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SOME FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH STUDENTS' PERFORMANCE AS CHILD DIRECTORS IN HOME MANAGEMENT HOUSES.

INTRODUCTION

Statement of Problem

Adults differ in the ways they may feel and act towards infants. What are some of the factors behind these differences? What is effective care? Since an infant's early experiences in being cared for have been shown to have a very significant effect on the later development of the individual, it is important to understand more about effective care and what may make it possible. The present study undertakes to investigate some factors associated with students' performance as child directors in home management houses.

In the home management house a group of young adults in turn take responsibility for the care of an infant under the supervision of an adviser. Under these conditions it is possible to measure effectiveness based on the opinions of the adviser and the other members of the group who have considerable opportunity to make a judgment. It is also possible to compare the students as to items in their past or present experience and the effectiveness with which they are judged to care for an infant. The situation offers an opportunity to investigate the question as to what influences the effectiveness with which adults care for infants.
Setting: The Home Management House

A period of residence in a "home management house" is required of home economics students in many institutions. An Office of Education bulletin on home economics in degree-granting institutions in 1955 and 1956 reported that out of 435 institutions, 307 (68 per cent) had some provisions for home management houses or apartments (20, p.14). In most cases, the period of residence, for which the students register, is one-half of a term or semester; however, the actual number of days the students live in the house varies with different groups due to the differences in the length of the term or semesters at the various institutions.

Persons living in the home management house include the students, a resident adviser, and, in some cases, a young child. The students are usually juniors or seniors enrolled in home economics. The number of students making up a home management house group may vary from five to eight, but is most often six. While in the house, the students assume the duties needed to maintain a home. Among these duties are care of the child (child director), laundress, cook, assistant cook, and manager. Each student, in turn, takes responsibility for an area, for an equal, or nearly equal, period of time.

A resident adviser lives with each group of
students in a house. This person is usually a part or full time instructor and, in many cases, is a graduate student working for an advanced degree. In her position as home management house adviser she supervises and helps the students as they assume the duties in the house. She is available to the students for suggestions and help in any phase of their work there. Together they evaluate what has been accomplished.

Some institutions also have infants living in the home management house. The Office of Education reported in 1955 that of 309 institutions having home management houses, 27 of these had infants living in them (19, p. 8). In these cases, care of the infant is one of the duties the students assume in the house. The duty of child director is one that is usually considered to involve the most responsibility. The child director takes full charge of the infant. When the student is child director, if it is necessary for her to be gone from the house, she arranges for another person to care for the child. As child director, the student bathes and dresses the infant, prepares his meals, feeds him, and in general is responsible for his emotional and physical welfare. As in the case of the other duties in the house, the student is under the supervision of the adviser.
The home management house provides a situation in which a number of people take responsibility for caring for an infant. Thus, a laboratory is available for studying a variety of people in a relationship with an infant. In this situation, several factors are subject to control that would be difficult to control using actual mother-child pairs. One is that the students are generally seniors in college, with a consequently small age range. Another is that for any group of students at a particular school the course requirements are similar, so that the background of college work is similar. Introduction to and instruction about the infant in the home management house is nearly identical for all members of a group. Great differences might be found in any sampling of mother-child pairs in these respects.

The resident adviser in the home management house is a person who can be used to observe and record student-infant interaction. The students are observed by their adviser in many situations with the infant. This would tend to give the adviser a more adequate sampling of the behavior of a particular student toward the infant than could be obtained by an outside observer watching mother-child behavior for only a specified time during the day. The fact that the adviser is an accepted member of the
group would help to eliminate differences in behavior that might result from a strange observer entering the home, and would give the adviser an opportunity to see the usual relationship between the student and the infant. Another advantage in studying the students in a home management house is that a group of students is working, in turn, with the same child. The infant's varying reactions to different students can be studied.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to determine if there are factors in a student's background, her present experiences, or her future plans which may be associated with her performance as child director in a home management house.

The area of mother-child relationships is receiving much attention in recent literature. The most important experiences for an infant seem to be in the areas of his relationships with the people who care for him. Usually, the person who cares for the infant most of the time is the mother. However, with an increase in the number of working mothers, a number of other persons may help with the care of the infant and child.

We need to know much more about the kinds of relationship experiences which an infant may have and which adults may offer. What influences an adult's
response to an infant? What are the ways in which an adult may react with a child?

The present study investigates eleven hypotheses concerning the effectiveness of students as they serve as child directors in three home management houses. Twenty-three students served as subjects. The effectiveness of the students was determined by the opinions of the resident adviser and the other students in the home management group. This research is a pilot study which may indicate areas which seem to present possibilities for further study.

The following hypotheses were investigated. In all the hypotheses "students" means "students in home management houses".

Hypothesis 1. Students with many siblings will be more effective child directors than students with fewer siblings.

Hypothesis 2. Students who are first born in a family with one or more younger siblings will be more effective child directors than students having other family ranks.

Hypothesis 3. Students who report they have had responsibility for younger family members will be more effective child directors than students who do not report having had such responsibility.
Hypothesis 4. Students who report having had considerable contact with infants outside of the home will be more effective child directors than students who report having had little contact with infants outside of the home.

Hypothesis 5. Students who report more satisfactory experiences with infants or children over a year of age will be more effective child directors than students who report less satisfactory experiences with children of these ages.

Hypothesis 6. Students who have previously taken or are taking at present a college nursery school course which involves active participation will be more effective child directors than students who have not had this experience.

Hypothesis 7. Students who state that they have plans for marriage within the next two years will be more effective child directors than students who do not state such plans.

Hypothesis 8. The students who are among the last child directors in their home management house group will be more effective child directors than the students who are among the first child directors in a house group.

Hypothesis 9. Students who are rated by their fellow students as more comfortable to be with will be more effective child directors than students who are rated as
less comfortable to be with.

Hypothesis 10. Students who are chosen more frequently for various activities by their fellow students will be more effective child directors than students who are chosen less frequently.

Hypothesis 11. Students with whom the home management house infant consumes a higher mean number of ounces of formula per day will be more effective child directors than students with whom the infant consumes a lower mean number of ounces of formula per day.
In recent literature a great deal of emphasis has been placed upon the importance of early childhood experiences in personality development. An increasing number of studies indicate that the care received by the child in the early years of life has an effect upon his development. McClelland discusses several reasons why this could be so. One reason for the importance of early experiences, as discussed by McClelland, is the simple fact that many of the routine situations (feeding, diapering, and so forth) occur many hundreds of times. Usually the parent or parent-figure develops a routine or somewhat consistent method of handling these situations. Since these situations occur over such a long period of time, it is not surprising that many expectations and modes of behavior toward them are established by the child, and that the parental attitudes and feelings towards them are communicated to the child, (15, p.343).

The concept that the family is of extreme importance to the child, whether it be judged good or poor, is expressed by Bowlby as he describes children, neglected and rejected by their true parents, who, nevertheless, remain firmly loyal to them and wish to leave their foster homes and return to their own home, (3, p.76).
If these early relationships are of such great importance in later development, the question arises regarding the type of relationship which will best serve to promote healthy personality development in the infant. Bowlby in *Maternal Care and Mental Health* states the current thinking on the type of mother-child relationship which will best serve to promote a healthy personality development in the infant.

"For the moment it is sufficient to say that what is believed to be essential for mental health is that the infant and young child should experience a warm, intimate, and continuous relationship with his mother (or permanent mother-substitute) in which both find satisfaction and enjoyment" (4, p.11). "It is this complex, rich, and rewarding relationship with the mother in the early years, varied in countless ways by relations with the father and with siblings, that child psychiatrists and many others now believe to underlie the development of character and mental health" (4, p.11).

In contrast to this description of the ideal mother-child relationship, Bowlby describes three studies on the effects of different types of handling of children in an institution and the differences between institution and home children. These studies, by Goldfarb on the differences between home-reared and institution-reared children, by Danials on the differences between institution children with different types of handling by the nurses, and by Simonsen who, using the Hetzer-Bühler tests, compared the development quotients of institution and non-institution
children, consistently stressed the advantages of the home-reared child over the institution-reared child.

Whatever the environment is like surrounding the infant, he responds to it. Some indication of the infant's feelings toward the people handling him may be observed in the feeding situation. The hypothesis that the feeding experience may be an important index of mother-child relationships is explored by Escalona. While serving for twenty months as nursery psychologist at the Massachusetts Reformatory for Women, Escalona observed several interesting reactions in the children (ages ten days to twenty-four months) towards the feeding situation.

In relation to nursing, ten infants of less than four weeks refused to breast feed. The mothers involved were, for the most part, "...obviously high strung and excitable..." (7, p.77). In six of these cases the same day the infants refused to eat from the tense mother they would accept formula when it was offered by someone else. Another interesting observation which was made was the high incidence of refusal of a particular food by an infant when it was offered to him by a person who disliked the food herself. Escalona investigated fifteen cases of this type with the person in charge of the infant having the same food dislike as that being shown by the infant. In three cases, children suddenly reversed food
preferences and upon investigation it was found there had been a change of persons in charge, with the new person having a dislike for the food the baby had previously eaten (7, p.78).

Griffith's study would seem to lend support to Escalona's observations. In a study on five home management house infants with a succession of child directors at Oregon State College, Griffith concluded

"A possible answer to the question of why an infant consumes more milk in the care of one child director and less in the care of another is suggested by a comparison of the results of question ten on the sociometric ratings and the mean number of ounces per day. It was found that all of the infants tended to consume less milk in the care of those students receiving the lowest scores in their groups on question ten. This result suggests a relation between how "uncomfortable" a student's peers feel with her and how the infant responds to the student. Perhaps the infant's response to a student with whom her peers feel relatively "uncomfortable" is a decreased consumption of milk" (8, p.151).

Just as the infant responds to the situation he is in, so does the adult behave in various ways to the situation that involves a child or children. Baldwin, et. al. express the idea that "Two general factors seem to be necessary for an understanding of the behavior of parents. The first is the emotional attitude of the parent

---

1See Appendix D
toward the child: the second, his intellectual philosophy of child care" (1, p.1).

Many things could contribute to the emotional attitude which adults have toward children. One could be the type of handling the adult received in his or her own family. There is evidence that the emotional attitude of the parent toward the child differs with each parent-child pair. Several studies have been conducted regarding the effects of the ordinal position in the family and family size as correlated with personality outcome. There have been conflicting reports from the research as to what the ordinal position in a family does mean to the child and how it shapes his personality. Lasko summarized some of these studies. She reports that Stagner and Katzoff, testing 450 male college students, found no significant differences in the scores on the Bernreuter Personality Inventory as related to birth order. Testing with the Bernreuter and the Bell Adjustment Inventory, Abernethy found, in a group of college women, "...that the oldest child is more aggressive, less neurotic, and better adjusted than later born individuals" (11, p.103). In her own study, on the reactions of forty-six mothers to their two children at the same age, Lasko observed several interesting results. The mothers were rated on their behavior with a child on the twenty-one variables of the
Fels Parent Behavior Rating Scales. Comparisons were made of the ratings obtained when the two children were the same age. Four of the major findings of this study are:

1. Parent behavior toward first children as contrasted to second children is on the average less warm emotionally and more restrictive and coercive. Similar differences exist between second and third children but are not so distinct.

2. Parent behavior toward second children tends not to change as the child grows older. Systematic changes do happen in the treatment of first children in the direction of reduced parent-child interaction.

3. Patterns and methods of handling children seem to remain stable but the "...nature of the emotional relationship between parent and child is less predictable from one sibling to another."

4. "The age difference between the siblings is an important contribution to the variation in parent behavior toward the two children" (11, p.134).

