	Passive
Hard	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	Soft
Fast	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	Slow
Good	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	Bad

	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Disagree</u>
A child should be taught to avoid fighting no matter what happens. (Approving mild aggression)	A	a	d	D
A child is most lovable when he is small and helpless. (Encouraging autonomy)	A	a	d	D
When you do things together, children feel close to you and can talk easier. (Encouraging communication)	A	a	d	D
Too much affection will make a child a "softie." (Expressing tenderness)	A	a	d	D
Most children should have more discipline than they get. (Punishment)	A	a	d	D
Children should be kept away from people with ideas which are different from their parents. (Own ideas and opinions)	A	a	d	D

APPENDIX F:

SAMPLE ITEMS FROM FIELDSTITE TEACHER PRACTICAL SKILL RATING FORMS

General Skills

Please use the following ratings:

- |                  |                  |
|------------------|------------------|
| 1: A great deal  | 4: Not very much |
| 2: A fair amount | 5: Not at all    |
| 3: Somewhat      | 6: Don't know    |

	In the LAST MONTH or so	At the BEGINNING of the student's work at your fieldsite
--	----------------------------	---

A. In working with children, does the student

STRUCTURE ACTIVITIES by taking into account children's:

- |                                  |       |       |
|----------------------------------|-------|-------|
| 1. Abilities                     | _____ | _____ |
| 2. Feelings and needs            | _____ | _____ |
| 3. Readiness to learn new things | _____ | _____ |

SUPPORT in children:

- |   |       |       |
|---|-------|-------|
| 1. Individual differences (e.g., reinforce child's individual style, choices, interests, dress) | _____ | _____ |
| 2. Self-esteem (e.g., reward children's efforts and accomplishments)                            | _____ | _____ |

TRY TO LEARN MORE about children by:

- |   |       |       |
|---|-------|-------|
| 1. Probing their reasons for their ideas and behavior   | _____ | _____ |
| 2. Using a variety of techniques (e.g., observing, collecting things children say and do, keeping a journal, trying out children's materials or activities--clay, a trampoline--to better understand a child's experiences) | _____ | _____ |

INDICATE AN AWARENESS of:

- |  |       |       |
|--|-------|-------|
| 1. All of a child's behavior as an opportunity to learn more about him   | _____ | _____ |
| 2. Differences among children as being both developmental and individual | _____ | _____ |



Specific Skills

To what extent has the student demonstrated competency in working with children in the skills listed below:

- 1: A great deal      4: Not very much  
 2: A fair amount    5: Not at all  
 3: Somewhat        6: Don't know

in the LAST  
MONTH or so

At the BEGINNING  
of the student's  
work at your  
fieldsite

A. In dealing with BEHAVIORAL PROBLEMS, does the student

RESPOND by:

1. Effectively handling minor behavior problems which arise
2. Taking into account that a young child's view of "what is fair" is different from the adolescent's

TRY TO PREVENT discipline problems by:

1. Organizing activities to minimize the likelihood of behavior problems occurring
2. Setting limits appropriate to the age of the children

TRY TO LEARN MORE about a particular child's behavior problems by:

1. Asking children about their feelings and needs

B. In working with children in PLAY ACTIVITIES, does the student

STRUCTURE ACTIVITIES by taking into account:

1. Children's interests at a particular age
2. The range of materials needed to encourage experimentation
3. That very young children are less able to follow games with complex rules
4. That as children develop, their play becomes more social (versus solitary)
5. The effect on children's behavior of varying the student's role (e.g., supervisor, participant observer)

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

EXPLORING CHILDHOOD PROGRAM

Director:

Marilyn Clayton Felt

Curriculum Coordinator:

Ruth N. MacDonald

Module Head:

Susan Christie Thomas

Project Manager:

Kathleen Maurer Horani

Senior Scholars:

Jerome Kagan, Professor of Human Development, Harvard University

James Jones, Assistant Professor of Social Psychology, Harvard University

Freda Reblsky, Professor of Psychology, Boston University

Consultants:

Elaine A. Blechman, Assistant Professor of Psychology, Yale School of Medicine, Yale University