Krouth also found there were differences in parental handling with children in various ordinal positions. 1093 college students (648 males, 445 females) and their family members filled out a questionnaire. From the answers on the questionnaire Krouth ascertained the "...relationships between certain intra familial response-patterns and certain attitudinal patterns as between men
and women in extra-familial contacts. Specifically, we aimed to see whether the presence or absence of the patterns of domination, attachment, or submission with reference to men and women outside the family milieu might show some interdependence upon (a) paternal or maternal dominance within the home, (b) paternal or maternal favoritism or discipline in the treatment of the various ordinal types, and (c) especial attachment, domination, or submission in the relations of subjects and their sibs" (10, p.10). Some of the differences found in parental handling were:

1. Older, oldest, and intermediate types tend to be rejected by the father, but highly favored by the mother. Types rejected by the mother are favored by the father.

2. Only eight ordinal types are favored by both mother and father. Three types were rejected by both. The types rejected are females, either preceded or followed by females.

3. "Displacement of an older child by a younger one is a frequent source of change in parental affection. Priority of birth is, however, an advantage in gaining maternal preference. The father reacts less favorably to the competitive strivings of the older male child. Hence the younger child is at an advantage in gaining his affection."
4. There is a genuinely warm relationship between the college subjects and their siblings. (10, p.29).

Sears feels that

"Ultimately, the explanation of an individual's behavior must be driven back to the exact circumstances of his rearing and of the immediate stimulational factors acting upon him, both biological and social, but for the discovery of regularities in personality development, the indices represented by family roles appear provisionally fruitful" (16, p.398).

As an example, Sears reports the following study by Dean.

"Dean investigated the personality characteristics of twenty pairs of children by having the mother in each instance make paired comparisons of her own two children on a large number of items. Each pair of children was of the same sex, eight of the pairs being girls and the remainder boys. In all the families there were but two children and all were under seven years of age. Children in the first ordinal position were judged by their mothers to be more dependent, to spend more time "just thinking", more worried, more excitable, to have their feelings hurt more easily, to be less demonstratively affectionate, and to be less effective in protecting themselves from verbal or physical attack" (16, pp.398-399). "In any case, the data suggest that there may be consistently different experiences for older and younger children" (16, p.399).

Another factor which could contribute to the emotional attitude which adults have toward children could be the size of their family. Differences have been found in the social adjustment of children as related to the size of the family. Social success of
children (college students) was studied by Loomis by means of answers to sociometric questions. To determine social success answers to the question of preference for roommate were used. The results were correlated with the size of the student's family. It was found that the 185 students in the sample who were from larger families tended to have a lower rejection rate. However, on the whole "the study showed little or no relationship between choice status and size of family for the students studied" (14, p. 320). This study is not supported by Bonney who studied social success as related to family size, socioeconomic home background and intelligence. Only the results concerning family size and social success are relevant here.

Social status was determined by a variety of methods such as: group members listing people who were the best leaders in the classroom, listing the names of best friends, selecting people to work with on various projects, voting for a "best citizen", counting the number of Valentines received by each child, and so forth. These choices were totaled into a composite score which was then converted into percentage. The results show there is evidence that children from smaller family units had a higher social status than children in larger family units. The number of only children in the various social status quartiles descended with regularity from the highest to
the lowest social status quartiles. Children from families with six or more children are in the next highest position. (2, pp. 27-30).

Two other factors may contribute to the emotional attitude of adults towards children. They are the amount of experience, and the quality of these experiences which the adults have had with children and the adults' desire to have a family of their own. No studies were found directly investigating these factors as they may contribute to adults' attitudes.

The intellectual philosophy of child care as well as the emotional attitude towards the child may be an important factor in determining the way adults behave towards children. That the intellectual philosophy can and does change through education has been demonstrated in two studies. Chang at Oregon State College in 1946 found significant changes in the attitudes toward four child-rearing practices in 362 students enrolled in child development classes at the college. The attitudes measured were self-reliance, corporal punishment, eating, and play.

"It would appear that the college courses in child development provided experiences which brought about significant mean changes in attitude for the four attitudes measured" (5, p. 84).

Stedman found similar results when she was pre-testing an instrument concerning attitudes towards child
behavior. Of the 435 subjects, 46 had attended a home management house while in college. A positive correlation was found between those people who had had experiences with a child in the home management house and the scores they received on the test. These persons had a higher score on the scale than subjects who had not been students in a home management house. It was also found that an individual's score on this scale was positively related to the number and type of home economics courses in which the subject had been enrolled. With the college group tested those subjects who had had home economics courses scored significantly higher than those who had none, but there was no significant differences among kinds of courses. However, those who had a course in child development in the college group scored significantly higher than those who had not had such a course in home economics. (18)

Another factor which may contribute to the way in which the adult cares for the child is the individual's position in the group in which he or she is living. In a situation such as the home management house, this may be an especially important factor. Sociometric ratings have been used to discover the position of members in a group as judged by the other members. Lindzey feels

"It is easy to conceive of the sociometric test as a variety of rating scales - the members of the group are asked to
rate or order the other members in terms of their attractiveness or desirability for sharing certain activities. The rater is asked to apply exactly those particular, unique, and sometimes irrational criteria he has spent a lifetime developing. Everyone is an experienced or expert rater when it comes to sociometric judgements. "One might say that the individual who uses these techniques is taking advantage of the largest pool of sensitive and experienced raters that is anywhere available" (12, p. 406).

Jennings discovered the sociometric positions of 400 girls at the New York Training School for Girls. The girls were asked to write the names of others whom they did and did not want to live with, work with, participate in recreation or leisure with, and study or work with. In studying the group members, Jennings found several general clues to explain the high choice status of the over-chosen subject. Among the criteria are these:

"shows ability to establish rapport quickly and effectively with a wide range of other personalities and to win their confidence under varying circumstances"

"insists on an impersonal fairness, and succeeds in gaining respect for this level of interaction between members"

"raises the level of conduct of average members by demanding considerate behavior towards the less able (in the sense of less contributing) members"

"controls the destiny of nonadjusting members...by influencing other members to aid them, by blocking their possible satisfactions in nonadjusting behaviors, and by obliging other members to show
respect for them in the community as a whole...

"causes others to feel that she aids them to meet their problems" (9, p.410).

Jennings also goes on to say that the role of leader in a group seems to be partly the effect of the group on a particular member. The "why" of leadership appears, however, not explainable by any personality quality or constellation of traits. Some individuals are found who are as emotionally mature and as resourceful in ideas as the leader-individuals of this study, yet they were not allowed a role of leadership, not chosen more than the average citizen in the community. The why of leadership appears to reside in the interpersonal contribution of which the individual becomes capable in a specific setting eliciting such contributions from him" (11, p.412).

That the make-up of the group is important in determining the kind of performance both for individual members and for the group as a whole is shown in a study by Lippitt and White. Using four groups of children under planned leadership roles (autocratic, laissez-faire, and democratic) the authors have shown how different types of group leadership affect group behavior. An example of this would be the differences in the type of activity initiated before the leader arrives in the group. In
the groups with authoritarian leaders there was "...no group initiative to start new work or to continue with work already under way...". In contrast, the groups headed by a laissez-faire "...were active but not productive...". Groups which had a democratic leader began their activities in a productive way before the leaders came (13, p.323). The organization and social structure in the home management house and the role the adviser plays may influence how students act with the baby, behavior here reflecting group influence.
METHOD OF PROCEDURE

Subjects

Data for this study were collected in three home management houses keeping infants on a twenty-four hour basis. Two of these (Kent and Withycombe Houses) are at Oregon State College and one is at Pennsylvania State University. Four groups of students were used from these three home management houses. The total number of students was twenty-three. Of this number, eleven students (Groups I and III) were from Kent House; five students (Group II) were from Withycombe House; and seven students (Group IV) were from Pennsylvania State University.

The number of days each group of students lived in the houses ranged from 34 to 44 days. The number of days spent in the house was 41 for Group I, 34 for Group II, 34 for Group III, and 44 for Group IV. The number of days each student was child director ranged from five to eight days, with 8.2 days being the average for Group I, 6 days being the average for Group II, 5.6 being the average for Group III, and 6.2 being the average number of days as child director for Group IV. Table I shows these figures, page 24.

The infants in the three home management houses were all under one year of age. Two of the infants, those
at Kent House (Oregon State College) and at Pennsylvania State University, were seven and one-half months at the time the study was completed. The other, at Withycombe House (Oregon State College) was three and one-half months old at the time the study was completed. All three infants were boys and in good health at the time of the study. They lived in the houses on a twenty-four hour basis.

Table I
Information Concerning 23 Child Directors In Four Home Management House Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Number of Student Directors</th>
<th>Number of Days in the Home Management House</th>
<th>Mean Number of Days As Child Director</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Oregon State College Kent House</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Oregon State College Withycombe House</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>34*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Oregon State College Kent House</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The infant arrived at the house four days after the group moved in. Five of the six students in the group served as child director.
The advisers at Oregon State College were half-time instructors working towards advanced degrees. The adviser at Pennsylvania State University was a full-time faculty member. All of the advisers had lived in a home management house when they were students and two of them had the opportunity to care for an infant there. The amount of experience as a resident adviser varied widely for the three advisers. The adviser at Kent House was in her first year as an adviser; the Withycombe House adviser was in her second year; the adviser at Pennsylvania State University had entered her thirteenth year as a home management house adviser.

**Instruments for Obtaining Data**

Data for this study were obtained through four instruments which were forms completed by the advisers or students in each home management house. Each instrument is described in the following section.

I. **Student Information Form** (See Appendix B)

A. The Form Itself. This form, a questionnaire, was completed by twenty-two of the twenty-three students while they were in the home management houses. (One student did not complete the form). It supplied information about the students' experiences and future plans. The topics covered by the questionnaire included the order in which the student held the position of child director, the student's position in her family, the number and position of
siblings in the student's family, the responsibility the student had assumed for siblings, the amount and quality of the student's experiences with siblings and infants outside of the home, the student's feelings about these experiences, the student's plans for the next two years, and the participation or non-participation of the student in a college nursery school.

This form was developed in order to obtain information about the students. Rough drafts of the form were presented to several persons for their suggestions and criticisms. The questionnaire was pre-tested by giving it to a group of six home management house students at Oregon State College during the first week of their stay in the house. On the basis of their suggestions and questions the questionnaire was revised and put into final form.

B. Methods of Handling Questionnaire Data. Several different methods of handling the raw data were needed in order to convert the student's responses to each question in this form into information which could be compared or quantified. These methods and the questions to which they apply are described below.

(1) Coding of the students' responses on four questions.

A coding system was developed for four questions on
the information form. The systems were developed before the data were received. An attempt was made to develop categories within each system that would make it possible to code any type of response that was given for a particular question. Each coding system was also constructed so that the meaning was as precise and clear as possible in order to avoid confusion in categorizing the students' responses.

Before the systems could be used for coding the students' responses, it was necessary to determine if the systems were usable and if one person could code the responses into the proper categories with accuracy. To accomplish these purposes completed information forms, obtained from thirty-six senior students in home economics, were used for practice purposes. Two coders discussed each category system until they felt it was usable. The responses of several students were then coded by each of the coders who worked independently of each other. On the basis of this experience, the categories were revised and clarified, if necessary, through discussion. The responses of several more students were then coded, independently, by the two coders. When a set of responses was coded into the categories by the two coders, working independently, with eighty percent agreement, it was felt that one person could reliably code the responses of the
students used in the study. The formula for computing reliability scores was:

\[
\text{Number of agreements} = \frac{\text{Number of agreements}}{\text{Number of agreements plus number of disagreements}}.
\]

The coding systems developed in this way, the questions for which the system was developed and the reliability scores of the two coders, are presented under the areas covered by the questions.

(a) Responsibility for siblings:

**Question Three (a):** If you have younger siblings: what responsibility did you take for them when they were under a year? Over a year?

The students' responses to this question were coded into one of three categories concerning the students' responsibility for younger siblings. They were: (1) NO: responsibility was not assumed, (2) Unclassifiable, and (3) YES: responsibility was assumed. Each of these is described as follows:

**NO:** responsibility was not assumed.

1) Answer tabulated here when the question was left unanswered by the student. Or:

2) The answer states that no responsibility was assumed for younger siblings.

Ex: I was too young. Ex: Mother wouldn't let me do anything.
Unclassifiable: It was not possible to ascertain if actual care for siblings was assumed or not. Ex: I don't know. Ex: I really didn't take much responsibility. Ex: I don't remember.

Table II

Amount of Agreement of Two Coders in Assigning Categories to Responses Relating to Assuming Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Entries</th>
<th>Number of Agreements</th>
<th>Number of Disagreements</th>
<th>Per Cent Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No responsibility assumed</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility assumed</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassifiable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YES: responsibility was assumed.

1) Specific areas of responsibility were stated.
2) Areas listed entail actual care of the child.
   Ex: I fed him sometimes. Ex: I took care of him in the afternoons.

The reliability scores of the two independent coders for this coding system are given on Table II (above).
way the responses of the students used in the study were coded are given in Appendix A.

(b) Satisfactory experiences with infants and children:

Question three (b): What things did you enjoy about having younger siblings when they were under a year old? Over a year old?

Question Five (a): Have you had any especially pleasant experiences with infants? ___Yes ___No Describe briefly.

In order to arrive at one numerical score which indicated the amount of satisfaction a student received from her experiences with infants and children the responses to these two questions were coded in the same manner and the scores added together to give a "satisfaction score".

Four categories were used to code the students' responses. The numerical scores for the categories ranged from zero to plus three. Each section of Question Three (b) and Question Five (a) was coded separately, and each could receive a top score of plus three. Thus, if a student reported many enjoyable experiences with siblings under a year, and over a year, and many pleasant experiences with infants she could receive a top score of plus nine. Each of these categories is described below.

/3 1) A statement which indicates to the reader that
the student has derived great satisfaction from her experiences with children; very enthusiastic. Ex: All my experiences have been lots of fun. Ex: I greatly enjoyed all my contacts with children. (It was decided that if the student simply wrote "I enjoyed..." the statement would not receive three points since this was a restatement of the question. For full credit an adverb would have to be used in connection with the word "enjoy"). Or:

2) A statement, or a list, containing four or more areas of enjoyment with children. Ex: Giving him his bottle, playing with him, putting him to bed, bathing him.

1) A statement that indicates satisfaction through the interesting or educational aspects derived from her experiences with children. The enjoyment would be related to the learning processes rather than simply enjoyment of the child. Ex: It was interesting to watch them grow and develop. Or:

2) A statement, or a list, containing two or three areas of enjoyment with children.

1) A statement which indicates satisfaction but with qualifications or reservations. Ex: I liked to
take care of my little sister if not for too long a time. Or:

2) A statement which indicates satisfaction was derived from the experiences, but gives the impression that the experiences were not remembered. Ex: I liked the children, but I don't remember anything in particular. Or:

3) A statement containing one area of enjoyment with children. Or:

4) A check placed by "Yes" on Question Five (a) without a subsequent description.

0 1) No answer is given by the student. Or:

2) A statement which indicates the student does not recall any enjoyable or pleasant experiences. Or:

3) A check is placed by "No" on Question Five (a).

The reliability scores of the two independent coders for this system are given on Table III, p.33. The satisfaction scores received by each student in the study are shown on Appendix A.

(c) Unsatisfactory experiences with infants and children:

Question Three (c): What things did you dislike about having younger siblings when they were under a year? Over a year?

Question Five (b): Have you had any especially
Table III

Amount of Agreement of Two Coders in Assigning Categories to Responses Relating to Satisfaction in Experiences with Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Entries</th>
<th>Number of Agreements</th>
<th>Number of Disagreements</th>
<th>Per Cent Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much Satisfaction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Satisfaction</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Satisfaction</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Satisfaction</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>88</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

unpleasant experiences with infants?  

---Yes  ---No  

Describe briefly.

In order to arrive at a numerical score which indicated the amount of dissatisfaction a student felt in her experiences with infants and children, the responses to these two questions were coded in the same manner as described above, and the scores added together to give a "dissatisfaction score".

Four categories were used to code the students'
responses. The numerical scores for the categories ranged from zero to minus three. Each section of Question Three (c) and Question Five (b) was coded separately, and each could receive a top score of minus three. Thus, if a student reported many experiences which she disliked with her siblings under a year and over a year, and many unpleasant experiences with infants, she could receive a top score of minus nine. Each of these categories is described below.

-3 1) A statement which indicates over-all dissatisfaction with the experiences. Ex: I did not like anything about my younger brother. Or:

2) A statement which indicates or implies dissatisfaction in many areas or in the total relationship. Ex: He got too much attention. Or:

3) A statement that indicates jealousy of the sibling or preference of the sibling by others. Ex: I felt that everyone liked my sister better than me. Or:

4) A statement, or a list, containing four or more areas which have been disliked or unpleasant. Ex: Changing diapers.

-2 1) A statement, or a list, containing two or three specific areas of dissatisfaction. The areas listed are specific to a situation and do not
Table IV

Amount of Agreement of Two Coders in Assigning Categories to Responses Relating to Dissatisfaction in Experiences with Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Entries</th>
<th>Number of Agreements</th>
<th>Number of Disagreements</th>
<th>Per Cent Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3 Much Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 Some Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1 Little Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 No Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

give the feeling of great dissatisfaction. Ex: When he got into my room and messed things up.

-1 1) A statement of one area which was disliked or unpleasant. Ex: I didn't like to feed the baby. Or:

2) A check is placed by "Yes" on Question Five (b) without a subsequent description.

0 1) No answer was given by the student. Or:

2) The statement indicates the student did not have
or cannot remember any unsatisfactory experiences. Or:

3) A check is placed by "No" on Question Five (b).

The reliability scores of the two independent coders for this system are given on Table IV, page 35. The dissatisfaction scores for the students in the study are shown in Appendix A.

(d) Projective question:

**Question Seven:** Complete the following sentences with whatever comes to your mind first:

When I hear a baby cry, I
Children are always
A baby is nicest when

The responses of the students' to each of these three statements were placed in one of three categories indicating positive feeling (+1), neutral feeling (0), or negative feeling (-1). Plus three was the top score any one student could receive on the three statements and minus three was the lowest possible any student could receive. These statements were designed to give a further indication of the students' feelings about their experiences with children and infants. The categories for coding the students' responses are as follows:

1) The completed sentence indicates a positive attitude towards the child or infant. Ex: Children
are always nice to have. Or:

2) The completed statement gives the feeling that there is concern for the child or infant. Ex: When I hear a baby cry, I want to help him. Or:

3) The completed statement indicates the infant or child is pleasant and fun to be with. Ex: Children are always fun to be around. Or:

4) The completed statement indicates an attempt on the student’s part to meet the needs of the child or infant. Ex: When I hear a baby cry, I think he needs something and I want to help. Or:

5) The completed statement indicates a display of affection. Ex: a baby is nicest when you can love them and hold them.

0 The completed statement gives neither a positive nor negative feeling. Ex: Children are always running around.

-1 1) The completed statement gives a negative feeling. Ex: When I hear a baby cry, I am irritated. Or:

2) The completed statement indicates the child or infant is more often a nuisance or bother. Ex: Children are always in the way. Or:

3) The completed statement indicates the respondent is concerned with meeting her own needs. Ex: A baby is nicest when they are out of the way so
Table V

Amount of Agreement of Two Coders in Assigning Categories to Three Projective Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Entries</th>
<th>Number of Agreements</th>
<th>Number of Disagreements</th>
<th>Per Cent Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Feeling</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Feeling</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

they won't get things dirty. Or:

4) The statement indicates that no attention needs to be given to the infant or child by the student.

A baby is nicest when they are asleep.

Coder reliability scores for this coding system are given in Table V, above. The scores received by each student in this study on these statements are given in Appendix A.

(e) Plans for the next two years:

**Question Eight:** What are your plans for the next two years?
The responses of the students indicating their plans for the next two years were placed into two categories: those who included plans for marriage and those who did not include plans for marriage. The coding system is given below. Plans for marriage:

1) The student states she will be married at a specific time. Ex: I am getting married in June and will be a homemaker.

2) The student states she has plans for marriage within the next two years but she has not set the date. Ex: I will teach next year and my fiance and I will be married the summer of the following year.

No plans for marriage:

1) The student does not make any mention of marriage; states work plans, plans for further education, and so forth. Ex: I plan to do my dietetic internship and then be a hospital dietitian. Or:

2) The student states she has hopes for marriage, but has no specific fiance in mind. Ex: I plan on teaching. If the right man came along I would get married.

Reliability scores of the two coders for this system are given on Table VI, page 40. The placement of the responses of the students used in the study into these two
categories is given in Appendix A.

Table VI

Amount of Agreement of Two Coders in Assigning Categories to Responses Relating to Plans for the Future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Entries</th>
<th>Number of Agreements</th>
<th>Number of Disagreements</th>
<th>Per Cent Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plans for Marriage Indicated</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Plans for Marriage Indicated</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(B) Methods of handling the remaining questionnaire data: The remaining questions were treated as follows.

(a) Question One: I am the ... child director in this group.

In answering this question the students marked their position (1st, 2nd, 3rd, and so forth) as child director in their home management house group. For purposes of comparison the first two child directors and the last two child directors in each group were used. In assigning rank positions to each child director for her position in her group the numerical position she held was used. Thus, the first child director had a rank of 1, the second child
director had a rank of 2, and so forth. Where needed for comparison, the average positions were found from these numbers.

The rank position of each student as child director is given in A.

(b) Question Four: How much experience have you had with infants (children under a year of age) outside of your own immediate family? Please mark the approximate amount on the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>contact*</td>
<td>no contact</td>
<td>occasional contact</td>
<td>Frequent*** contacts</td>
<td>Frequent contact</td>
<td>Frequent contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with 1 infant or occasional with more than 3 infants</td>
<td>with 2 or with 6 or 3 infants</td>
<td>more infants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* "contact" means being around the infant for an hour or more.
** "occasional" means four or less contacts with an infant per year.
*** "frequent" means six or more contacts with an infant per year.

Many of the students in answering this part of the form simply circled one of the numbers on the scale. However, several students did place a check between two numbers. In order to find their relative frequency of contact with infants outside of the home for these students, a twelve-inch ruler was used to measure their numerical position on the scale. Measurements were taken to the
nearest sixteenth of an inch and the percentage of the inch was used as indicating the frequency of contact the student had had with infants.

The scores indicating the frequency of contact with infants received by each student are given in Appendix A. For purposes of comparison, the scores of the students with the most contact and the students with the least contact with infants outside of the home were used. These groups are described under Hypothesis 4 in the chapter on Results and Discussion.

(c) Question Six: As you look back on your experiences with children, do you feel they were predominantly

please check

___ pleasant

___ unpleasant

___ profitable

___ confusing

___ neutral (no feelings about them)

The purpose of this question was to discover more about the students' feelings about their experiences with children. If the student checked "pleasant" or "profitable" she received a score of +1. If the student checked "unpleasant" or "confusing" she received a score of -1. If a student checked "neutral" she received 0. The scores from this question for each student in the study are given in Appendix A.
(c) Total Satisfaction Score.