T. Berry Brazelton, Pediatrician and Clinical Assistant Professor, Harvard University

Urie Bronfenbrenner, Professor of Human Development and Family Studies, Cornell University

Jerome S. Bruner, Watts Professor of Psychology, Department of Experimental Psychology, Oxford University

Betty H. Bryant, Nursery School Director, Center for Child Care Research, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey

Courtney Cazden, Professor of Education, Harvard University

Joan Goldsmith, Co-Director, The Institute of Open Education/Antioch Graduate Center

Patricia Marks Greenfield, Associate Professor of Psychology, University of California at Los Angeles

John Herzog, Associate Professor of Education, Northeastern University

David Kantor, Director of Research and Development, Boston Family Institute

Eli H. Newberger, Director, Family Development Study, The Children's Hospital Medical Center

Ed Tronick, Associate in Pediatrics, Harvard Medical School, Harvard University

Robert Selman, Clinical Psychologist, Judge Baker Child Guidance Center, Boston, Massachusetts

Beatrice Blyth Whiting, Professor of Education and Anthropology, Harvard University

Developers:

Norma Arnow  
Wendy Johnson Barnes  
Ellen Grant  
Rogier Gregoire  
Toby Grover  
Patricia Hourihan  
Margaret Janey  
Peggy Lippitt  
Ronald Lippitt  
Karlen Lyons  
Lucy Lyons  
Pamela Matz  
Jim McMahon  
John Nove  
Judith Salzman  
Jeanette Stone  
Ianthe Thomas  
Juliet Vogel  
Sandra Warren  
Dennie Wolf

Filmmakers:

Henry Felt  
John Friedman  
Mark Harris  
Lynn Smith  
David Vogt

Film Staff:

David Barnett  
David Berenson  
Frank Cantor  
Elvin Carini  
Edward Joyce  
Allegra May  
David Nelson  
Charles Scott  
Dan Seeger  
Charles White, Jr.

Editors:

Anne Cleaves  
Anne Glickman  
Marcia Mitchell  
Marjorie Waters  
Nancy Witting

Design:

Myra Lee Conway  
Roz Gerstein  
Diana Ritter  
Michael Sand  
Karen Shipley  
Judy Spock  
Alison Wampler

Production:

Patricia A. Jones  
Scott Paris

Parent Education:

Louis Grant Bond  
Naarah Thornell

Teacher Education:

Michael J. Cohen  
Rita Dixon  
Marjorie Jones  
Edward Martin  
Barbara S. Powell  
Emma Wood Rous

Evaluation:

Geraldine Brookins  
Martin Chong  
Catherine Cobb  
Karen C. Cohen  
Joan Costley  
Sherryl Graves  
Aisha Jones  
Eileen Peters  
Toby Schneider  
Caren von Hippel

Regional Evaluators:

John R. Brown  
Karen M. Cohen  
Judith McMurray  
Mark Walker  
Kaffie Weaver

Regional Field

Coordinators:  
Florence J. Cherry  
Thomas A. Fitzgerald  
Andrea J. Love  
Annie Madison  
T. David Wallsteadt  
Dianne H. Willis

Support Staff:

Marylene Altieri  
Florence Bruno  
Genevra Caldon  
Bushra Karaman  
Judith Knapp  
Ruth Kolodney  
Pamela Ponce de Leon  
Maria Rainho  
Barbara Connolly Sweeney  
Denise Weaver

Distribution Coordinator:

Steve Westlund

EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT CENTER/EDC SCHOOL AND SOCIETY PROGRAMS

Director:

Janet Whitla

Central Staff:

Marilyn Clayton Felt  
Cheryl Healer  
Earle Lomon  
Ruth N. MacDonald  
Dennen Reilley  
Susan Christie Thomas

EXPLORING CHILDHOOD has been developed by the School and Society Programs of Education Development Center under grants from the Office of Child Development and the National Institute of Mental Health, and with the support of the Office of Education.

Education Development Center, Inc. (EDC) is a publicly supported, nonprofit corporation engaged in educational research and development.