From the scores received by each student on the questions concerning her feelings about siblings, infants, and children, a "total satisfaction score" was derived. It will be recalled that the scores received by each student on Questions Three (b) and Five (a) of the information form were added together to form a "satisfaction" score. It will also be recalled that a "dissatisfaction" score was arrived at by adding the students' scores on Questions Three (c) and Five (b) together. By combining the plus scores received by the students for reported pleasant or enjoyable experiences with infants and children with the minus scores received by the students on reported disliked or unpleasant experiences with infants and children, a score was arrived at which indicated the total amount of, or lack of, satisfaction or dissatisfaction in her experiences with infants and children.

Prior to the analysis of the data, it was planned to add the plus scores received by the students on Questions Six and Seven of the questionnaire to the satisfaction score and the minus scores received on these two questions to the dissatisfaction score. However, an analysis of the scores received on the questions by the students did not show any discrimination between the students with more satisfactory and those with less satisfactory experiences with infants and children. These
data were not used in the study.

The total satisfaction scores received by each student are given in Appendix A. For purposes of comparison the students with high satisfaction scores were compared with the students with low satisfaction scores. These students are described in the discussion of Hypothesis 5 in the chapter on Results and Discussion.
II Infant Feeding Record (See Appendix C-1 and 2).

This form provided data on one area of the infant's behavior while in the care of each child director. Instructions included with this form directed the child director to place a mark in the column indicating how many ounces of formula the infant had consumed during that day. The end of a student's period as child director was indicated by a double line, drawn horizontally across the chart by the student, on the proper date line. From this record the mean amount of milk consumed per day by the infant while each student was child director was obtained by adding the total amount of formula consumed each day and by dividing this number by the number of days the student was child director.

When the mean daily amount of milk consumed by the infants while in the care of each child director was found, the students were placed in an order which indicated their relative position as to the amount the infant consumed with them. For example, the student in each group with whom the infant consumed the highest mean amount of milk was given a rank of 1. The student in each group with whom the infant consumed the second highest mean amount of milk was given a rank of 2, and so forth. The rank order of each student in relation to the amount of milk the infant consumed when she was child director is
given in Appendix A.

The Infant Feeding Record was presented to several persons for consideration in respect to readability and ease of usage. Revisions were made following their suggestions. The final form was not pre-tested prior to use in the study.

No evidence of the reliability of the students' computation and recording of the amount of milk an infant consumed was obtained.

III Form for the Study of Group Relationships (See Appendix D).

A. The Form Itself. This form, a sociometric questionnaire, consisted of ten questions yielding data on the reactions of the group members to each other. The students' responses indicated whom they would choose from their fellow students in the home management house group for various activities and how comfortable they felt with each student in the house group. The students completed the form during their last week in the house.

The information from this form was used in two ways: 1) for determining the position of each student in relation to the other students in her house group, and, 2) as a measure of the effectiveness of each student as child director as indicated by the responses of the group members to Question Two (I would feel most comfortable about
leaving the baby in the care of _____.) of the form.

This instrument was developed by Katherine Read for use in the Oregon State College home management houses. It has been in use there for several years. The form was developed to study the relationships and social structures of the house groups.

No evidence of the reliability or validity of this instrument has been demonstrated prior to this study.

B. Method of Handling Sociometric Data.

Since three of the four home management house groups had different numbers of members it was necessary to equalize the final score received by each student on these questions. For example, an individual in a group of five students could receive 35 choices from the other students on Questions One through Nine and 36 points from the other students on Question Ten. In a group of six students an individual could receive 45 choices and points and in a group of seven students an individual could receive 54 choices and points from the other students.

To equalize the variable in these scores, a common denominator, 540, was found for the total possible scores for each group. The actual score received by each individual was multiplied by the number that, when multiplied by the total number of points possible, equaled 540.

Thus, in a group of five students, the possible
total points, 36, multiplied by 15 would equal 540. In a group of six students, the possible total points, 45, multiplied by 12 would equal 540. In a group of seven students, the possible total points, 54, multiplied by 10 would equal 540. The actual number of choices and points received by each student on Questions One through Nine and Question Ten were multiplied by these numbers to give the adjusted score. An example of the procedure used to adjust the students' scores is given below.

Ex: In a group of five students, if a student received 34 out of a possible 36 points on Question Ten:

$$34 \times 15 = 510$$

510 is the adjusted score this student would receive for Question Ten.

While the range in possible scores was from 0 to 540, the actual range of scores on Questions One through Nine on the form was from 10 to 285. On Question Ten, the actual range of scores was from 408 to 540. The adjusted scores for each student in these two areas are given in Appendix A.

For purposes of comparison, the students who received the most choices on Questions One through Nine were compared with the students who received the least choices on these questions. Similarly, the students who received the highest number of points on Question Ten were
compared with those students who received the least number of points on that question from the other students. The division into the groups with the least and most choices and points is discussed under Hypotheses 9 and 10 in the chapter on Results and Discussion.

Only Question Two of the Study of Group Relationships form was used as a measure of the effectiveness of the students as child directors. In answering this question, the students gave the name of the person whom they would feel the most comfortable about leaving the baby with.

The scores for this question were adjusted in the same manner as described above. Thus, in a group of five members, four choices for child director were possible, for each student: in a group of six members, five choices for child director were possible: in a group of seven members, six choices for the position of child director were possible for each student. The common denominator for the top possible choices in each group was 60 and the multiple numbers were 15 for a group of five members; 12 for a group of six members; and 10 for a group of seven members. An example of the procedure used to arrive at the adjusted score is given below.

Ex: In a group of five members, a student received two choices for child director.
The adjusted score for choices for child director from the group members for this student is 30.

The possible range of scores was from 0 to 60. The actual range of scores for the students in this study was from 0 to 48. The adjusted scores for each student are given in Appendix A.

The scores received by each student in choices for child director from the group members were combined with the scores received by each student on the adviser's rating scale to form a total effectiveness score. This is described in the Method of Analysis in this chapter.

IV Evaluation of Student's Performance as Child Director
(See Appendix E).

Each student's performance as child director was rated by the faculty adviser at the end of the student's period as child director. The rating was done on a rating scale devised for the purpose. A series of twenty statements, covering the areas of performance of the student as child director, was drawn up, a priori, by the writer. Some of the areas under consideration by the raters were the physical care of the infant (safety and health precautions, preparation of food, play areas and play toys), awareness of the infant's needs (knowledge of the infant's schedule for feeding and sleeping, demonstration of
affection for the infant, protection of the infant from over-stimulation) and interest in the role as child director and in the infant, acceptance of the responsibility, decision-making in connection with the duty, interest in the infant after completion of the duty).

In using the scale, each rater marked the point on a line which indicated her judgement of the student's performance. Three points--high, middle, and low were defined on each scale. The definitions used were: 1) Shows optimum amount of this behavior to insure the maximum welfare of the infant; 2) Shows enough of this behavior to insure the welfare of the infant in a reasonable satisfactory way; and, 3) Shows almost none of this behavior. If the rater did not have an opportunity to observe a student in any one of the twenty areas of performance, she was asked to indicate this by writing a statement to that effect in the area not observed. It was not possible to establish the reliability of the advisers' ratings of the students' performance.

The rating on each area of performance was made by placing a mark on a six-inch line. The ratings made by each adviser were then measured with a ruler to the nearest sixteenth of an inch. Percentages were substituted for the fraction numbers. The numerical scores obtained on each area of performance for each student were then
totaled. The scores received by each student on this rating scale are given in Appendix A. These scores were used as one of the measures of the effectiveness of the students' performance as child director.

This instrument was judged by the supervisor of the Oregon State College home management houses with respect to wording, set-up, and appropriateness of the questions. The form was used in a pre-test situation by the adviser of one of the houses. She rated two students on their performance as child directors. Revisions were made as a result of the suggestions arising out of the considerations of these two people.

V Evaluation of Experience by Child Director (See Appendix F).

One other instrument was used to gather data pertaining to the student's effectiveness as child director. This was the student's own evaluation of what the experience had meant to her. This form included questions on things enjoyed and not enjoyed about the experience, things learned while child director, any change of ideas while child director, and the value of the experience for future situations. When the data had been collected, the question arose as to whether this instrument actually would give a measure of how effective the student felt she was. The validity of the student evaluation as an instrument to measure effectiveness of her own performance seemed
doubtful since many factors may influence such a personal evaluation. Rather than include this instrument with the other measures of effectiveness, and thereby possibly contaminate those scores, it was decided not to use the instrument.

**Administration of Instruments**

The administration of the instruments was done by the advisers in each of the home management houses used in the study. The material used in the study was accompanied by a letter of instructions (See Appendix G) which contained suggestions for the use of the material. Some of the suggestions concerned the time the Student Information Form should be given, the use of the infant's feeding record, how long the students should have to complete their evaluation of their experience, the time when the sociometric questionnaire should be given, and when the adviser should rate the student's performance as child director. Through these suggestions, an attempt was made to control such variables as the time when the forms were filled out and the length of time used to complete the forms.

**Method of Analysis**

I Determination of the Effectiveness of Each Student as Child Director.

Two measures were used in order to determine how
Table VII
Product-moment Correlation Between Scores on the Two Measures of Effectiveness for 23 Students in Four Home Management House Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Measures of effectiveness</th>
<th>Scores from adviser's ratings</th>
<th>Scores from students' choices</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>103.88</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>106.94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>98.68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>117.86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>88.34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>83.35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>106.9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.87*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>103.59</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table VII (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group III</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>104.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>97.68</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>117.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>85.73</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>117.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>84.96</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group IV</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>113.41</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>100.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>74.44</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>87.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>99.64</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>102.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>103.64</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** | .53* |   |   |

* Significant at the .05 level of confidence.
effectively each student performed the role of child director. These measures were: 1) the adviser's ratings of each student at the end of her period as child director, and, 2) the group members' choices for child director. The scores received by each student from these measures were combined to form a "total effectiveness" score.

In order to justify making a total effectiveness score by combining the scores on the students' choices for child director and the adviser's ratings of each student as child director, the two measurements were analyzed to determine the amount of correlation between them. The product-moment correlation statistic was used with the following formula being employed:

\[
\tau = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i Y_i - (\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i)(\sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_i)}{\sqrt{(\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i^2 - (\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i)^2)(\sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_i^2 - (\sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_i)^2)}}
\]

A description of this statistic may be found in Wert, Neidt, and Ahmann (21, p. 83).

Table VII, p. 54, shows the two scores for each student, i.e., the one received on the adviser's rating scale and the one received on the group members' choices for child director, and the correlation coefficient of the scores. For the total group of twenty-three students, the correlation between the two measures of effectiveness was .53 which was significant at the .05 level of confidence. In addition to this analysis, the scores for each group of
students were submitted to correlation analysis. For Group I the correlation between the measures of effectiveness was .02; for Group II the correlation was .87; for Group III the correlation was .72 and for Group IV the correlation was .59. The only correlation which was significant was that of Group II. It was significant at .05 level of confidence. Due to the small numbers in the groups the other correlations were not significant.

The correlation coefficient for the total group indicates that there is a significant correlation between the two measures of a student's effectiveness as child director. The advisers and the group members seem to rate the child directors generally in the same manner. The degree of correlation indicates that the advisers and the group members are probably measuring the same thing, which, in this study, is called "effectiveness".

Since the correlation between the two measures of effectiveness was significant, it was decided that the two scores could be combined for each student to form a total effectiveness score. In order to have each of the two measures of effectiveness contribute equally to the total effectiveness score, it was necessary to make adjustments in the scores received by the students for child director from the group members. The top score possible on choices for child director was previously given as 60. The top
score on the adviser's ratings was 120. By doubling the scores the students received for child director from the other group members, each measure of effectiveness had a possible score of 120. An example of the weighting procedure is given below.

Ex: A student from a group of seven students received two choices for child director.

\[2 \times 10 = 20\] (adjusted score for choices for child director)

\[2 \times 20 = 40\]

40 is the weighted score this student would receive as child director from the other group members.

The adjusted scores for each student were weighted in this manner. These scores were then added to the scores each student received from the adviser's rating scale. In order to make the total effectiveness scores more workable, the total of the two measures was divided in half and rounded off. The total effectiveness scores for each student are given in Appendix A.

II Procedure Used to Test Each Hypothesis.

Data relevant to each hypothesis were analyzed in four ways. They were:

A. The original hypothesis was tested to determine if there were significant differences in the mean total effectiveness scores of the students falling into the two
groups defined in the hypothesis.

B. The original hypothesis was tested to determine if there were significant differences in the mean effectiveness scores of the students falling into the two groups defined in the hypothesis using only the students' choices for child director as a measure of effectiveness.

C. The original hypothesis was tested to determine if there were significant differences in the mean effectiveness scores of the students falling into the two groups defined in the hypothesis using only the adviser's ratings as a measure of effectiveness.

D. For each hypothesis, the seven students with the highest total effectiveness scores were compared with the seven students with the lowest total effectiveness scores to determine if there were significant differences between these groups in their backgrounds or experiences which related to the hypothesis.

To compare the mean scores of the two groups in each hypothesis, the $t$ analysis for uncorrelated groups was used. The formula used to compute $t$ was:

$$
t = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{S_p^2 \sqrt{\frac{\sum X_{1i}^2 - (\sum X_{1i})^2}{N_1} + \frac{\sum X_{2i}^2 - (\sum X_{2i})^2}{N_2}}} \sqrt{\frac{N_1 + N_2 - 2}{N_1 + N_2 - 2}}
$$
A description of this formula can be found in Dixon and Massey (6, p.103).

Significant differences were reported only at or beyond the .05 level of confidence.
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Each hypothesis will be discussed in turn with the results and a summary table of the results given for the hypotheses.

I Hypothesis 1. Students with many siblings will be more effective child directors than students with fewer siblings.

Data relating to this hypothesis were obtained from Question Two (What is your position in your family?) on the student information form. Of the twenty-two students answering, three reported no siblings, six reported one sibling, seven reported two siblings, two reported three siblings, and one student reported four siblings. Two students added that they had had a sibling who was now dead. These students were included with the students having no siblings although it was not known when the deaths occurred and how long the student had been an only child. The mean number of siblings for the total group was 1.5.

The total group of twenty-two students was divided into two groups according to the number of siblings; those with more than 1.5 siblings and those with less than 1.5 siblings. The number in each of the sub-groups was eleven.

A comparison of the total effectiveness scores for each of these groups revealed no significant differences between the means of the groups. The mean total
effectiveness score was 65.09 for the group of students with more siblings than the average, and 61.45 for the group of students with less siblings than the average.

The effectiveness scores of the two groups were also analyzed using the adviser's ratings and the students' choices for child director separately. The mean score on the adviser's rating scale was 100.82 for the students with more siblings, and 100.23 for the students with less siblings than the average. The mean score of the other students' choices for child director was 29.64 for the students with more siblings than the average, and 20.73 for the students with less siblings than the average. Again, these differences were not significant. These results are given in Table VIII, page 63.

When the seven most effective child directors were compared with the seven least effective child directors, no significant differences in the number of siblings in the groups was found. The seven most effective child directors had an average of 1.4 siblings and the seven least effective child directors had an average of 1.71 siblings.

These results suggest that the number of siblings which a student has does not seem to increase or decrease the effectiveness of the student's performance as child director.
Table VIII

Comparison of the Mean Effectiveness Scores of Eleven Students Reporting More Siblings Than the Average and Eleven Students Reporting Fewer Siblings Than the Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Total Effectiveness Score</th>
<th>Mean Score on Adviser's Ratings</th>
<th>Mean Score on Students' Choices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students with more siblings (Eleven students)</td>
<td>65.09</td>
<td>100.82</td>
<td>29.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with fewer siblings (Eleven students)</td>
<td>61.45</td>
<td>100.23</td>
<td>20.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II Hypothesis 2. Students who are first born in a family with one or more younger siblings will be more effective child directors than students having other family ranks.

Data relating to this hypothesis was obtained from Question Two (What is your position in your family?) of the student information form. The number of students in the first born position with one or more younger siblings was seven. There were fifteen students in other positions.

A comparison of the effectiveness scores of the two groups revealed no significant differences in the mean
scores. The mean total effectiveness scores were 73.29 for the students who were first born with younger siblings, and 58.47 for the students in other family ranks. When the scores from the adviser's ratings and the students' choices for child director were considered separately, there were no significant differences between the groups. The mean scores from the adviser's rating scale were 101.70 for the students who were first born with younger siblings, and 99.97 for the group of students in other family positions. The students who were first born with younger siblings received a mean score of 45.43 on the students' choices for child director, while the students in other family ranks received a mean score of 17.33 on this measure of effectiveness. Table IX, page 65, gives these results.

A comparison of the sibling rank of the seven most effective and the seven least effective child directors show no significant differences in the sibling position. In the group of the seven most effective students, five of these students were in the first born position, with younger siblings, while in the group of the seven least effective students, two of the students were in this sibling position.

It is interesting to note that, while the comparisons did not reach statistical significance, there is a
tendency for the mean effectiveness scores to be in the
direction which supports the hypothesis. However, from
these data, it seems reasonable to conclude that the
sibling position of the students in this study was not
likely to influence their performances as child directors.

Table IX
Comparison of the Mean Effectiveness Scores
of Seven Students Who Are First Born
With Younger Siblings and Fifteen Students
Having Other Family Ranks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Rank</th>
<th>Mean of Total Effectiveness Score</th>
<th>Mean score on Adviser's Ratings</th>
<th>Mean score on Students' Choices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First born with younger siblings</td>
<td>73.29</td>
<td>101.70</td>
<td>45.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(seven students)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other family ranks</td>
<td>58.47</td>
<td>99.97</td>
<td>17.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(fifteen students)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III Hypothesis 3. Students who report they have had re­
sponsibility for younger family members will be more ef­
fective child directors than students who do not report
having had such responsibility.
Data relating to this hypothesis were obtained from the student's answers to Questions Three (a) (If you have younger siblings what responsibility did you take for them when they were under a year old? over a year old?) on the student information form. The answers placed the students into two categories: those who reported having had responsibility for younger siblings, and those who did not report having had responsibility for younger siblings. The number of students in each group was eleven.

No significant differences in the mean scores was found in a comparison of the total effectiveness scores of these two groups. The students who did report responsibility for younger siblings received a mean total effectiveness score of 68.82 and the students who did not report responsibility for younger siblings received a mean score of 57.73.

Analysis using the adviser's ratings and the students' choices for child director separately also revealed no significant differences. The mean scores of the adviser's rating scale were 102.95 for the group who reported responsibility and 98.10 for the group who had not reported responsibility. The mean scores from the other students were 35.09 for the group with responsibility and 17.45 for the group who had not had responsibility. Table X, page 67, gives these results.

A comparison of the seven most effective child
Table X
Comparison of the Mean Effectiveness Scores of Eleven Students Who Report They Have Had Responsibility for Younger Family Members and Eleven Students Who Do Not Report Having Had Such Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Total Effectiveness Score</th>
<th>Mean score of Adviser's Ratings</th>
<th>Mean score of Students' Choices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report responsibility (eleven students)</td>
<td>68.82</td>
<td>102.95</td>
<td>35.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not report responsibility (eleven students)</td>
<td>57.73</td>
<td>98.10</td>
<td>17.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

directors and the seven least effective child directors did not reveal a statistical difference in the number of students who had assumed responsibility for younger siblings. However, six of the most effective students reported assuming responsibility for siblings, while only two of the least effective students reported assuming responsibility. These results are in the direction of supporting the hypothesis and with a larger number of students, significant differences may be found.

From these results, it would be reasonable to say that having responsibility for younger family members is not likely to be a factor associated with the effectiveness of a
student as child director in a home management house.

IV Hypothesis 4. Students who report having had considerable contact with infants outside of the home will be more effective child directors than students who report having had little contact with infants outside of the home.

Data relating to this hypothesis were obtained from Question Four (How much experience have you had with infants—children under one year of age—outside of your own immediate family?) on the student information form. The amount of contact indicated by the students ranged from 0, no contact with infants outside of the home, to 4, frequent contact with six or more infants, on the rating scale. From the total group, two sub-groups were selected for comparison: eight students with considerable contact with infants outside of the home (scores ranging from 2 to 4 on the rating scale), and seven students with little contact with infants outside of the home (scores ranging from 0 to .87 on the rating scale).

The effectiveness scores of these two groups of students were compared and a significant difference between the mean scores was revealed. The mean total effectiveness scores were 73.87 for the group with considerable contact with infants, and 50.14 for those with little contact with infants outside of the home. The t-score for this comparison was 2.85 with the difference at the .05 level of
confidence. When the two measures of effectiveness were used separately, significant differences between these two groups appeared with the scores on the adviser's ratings. The mean score of the adviser's ratings for the students with considerable contact with infants was 107.38; for the students with little contact with infants the mean score was 91.78. The t-score for this comparison was 2.95 with the difference at the .05 level of confidence. No significant differences were found when only the students' choices for child director were used as a measure of effectiveness. The mean score on this measure for the students with considerable contact with infants outside of the home was 40.5; for the students with little contact with infants outside of the home the mean score was 8.57. While these results are also in the direction to support the hypothesis, the t-score was only 2.2 and the difference was not great enough to reach the .05 level of confidence. These data are given in Table XI, page 70.

A comparison of the seven most effective child directors with the seven least effective child directors did not show significant differences in the amount of contact with infants outside of the home. For the seven most effective child directors, the mean amount of contact reported was 1.83; for the seven child directors rated least effective, the mean amount of contact with infants was .93.
Table XI
Comparison of the Mean Effectiveness Scores of Eight Students Reporting Considerable Contact With Infants and Seven Students Reporting Little Contact With Infants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Student Contact with Infants</th>
<th>Mean Total Effectiveness Score</th>
<th>Mean Score on Adviser's Ratings</th>
<th>Mean Score on Students' Choices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Considerable contact (eight students)</td>
<td>73.87</td>
<td>107.38</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little contact (seven students)</td>
<td>50.14</td>
<td>91.78</td>
<td>8.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( t )-score</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.95*</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

The results suggest that the amount of experience with infants outside of the home does seem to be associated with a student's performance as child director as judged by the adviser. It is reasonable to assume that the students who had more contact with infants outside of the home might have had these experiences because they liked infants, chose to babysit, and so forth. The infants in the home management houses were all under a year of age and the students enjoyed this experience, too.

V Hypothesis 5. Students who report more satisfactory experiences with infants or children over a year of age will be more effective child directors than students who report less satisfactory experiences with children of these ages.
Data relating to this hypothesis were obtained from Question Three, parts b (What things did you enjoy about having younger siblings when they were under a year old? over a year old?) and c (What things did you dislike about having younger siblings when they were under a year old? over a year old?), and Question Five, part a (Have you had any especially pleasant experiences with infants?) and part b (Have you had any especially unpleasant experiences with infants?) of the student information form. The responses to these questions were placed into categories with enjoyable or pleasant experiences being given plus numerical scores and disliked or unpleasant experiences being given minus numerical scores. The results were totaled to give a "total satisfaction" score. The satisfaction scores for the whole group ranged from minus three to plus five.

The total group was divided into two groups: seven students with more satisfactory experiences and eleven students with fewer satisfactory experiences. The students with more satisfactory experiences were those whose total satisfaction score ranged from plus three to plus five. The students with fewer satisfactory experiences were those students whose total satisfaction scores ranged from minus three to plus one. In order to equalize the number of students in each group, a random sampling of four
students was selected from the eight students who received a satisfaction score of one. These four students were added to the three students who had satisfaction scores of less than one to make up a group of seven students with less satisfactory experiences.

The effectiveness scores of these two groups were compared. There was no significant difference in the means of the total effectiveness scores of the students who had high satisfaction scores and the students who had low satisfaction scores. The mean scores were 70.43 for the seven students with high total satisfaction scores and 48.57 for the seven students with low total satisfaction scores. A comparison of the effectiveness scores of the group with higher satisfaction scores and the group with lower satisfaction scores when only the adviser’s ratings were used as a measure of effectiveness also revealed no significant differences in the mean scores. The mean scores were 105.98 for the group with high satisfaction scores and 90.58 for the group with low satisfaction scores. When only the students’ choices for child director were used as a measure of effectiveness, no significant difference was found in the means of the two groups. The mean score from this measure of effectiveness for the students with high satisfaction scores was 35.14. The students with low satisfaction scores received a mean of
6.86 choices for child director from the other students. Table XII, below, gives the mean scores for the measures of effectiveness.

Table XII

Comparison of the Mean Effectiveness Scores of Seven Students Reporting More Satisfactory Experiences With Infants and Children and Seven Students Reporting More Unsatisfactory Experiences with Infants and Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiences with children and infants</th>
<th>Mean Total Effectiveness Score</th>
<th>Mean score on Adviser's Ratings</th>
<th>Mean score on Students' Choices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More satisfactory (seven students)</td>
<td>70.43</td>
<td>105.98</td>
<td>35.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More unsatisfactory (seven students)</td>
<td>48.57</td>
<td>90.58</td>
<td>6.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was no significant difference in the total satisfaction scores of the seven most effective and the seven least effective child directors. The mean satisfaction score for the seven most effective child directors was 2.43, and the mean satisfaction score for the seven least effective students was .86.

From these results, it can be concluded that the number of satisfactory and unsatisfactory experiences with infants or children a student reported would not necessarily be associated with her performance as child director.
However, while the differences are not significant, they are all in the direction of the higher effectiveness scores appearing with higher satisfaction scores.

VI Hypothesis 6. Students who have previously taken or are taking at present a college nursery school course which involves active participation will be more effective child directors than students who have not had this experience.

Data relating to this hypothesis were obtained from Question Nine (Have you taken, or are you now taking a course which included working with children in a nursery school?) on the student information form. The students answered the question either yes or no. The students were then divided into two groups: one group, composed of twelve students, indicated they had had or were participating in a nursery school course: the other group, composed of ten students, indicated they had not had the nursery school experience.

A comparison of the effectiveness scores of these two groups revealed no significant differences in the mean scores between students who had participated in a nursery school course and those who had not had the experience. The mean scores were 59.33 for the students who had participated in a nursery school course and 68 for the students who had not participated in a nursery school course. No
significant difference appeared when the two measures of effectiveness were used separately.

The mean scores on the advisers' ratings were 100.27 for the group who had participated in the nursery school and 100.83 for the group who had not participated in the nursery school. The mean scores from the students' choices were 18.67 for the group who had participated in the nursery school and 35.4 for the group who had not participated in the nursery school.

Table XIII gives the mean scores for each of these analyses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students who have participated in a nursery school course. (twelve students)</th>
<th>Mean Total Effectiveness Score</th>
<th>Mean score on Adviser's Ratings</th>
<th>Mean score on Students' Choices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students who have not participated in a nursery school course. (ten students)</td>
<td>68.</td>
<td>100.83</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison of the seven most effective and the seven least effective child directors did not reveal statistical differences in the amount of nursery school participation in either group. While four of the seven most effective child directors had participated in a nursery school course, two of the seven least effective child directors had participated in a nursery school course.

From these analyses it is reasonable to conclude that experience or lack of experience in a nursery school course did not significantly affect the students' performance as child director.

VII Hypothesis 7. Students who state that they have plans for marriage within the next two years will be more effective child directors than students who do not state such plans.

Data relating to this hypothesis were obtained from Question Eight (What are your plans for the next two years?) on the student information form. On the basis of the students' statements of their plans for the next two years, the students were placed into two groups: those who included plans for marriage and those who did not include plans for marriage. Eight students reported plans for marriage and thirteen did not report such plans. One student did not answer this part of the form.

No significant difference in the mean scores was
found between the total effectiveness scores for the two groups, or between the effectiveness scores using each measure of effectiveness separately. The mean total effectiveness scores were 68.5 for the students reporting plans for marriage and 60.69 for the students not reporting plans for marriage. The mean scores on the adviser's rating were 103.95 for the students reporting plans for marriage and 97.92 for the students not reporting plans for marriage. The mean scores on the students' choices were 33 for the students with plans for marriage and 24.15 for the group of students who did not report plans for marriage. Table XIV shows the mean scores for these groups.

Table XIV

Comparison of the Mean Effectiveness Scores of Eight Students Who Reported Plans for Marriage and Thirteen Students Who Did Not Report Such Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on Total</td>
<td>on Adviser's</td>
<td>on Students'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Ratings</td>
<td>Choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who reported</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>103.95</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plans for marriage.</td>
<td>(eight students)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who did not</td>
<td>60.69</td>
<td>97.92</td>
<td>24.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>report plans for</td>
<td>(thirteen students)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marriage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the seven most effective child directors, four students reported plans for marriage. Two of the seven least effective child directors reported plans for marriage. The differences between the groups was not statistically significant.

Having definite plans for marriage would not seem to be a factor related to a student's performance as child director. The data do not offer confirmation for the hypothesis proposed.

VIII Hypothesis 8. The students who are among the last child directors in their home management house group will be more effective child directors than the students who are among the first child directors in a house group.

Data relating to this hypothesis were obtained from Question One (I am the ... child director in this group.) of the student information form. The students marked the order in which they held the position of child director. For purposes of testing the hypothesis, the effectiveness scores of the first two child directors in a house group were compared with those of the last two child directors in a house group.

A significant difference in the mean scores was found in a comparison of the total effectiveness scores of the two groups, but not in the direction to support the hypothesis. The first two child directors were rated as
more effective than the last two. The mean effectiveness score for the first two child directors was 76.25 and for the last two child directors it was 53.38. The t-score for this analysis was 2.62 with the difference at the .05 level of confidence.

When the two measures of effectiveness were used separately, a significant difference, in this same direction, was found only with the students' choices for child director. The students chose the first two child directors more often than the last two child directors. The first two child directors received a mean score of 49.75 for child director from the other students, while the last two child directors received a mean score of 9 for child director. The t-score in this comparison was 3.01 with the difference at the .02 level of confidence. No significant difference was found, however, when only the adviser's ratings were used as the measure of effectiveness. The mean scores were 103.21 for the first two child directors and 98.15 for the last two child directors.

A comparison of the position of the seven most effective and the seven least effective child directors did not reveal any significant differences although the differences were in the direction suggested by the results above. With the number 1 representing the position of the first child director, 2 representing the position of the
second child director, and so forth, it was found that the seven most effective child directors had a combined average position of 2.57. The seven least effective child directors had a combined average position of 4.14. The difference between the average position was not significant.

An explanation of why the most effective child directors seemed to be those who took care of the infant first could lie in the fact that the student, in at least two of the houses (those at Oregon State College) chose the duty she was to perform first. The first child directors in these cases would have chosen the duty. The student who chooses to be child director is probably a student who is comfortable with the babies and feels herself to be capable of assuming the duty and adjusting to it easily. These results suggest that this may be a more important factor in the student's performance as child director than the opportunity to be around the infant and knowing him before assuming his care.

Another possible explanation of the finding that the first child directors seem to be more effective than the last is that the students who come first in order may be associated more firmly with the baby in the minds of the group than those students who care for the baby later. The first two students are the ones who are seen with the infant the most during the first weeks a group is in the
home management house. This important first impression may remain throughout the group's stay in the house. The adviser may be less influenced by this first impression as her scores indicate.

Table XV
Comparison of the Mean Effectiveness Scores of the First Two Child Directors in a Group With the Last Two Child Directors in a Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean of Total Effectiveness Score</th>
<th>Mean score on Adviser's Ratings</th>
<th>Mean score on Students' Choices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First two child directors.</td>
<td>76.25</td>
<td>103.21</td>
<td>49.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(eight students)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last two child directors.</td>
<td>53.38</td>
<td>98.15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(eight students)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-score</td>
<td>2.62*</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>3.01**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.  
**Significant at the .02 level of confidence.

IX Hypothesis 9. Students who are rated by their fellow students as more comfortable to be with will be more effective child directors than students who are rated as less comfortable to be with.

Data relating to this hypothesis were obtained from Question Ten (How comfortable ... do you feel with each member of the group?) of the group relationships form. The
raw score received by each student was weighted in order to equalize the differences between the various group sizes. The twenty-three students were then arranged in order from those receiving the highest weighted score to those receiving the lowest weighted score. The top third and the bottom third students were selected as those rated as more and less comfortable by their fellow students. This breakdown became more meaningful since there was a natural division of the scores into these groupings. The eight students who received the highest weighted scores from Question Ten (those of 516 or above) were compared with the eight students who received the lowest weighted scores from Question Ten (those of 480 or below).

A comparison of the effectiveness scores of these groups revealed significant differences in the means between the most comfortable to be with and the least comfortable to be with students. When the total effectiveness scores were compared, the mean scores for the eight most comfortable students was 74.38; for the eight least comfortable students the mean score was 51.75. The t-score for this analysis was 2.88 with the difference at the .05 level of confidence. When only the adviser's ratings were used as a measure of effectiveness, there was no significant difference between the mean scores of the two groups. The mean score on the adviser's ratings was 104.68
for the most comfortable students and 94.42 for the least comfortable students. However, when the scores of the students' choices for child director were used alone as a measure of effectiveness, a significant difference between the means of the two groups was found. The students rated most comfortable to be with by their fellow students received a mean effectiveness score of 44.5 in choices for child director from the other students in the group and the students rated least comfortable to be with by their fellow students received a mean effectiveness score of 9. The t-score for the comparison was 2.9 with the difference at the .05 level of confidence. Table XVI, page 84, gives these results.

A comparison of the seven most effective child directors and the seven least effective child directors revealed no significant differences in how comfortable they were rated to be with by the other students, but the differences in the mean scores were in the same direction as the results above. The most effective child directors had a mean score of 509.14 from the group members on Question Ten and the seven least effective students received a mean score of 489.86 from the other students on this question.

From these results, it would seem that how comfortable a student is to be with would be an important factor
Table XVI
Comparison of the Mean Effectiveness Scores of Eight Students Rated As More Comfortable To Be With and Eight Students Rated As Less Comfortable To Be With

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Total Effectiveness Score</th>
<th>Mean Score on Adviser's Ratings</th>
<th>Mean Score on Students' Choices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More comfortable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students (eight students)</td>
<td>74.30</td>
<td>104.68</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less comfortable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students (eight students)</td>
<td>51.75</td>
<td>94.42</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-score</td>
<td>2.88*</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence

when the other students were making their choices for child director. However, this would not be an important factor influencing the adviser's ratings. It is significant when the total effectiveness scores are considered. It may be the home management house students select the students with whom they feel comfortable for the various house duties and activities. A type of halo effect would result with the most comfortable students receiving many choices for various activities regardless of their abilities, including the choice as child director.

The hypothesis was supported by the results when the
students' choices for child director were used as a measure of effectiveness and when the total effectiveness scores were compared.

Hypothesis 10. Students who are chosen more frequently for various activities by their fellow students will be more effective child directors than students who are chosen less frequently.

Data relating to this hypothesis were obtained from questions one through nine on the group relationship form. The number of choices each student received from other group members for various activities was totaled and then weighted in order to equalize the differences between the group sizes. The twenty-three students were then arranged in order from those receiving the highest weighted score to those receiving the lowest weighted score. The top third and the bottom third students were selected for purposes of comparison. The students who were chosen most frequently by their fellow students were eight students whose weighted scores were 140 or above. The students who were chosen least frequently by their fellow students were eight students whose weighted scores were 80 or below. The breakdown of the group into the top third and bottom third became more meaningful since there was a natural division in the scores at these points. The effectiveness scores of these two groups of students were
A significant difference in the mean scores was found when the effectiveness scores of the most frequently chosen students and the least frequently chosen students were compared. The most frequently chosen students were significantly more effective as child directors. The mean effectiveness score for the eight most chosen students was 73.88. The mean score for the eight students who were chosen least frequently was 47.38. The \( t \)-score for this comparison was 4.14 with the difference at the .01 level of confidence. When the two measures of effectiveness were used separately, significant differences were again found in the effectiveness scores of the two groups of students. When only the adviser's ratings were used, the most frequently chosen students were rated as most effective child directors with the difference at the .02 level of confidence. The mean scores for this measure of effectiveness were 106.47 for the most frequently chosen students and 92.15 for the least frequently chosen students. The \( t \)-score was 3.25. The students in the group who were most frequently chosen for various activities by the other group members were also chosen to be child director more often by their fellow students. The mean effectiveness score of the students' choices for the students chosen most frequently for various activities was 3. The \( t \)-score was 4.37 with the
difference at the .01 level of confidence. Table XVII gives these results.

Table XVII

Comparison of the Mean Effectiveness Scores of the Eight Students Who Were Chosen Most Frequently for Various Activities and Eight Students Who Were Chosen Least Frequently for Various Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Total Effectiveness Score</th>
<th>Mean score on Adviser's Ratings</th>
<th>Mean score on Students' Choices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chosen most frequently</td>
<td>73.88</td>
<td>106.47</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(eight students)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chosen least frequently</td>
<td>47.38</td>
<td>92.15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(eight students)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-score</td>
<td>4.14*</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>3.25**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .01 level of confidence.
**Significant at the .02 level of confidence.

A comparison of the seven most effective and the seven least effective child directors did not reveal significant differences between the number of choices received by the students. However, the seven most effective students had a mean score, representing choices for various activities, of 151.29, while the least effective students received a mean score of only 91.57. These scores are in the same direction as the results reported above which
lend support to the hypothesis proposed.

It would seem, from these analyses, that the students whom the adviser and the other students felt were the most effective child directors were also considered more desirable choices in other respects. It suggests that a person who is adequate and confident in many areas is likely to be considered effective as a child director.

It will be recalled that the results of the previous hypothesis showed that the students in a group selected as child director a student whom they rated as being a comfortable group member. It was suggested then that the students may choose a comfortable group member more often for various activities regardless of her abilities. That finding may be related to the fact that the students who were selected most frequently for various activities were also rated as the most effective child directors by the students. The choices made by students for child director, their choices for other activities, and how comfortable they report feeling with other students are interrelated and undoubtedly affect one another.

XI Hypothesis II. Students with whom the home management house infant consumes a higher mean number of ounces of formula per day will be more effective child directors than students with whom the infant consumes a lower mean number of ounces of formula per day.
Data relating to this hypothesis were obtained from the Infant Feeding Record which was kept by each child director while she was in charge of the infant. The mean amount of formula the infant consumed per day with each child director was computed and each student was ranked in her group in order, from those with whom the infant consumed the most mean formula per day to those with whom the infant consumed the least mean formula per day. The two students with whom the infant consumed the most milk and the two students with whom the infant consumed the least milk were selected from each of the four home management house groups.

A comparison of the effectiveness scores of the eight students with whom the infant consumed the highest mean amount of milk and the eight students with whom the infant consumed the lowest mean amount of milk revealed no significant differences in the means. The mean total effectiveness scores were 58.38 for the students with whom the infants consumed the most formula, and 63.63 for the students with whom the infants consumed the least formula. When the two measures of effectiveness were used separately, there were no significant differences revealed. On the adviser's ratings a mean score of 95.27 was received by the students with whom the infant consumed the most formula, and a score of 99.4 was received.
by the students with whom the infant consumed the least amount of formula. The mean scores from the other students' choices were 21.75 for the students with whom the infant ate the most, and 28 for the students with whom the infant ate the least. These mean scores are shown on Table XVIII.

Table XVIII

Comparison of the Mean Effectiveness Scores of Eight Students With Whom the Home Management House Infants Consumed the Most Amount of Formula and the Eight Students With Whom the Home Management House Infants Consumed the Least Amount of Formula

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Total Effectiveness Score</th>
<th>Mean score on Adviser's Ratings</th>
<th>Mean score on Students' Choices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students with whom the home management house infants consumed the most formula. (eight students)</td>
<td>58.38</td>
<td>95.27</td>
<td>21.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with whom the home management house infants consumed the least formula. (eight students)</td>
<td>63.63</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significant difference was shown when the ranks of the seven most effective and the seven least effective child directors were compared. A rank of 1 was given to each student in the four home management house groups with whom the
infant consumed the highest mean amount of milk. A rank of 2 was given to the students with whom the infant in their house consumed the second highest mean amount of milk, and so on. The mean rank for the most effective child directors was 3.42 and the mean rank for the least effective child directors was 2.64.

Contrary to the hypothesis, it would seem that the amount of formula consumed by the infants is not associated with the effectiveness of the students as child directors.

That an increase or decrease in the amount of formula consumed per day by the infants may have nothing to do with the individual child director was shown by the reaction of Kevin, the infant at Withycombe House at Oregon State College, to a new group of students or a new child director. At the beginning of a new group, Kevin's feedings fluctuated from day to day. On some days he ate three meals, others he ate four. In the second week the group was in the house he settled down to three meals a day and continued in this pattern for several days, then he returned to his usual four feedings per day. With each succeeding new child director, however, he usually returned to three meals a day for one or two days. Kevin's reaction to a new group and a new child director seemed to be eating less and sleeping more, regardless
of how effective or ineffective the student was.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine if there are factors which seem to be associated with the effectiveness of home management house students' performance as child directors. To achieve this end, eleven hypotheses were tested dealing with: the number of siblings in the student's family, the position of the student in her family, responsibility assumed for younger siblings by the students, the amount of contact the student had with infants outside of the home, the number of satisfactory experiences the student had had with infants and children, participating or non-participation in a nursery school course by the student, the student's plans for the future, the student's position as child director in her house group, how comfortable the student was to be with as rated by her fellow students, the number of times a student was chosen for various activities by her fellow students, and the amount of formula consumed by the home management house infants while in the care of each student.

Twenty-three students from four home management house groups were used as the subjects of the study. Information for the study was obtained through the use of four instruments. Data collected included personal
information about the twenty-three students, the feeding responses of the home management house infant to each student, the sociometric position of the student in her house group, and a measure of each student's performance as child director as she was rated by the adviser in her house. How effectively each student performed the duty of child director was indicated by a "total effectiveness" score. This score was obtained from two sources, namely, the group members' responses to the second question of the sociometric questionnaire ("I would feel most comfortable about leaving the baby in the care of ______________.") and the adviser's ratings of each student's performance as child director. The choices of the group members for child director were weighted in order that they would contribute equally to the total effectiveness score. These weighted scores were then combined with the scores from the adviser's ratings to give the final effectiveness score of each student.

Each of the eleven hypotheses was tested, using the t-test, in four ways:

1) the mean total effectiveness scores of the groups defined in the hypotheses were compared,

2) the mean effectiveness scores from the
adviser's ratings for each group defined in the hypotheses were compared,

3) the mean effectiveness scores from the other students' choices for each group defined in the hypotheses were compared, and,

4) the seven child directors with the highest total effectiveness scores were compared with the seven child directors having the lowest total effectiveness scores to determine if there were differences in these groups in the terms of the various hypotheses.

The results indicate several interesting trends. Of the four hypotheses which proved to be significant (at or beyond the .05 level of confidence), three were related to personality factors rather than reported background experiences. The students who were chosen most often for various activities by their fellow group members, those who were rated as most comfortable to be with by their fellow group members, and those who were the first and second child directors were significantly more effective as child directors than those students who were chosen least for various activities, were rated as least comfortable to be with, and were the last two child directors in their group. (In three of the four houses, students had an opportunity to
select the order in which they assumed the duty of child director.) While significant differences appeared in these groups when the total effectiveness scores were compared, it is interesting to note that a comparison of the mean scores from the adviser's rating scale was significant only in the case of the hypothesis dealing with the students who were chosen most and least frequently for various activities by their fellow students. How comfortable a student was to be with and the position in which the student held the duty of child director would seem to be two of the factors which the other group members considered when they selected a student to be child director, while the adviser might not be so concerned with these factors when she rated each student.

One factor from the students' background experiences was significant when the total effectiveness scores and the adviser's ratings were compared. This factor concerned the amount of contact the students had had with infants outside of the home. Students with more contact were significantly more effective child directors than students with less contact. This factor was not significant when the students' choices were compared, but the trend of the mean scores was in the same direction. A great deal of contact with infants outside of the home may be an indication of interest in infants with a
feeling of satisfaction arising from these experiences that carried over into the home management house experience. This could be related to the hypothesis dealing with the amount of satisfactory experiences with infants and children which was reported by the students. While the results of this hypothesis did not reach statistical significance, the mean effectiveness scores were definitely in the direction of the more effective students reporting more satisfactory experiences with infants and children. One other factor studied approached significance and can be related to the above. The effectiveness scores of the students who were first born with younger siblings tended to be higher than the scores of the students in other family positions. It may be that having younger siblings was a satisfactory experience for those students and this influenced their performance as child director.

The results of this study give more information about some factors which are important in the success of a student as child director. Personality factors could be explored further in future studies. A personality inventory could be used and the results of this compared with the effectiveness of the students to determine if there are particular characteristics which are associated with a student's performance as child director.
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APPENDIXES
APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF DATA ON 23 STUDENTS FROM HOME MANAGEMENT HOUSES

1. Students
2. Effectiveness Scores
   A. Adviser's ratings
   B. Scores on students' choices for child director from Question Two of sociometric questionnaire
   C. Total Effectiveness Score
3. Number of siblings
4. Family rank
   A. First born with siblings
   B. Other family ranks
5. Responsibility for siblings
   A. Reported assuming responsibility
   B. Did not report assuming responsibility
6. Frequency of contact with infants outside of the home
7. Satisfaction score
8. Dissatisfaction score
9. Total satisfaction score
10. Scores from three projective questions
11. Scores on student's feelings about experience with children
12. Participation in a nursery school course
   A. Have participated
   B. Have not participated
13. Plans for the next two years
   A. Report plans for marriage
   B. Do not report plans for marriage
14. Student's position as child director
15. Weighted score from Question Ten on the sociometric rating scale
16. Weighted score on Questions One through Nine on the sociometric questionnaire
17. Rank order in relation to amount of formula consumed by the infant
### APPENDIX A

**SUMMARY OF DATA ON 23 STUDENTS FROM HOME MANAGEMENT HOUSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S*</th>
<th>1*</th>
<th>2*</th>
<th>3*</th>
<th>4*</th>
<th>5*</th>
<th>6*</th>
<th>7*</th>
<th>8*</th>
<th>9*</th>
<th>10*</th>
<th>11*</th>
<th>12*</th>
<th>13*</th>
<th>14*</th>
<th>15*</th>
<th>16*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>103.88</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>106.94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>98.68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>115.</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>117.86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>88.34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>83.35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>106.9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>84.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>103.59</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>104.5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>97.68</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>117.14</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>85.73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>117.14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>84.69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</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>17</td>
<td>113.41</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>100.43</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>74.44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>87.71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>99.64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>102.16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>103.64</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See previous page*
APPENDIX B

STUDENT INFORMATION FORM

Name................................................. Date_____

1. I am the 1st_2nd_3rd_4th_5th_6th_7th_8th child director in this group. (Place a check by your position.)

2. What is your position in your family?
   Indicate by: 1) Circling the number on the line below which represents your position in your family, as, for example, if you are the second child. 2) Adding the positions of any siblings by writing B (for boy) or G (for girl) above the number which represents the position of a brother or sister, and adding besides the B or G the number of years he or she is older or younger than you, as in the example below: B-8 for a brother 8 years older than yourself and G-1 for a sister one year younger.

   Example: B-8 G-1
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

3. If you have younger siblings:
   a. What responsibility did you take for them when they were under a year old?

   over a year old?

   b. What things did you enjoy about having younger siblings when they were under a year old?
over a year old?

c. What things did you dislike about having younger siblings when they were under a year old?

over a year old?

4. How much experience have you had with infants (children under one year of age) outside of your own immediate family? Please mark the approximate amount on the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no contact*</td>
<td>occasional contact with 1-3 infants</td>
<td>Frequent contacts with 1 infant or occasional contact</td>
<td>Frequent contacts with 2 or 3 infants</td>
<td>Frequent contacts with 6 or more infants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* "contact" means being around the infant for an hour or more.
** "occasional" means four or less contacts with an infant per year.
*** "frequent" means six or more contacts with an infant per year.

5. a. Have you had any especially pleasant experiences with infants? Yes__No__ Describe briefly.
b. Have you had any especially unpleasant experiences with infants? Yes No Describe briefly.

6. As you look back on your experiences with children do you feel they were predominately
   Please __pleasant
cHECK ONE __unpleasant
   ___profitable
   ___confusing
   ___neutral (no feelings about them)

7. Complete the following sentences with whatever comes to your mind first:
   When I hear a baby cry, I
   Children are always
   A baby is nicest when

8. What are your plans for the next two years?

9. Have you taken, or are you now taking, a course which included working with children in a nursery school?
   ___Yes ___No
APPENDIX C-1

DIRECTIONS FOR INFANT FEEDING CHART

1. Please fill in the birthdate of the infant.

2. If you are the first child director, write your name on the line under the heading "Student's Name". If you are the second through the last child director, write your name in the right-hand side of the chart in the block of space that indicates your time as child director.

3. Draw a double line between your last day as child director and the next child director's first day.

4. Put a dot on the proper date line, in the column showing the number of ounces of formula the baby took during that day.
### APPENDIX C-2

#### INFANT'S FEEDING RECORD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number of ounces consumed per day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student's Name**

1st

Child Director
APPENDIX D

FORM 4

Name __________________ Date __________________

STUDY OF GROUP RELATIONSHIPS

One of the values of the Home Management House is the opportunity it offers for relationships with others. At the end of the experience it is worth while to look back and to be aware of what these relationships were. How did members of the group develop? What are your answers to these questions? (Your answers will be kept confidential. They will be used for research purposes, but only with names omitted so that no identification of individuals will be possible.)

1. In case of an emergency, I would like to have ____________ with me.

2. I would feel most comfortable about leaving the baby in the care of ________________.

3. If I needed to ask someone to do a favor for me, I would ask ________________.

4. I would choose to invite an important guest to dinner at the house while _____________ was cook.

5. I would like to have ________________ with me as co-hostess for a tea.

6. I would like to have ________________ help in carrying out a duty.

7. I would like to help ________________ in carrying out a duty.

8. I felt that ________________ managed her time best.

9. If I were to settle in a strange town, I would like to find ________________ living there.

10. On leaving the house, I feel most comfortable (relaxed, like to be with) with the girls as follows: (indicate where you would place each girl on the following scale from least-comfortable-with to most-comfortable-with.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF GIRL</th>
<th>Feel very uncomfortable with</th>
<th>Feel uncomfortable with</th>
<th>Feel neutral with</th>
<th>Feel comfortable with</th>
<th>Feel very comfortable with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questionnaire developed at Oregon State College, School of Home Economics
APPENDIX E

EVALUATION OF STUDENT'S PERFORMANCE AS CHILD DIRECTOR

FORM 5

Student's Name
Date blank filled out

Directions: The following sentences describe areas of student behavior important in the care of an infant. Put a cross at the point on the line which you feel represents the behavior of this student while she was child director, with the left hand end of the line as the point indicating almost none of this behavior and the right hand end of the line as the point indicating an optimum amount of this behavior in respect to this area of behavior. On the last page there is room for any comments you have about the student in addition to the items below. Please include any remarks made by the student about the baby, about babies in general, or her past experiences with them and any attitudes which you may feel she has shown toward the baby. If any items do not apply to your situation mark as "No opportunity for judging."

1. Is aware of safety and health precautions, such as:
   - keeps the food and formula refrigerated, keeps pins away from the baby, does not leave him alone on a high bed or table, keeps baby away from drafts, wears clean clothes and washes her hands before caring for the baby.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shows almost none</th>
<th>Shows enough of this behavior to</th>
<th>Shows optimum amount of this behavior to insure the welfare of the infant in a reasonably satisfactory way.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Keeps the baby's room clean: removes food dishes, keeps clothes picked up, changes the bed when needed, takes care of used diapers properly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Almost none</th>
<th>Enough</th>
<th>Optimum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Is careful in preparing formula; manages time well in planning when to prepare it, sees that the baby is offered a balanced diet with plenty of foods he likes (if he is eating solids).

| Almost none | Enough | Optimum |

4. Makes eating attractive, but avoids urging when the baby does not want food.

| Almost none | Enough | Optimum |

5. Bathes the baby every day unless there is a good reason to the contrary; makes the bath time pleasant by giving the baby time to enjoy the experience and handling him gently but firmly.

| Almost none | Enough | Optimum |

6. Handles soiling in a matter of fact way, makes sure the baby is clean and comfortable.

| Almost none | Enough | Optimum |

7. Shows good judgement in the selection of the proper place for the baby to play as: away from drafts, where the baby can move safely, a place that does not interfere with others: keeps toys picked up when not in use.

| Almost none | Enough | Optimum |
8. Provides appropriate playthings, offers appropriate experiences as a change of room he is in, time outdoors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shows almost none</th>
<th>Shows enough of</th>
<th>Shows optimum amount of this behavior to insure the welfare of the infant in a reasonably satisfactory way.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. Accepts irregularities in sleep rhythm of baby, but encourages more regularity in line with the baby's own patterns; makes rest easy for the baby by talking in a low, calm voice, avoiding stimulating him when he is tired and ready for sleep.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Almost none</th>
<th>Enough</th>
<th>Optimum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. Is aware of the baby's basic schedule, but is able to accept fluctuations and adjust comfortably to the baby's varying demands from day to day.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Almost none</th>
<th>Enough</th>
<th>Optimum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. Protects the baby from overstimulation: avoids unnecessary contacts with many people at one time, protects him from demands for responses from many people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Almost none</th>
<th>Enough</th>
<th>Optimum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12. Seeks to understand reasons for the baby's unusual behavior, as: not "Just fussy.", but "May be fussy, because...".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Almost none</th>
<th>Enough</th>
<th>Optimum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13. Accepts her responsibility for the child and does not ask other people to care for the baby more than is necessary or desirable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Almost none</th>
<th>Enough</th>
<th>Optimum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
14. Manages her time wisely so that she will be as rested as possible in caring for the baby, is relaxed and comfortable with the baby.

Almost none  

Enough  

Optimum

15. Shows affection for the baby, seems to enjoy being with him, but does not demand a response from him.

Almost none  

Enough  

Optimum

16. Uses own initiative in making decisions as child director, is able to take action when necessary without supervision.

Almost none  

Enough  

Optimum

17. Is able to use the help of the adviser and accepts suggestions; reads and discusses and makes use of other resources at hand that will help her be a better child director.

Almost none  

Enough  

Optimum

18. Can accept interest and help of others, not overly possessive of the child.

Almost none  

Enough  

Optimum

19. Shows interest in the baby, as, took an opportunity to get acquainted with the baby before she was child director (if not the first) and to spend time with the baby after she was no longer child director (if not the last one in the group).

Almost none  

Enough  

Optimum

20. Seems to find real satisfaction in the baby's development, watching him but not "pushing" or interfering with him.

Almost none  

Enough  

Optimum

Name of Resident Adviser ____________________
APPENDIX F

FORM 3

Name__________________
Date__________________

EVALUATION OF EXPERIENCE BY CHILD DIRECTOR

1. What are some of the important things you learned while you were child director?

2. What things did you enjoy most about caring for the baby?

3. What things did you enjoy the least?

4. Did you change your ideas on infant care while you were child director? If so, how?

5. What value do you think this experience will have for you in the future?
APPENDIX G

FORM 6

School of Home Economics
Oregon State College
Corvallis, Oregon
November, 1956

Miss

Dear Miss______,

Mrs._______ has informed me that you are willing to help me gather data for a study I am conducting on factors that are associated with a student's performance as child director in a Home Management House. Some of the information I am collecting on the students will be sibling rank order, amount and quality of responsibility assumed for siblings, amount and quality of responsibility assumed for infants, group relationships in the Home Management House, plans for the next two years, position as child director, and experiences in a nursery school.

The forms which I am using in collecting the data are: 1) Student Information Form, 2) Infant's Feeding Record, 3) Evaluation of Experience by Child Director, 4) Study of Group Relationships, and 5) Evaluation of Student's Performance as Child Director. I shall appreciate it very much if you can use them with your group in the following way:

1) The Student Information Form (Number 1, enclosed) to be given to each student to fill out within the first week that she is in the Home Management House.

2) The Infant's Feeding Record (Number 2, enclosed) to be kept by each student in charge of the infant. The student should record on the chart the total amount of formula consumed per day by the infant each day during the time she is child director. (Complete instructions for the use of this form are included with the chart.)
3) **The Evaluation of Experience by Child Director** (Number 3, enclosed) to be written by the student at the end of her experience as child director. Please have the child director complete the form and hand it in to you within two days after the completion of the job.

4) **The Study of Group Relationships form** (Number 4, enclosed) to be filled out by all members of the group sometime during the last two or three days the group is in the House. Please read the instructions on question 10 over carefully with the students at the time they fill out the form, so they will understand the manner in which they are to list their fellow students.

5) **Evaluation of Student's Performance as Child Director.** I will need your help in making an evaluation of each student's performance as child director. Would you please fill out a form on each student within two days after each student has finished her assignment as child director.

When all of the material is completed, i.e., at the end of the group's stay in the House, please send it to me in the enclosed envelope.

One last thing. I would like to get some information on you! Please answer the following questions and send this part of the letter to me with the other material.

I would like to express my appreciation to you and your students for your cooperation and assistance. Without it this study would not be possible.

How many quarters or semesters have you lived in a Home Management House as a resident adviser? Name
How many quarters or semesters have you lived in a Home Management House with an infant?
Did you live in a Home Management House as a student?
If so, did you have the opportunity to care for the baby there?

Sincerely,
### APPENDIX H

**T-scores Obtained from Data Relating to Eleven Hypotheses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Comparison of Total Effectiveness Scores</th>
<th>Comparison of Adviser's ratings</th>
<th>Comparison of scores from other students' choices</th>
<th>Comparison of the seven most effective and the seven least effective child directors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.85*</td>
<td>2.95*</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.62*</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>3.01**</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.88*</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>2.9*</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.14***</td>
<td>4.37***</td>
<td>3.25**</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level of confidence.
** Significant at the .02 level of confidence.
*** Significant at the .01 level of confidence.