

KNOWLEDGE OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT OF
HOME ECONOMICS STUDENTS

By

MICHELLE GLOZIER KING

Bachelor of Science in Home Economics

University of Tennessee at Martin

Martin, Tennessee

1986

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
July, 1988

Thesis
1988
K535.R
cop. 2



KNOWLEDGE OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT OF
HOME ECONOMICS STUDENTS

Thesis Approved:

A.M. Fulton

Thesis Adviser

Mona Lane

Atkea Wright

Norman N. Durham

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Sincere appreciation is expressed to my adviser, Dr. Arlene M. Fulton, for her endless advice, encouragement, support and friendship during my study. I am also grateful to committee members, Dr. Althea Wright and Mona Lane, for their advice, suggestions, and support during the writing of this thesis.

Appreciation is also extended to Dr. Dave Fournier who generously gave of his time and expertise in computer analysis of my data and to Dr. Sarah L. Anderson who helped me get this thesis off the ground.

Thanks are extended to Home Economics instructors, Karleen Sheets, Barbara Rackley, and Hazel Waldron-Forsythe, for allowing me to collect data in their classes and to the students in Home Economics: *Professionalism, Issues and Actions* and to students in *Careers in Home Economics* for providing the data needed for this study.

I am thankful to my family members and friends who were constant contributors of support and understanding.

Special thanks is extended to Marsha Speer, who pulled this paper together into its final form.

My deepest appreciation and gratitude is expressed to my parents, Bobby and Louise Glozier for their unforgettable encouragement, confidence, and sacrifices made during my college endeavors.

Finally, I would like to express a sincere thanks to my husband, Jeff, for the moral support given during the long hours required for this study. Thanks are also expressed for the many patient hours of teaching me computer skills,

skills that were required to finish this project. With all my gratitude and love, Jeff, I dedicate this thesis to you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of Study	2
Hypotheses.....	3
Definitions of Terms.....	3
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	5
Effects of Parenting on Child Development.....	6
Adolescent Knowledge of Child Development	8
College Student's Knowledge of Child Development.....	10
Summary.....	11
III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES	12
Procedure.....	12
Subjects.....	13
Data Collection.....	13
Instrument.....	14
Analysis of Data	14
Test-Retest Reliability.....	15
IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	16
Subjects.....	16
Hypotheses.....	16
Additional Findings.....	21
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	23
Conclusions	23
Recommendations.....	25
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	27
APPENDIXES.....	29
APPENDIX A - CHILD BEHAVIOR AND DEVELOPMENT INVENTORY QUESTIONNAIRE	30

Chapter	Page
APPENDIX B - STATEMENT TO SUBJECTS.....	42
APPENDIX C - CORRESPONDENCES	44
APPENDIX D - VARIABLE CODE LABELS.....	48

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Comparison of Four Subscales of CBDI	18
II. Analysis of Variance on Selected Variables	20
III. Child Behavior-Development Inventory-Subscales, Pearson Correlation Coefficient.....	22

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Considerable attention has been given to the relationship between child development knowledge and effective child rearing. Of great concern, is the training individuals receive to take on the responsibility of parent. Also, along with the importance of being knowledgeable about child development is the ability for individuals to provide quality learning environments for children.

The role of parent has had much emphasis in recent years, stressing the importance of the parent's role in developing proper growth and development of the child. How do individuals obtain skills for this demanding role? Wolfendale (1983) stated that the role of parent is a full-time "occupation" but not a "skilled trade" in the sense that society demands or provides prior training for parenthood. On the whole, many adults take on the role of parent, ignorant of many aspects of child development, early learning processes, care of the child, or the procedures by which to obtain information and support for this new role.

As commented by Larsen and Juhasz (1985), parenting roles and abilities are assumed to develop naturally as a result of family membership. However, with the small, mobile family of today few experiences with young children are provided. Many take on this new role assuming that the parental role is a natural talent and that parenting is always a joyful, positive experience.

Societies in the past relied upon the passing of child care information from generation to generation, but with the changes brought about by technology and urbanization, this means of information has been encroached

upon (Roehl, Herr, and Applehaus, 1985). According to Herr and Gill (1978), these changes in our society have made the role of parent a more confusing one.

With this in mind, many individuals take on the parental role with limited knowledge about child development. How does this lack of knowledge impact on the child's full developmental growth? DeLissovoy (1973) believes that a major component associated with unrealistic developmental and behavioral expectations of children is the lack of child development and child rearing knowledge. Of great concern in this study is the child development knowledge undergraduate students have and how this knowledge will affect them as parents in the future.

Purpose of Study

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the knowledge level of child development of Home Economics undergraduate students. Specific objectives of the study were:

1. To compare freshmen and senior students in regard to child development knowledge.
2. To compare freshmen and senior students' scores on the four subscales of the Child Behavior and Development Inventory (CBDI): infant-toddler development, preschool development, school-age development, and adolescent development.
3. To investigate the level of child development knowledge of undergraduate students on four subscales of the CBDI on the basis of the following variables:
 - a. prior coursework in child development
 - b. age

- c. program of study
- d. parenthood status
- e. birth order

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were formulated in relation to this study:

Hypothesis I: Senior students will have a significantly higher level of knowledge of child development than will freshmen students.

Hypothesis II: Senior students will have a significantly higher level of knowledge of child development than will freshmen students when examining the four subscales of the Child Behavior and Development Inventory: infant-toddler development, preschool development, school-age development, and adolescent development.

Hypothesis III: There will be no significant difference between undergraduate student's knowledge of child development on the four subscales of the CBDI on the basis of:

- a. prior coursework in child development
- b. age
- c. program of study
- d. parenthood status
- e. birth order

Definition of Terms

In order that accurate understanding and interpretation of the study was assured, it was necessary to define the following terms.

1. Infant-Toddler development. Development that occurs from birth through age 2.

2. Preschool development. Development that occurs from age three through age five.
3. School age development. Development that occurs from age six through age eleven.
4. Adolescent development. Development that occurs from age twelve through age eighteen.
5. Knowledge. Oxford American Dictionary (1980) defines knowledge as the organized body of information (p. 367).
6. Level of Knowledge. All that an individual knows about a subject, topic or entity.
7. Prior Coursework. Courses completed in child development or child care in high school or college.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In recent years, much emphasis has been placed on the role of parents in the overall development of their children. Many parents enter the role of parenthood lacking knowledge of child development and the realization of the demands of being a parent. Wolfendale (1983) stated that parenting is a full-time "occupation," but not a "skilled trade" in the sense that society demands or provides prior training to parenthood. On the whole, adults take on the role of parent ignorant of many aspects of child development, early learning processes, care of the child, or the procedures by which to obtain information and support for this new role.

Many individuals enter the parenting role with assumptions about parenthood. Larsen and Juhasz (1985) commented that two false assumptions exist toward parenting. The first is that the ability to raise children is a natural talent possessed by most parents; and secondly, that parenting is always a joyful, positive experience. These parenting roles and abilities are assumed to develop naturally as a result of family membership. However, with the small, mobile family of today, few experiences with young children are provided.

In regard to the demanding role of parenthood, Roehl, Herr and Applehaus (1985) stated:

parenting is a significant task for mothers and fathers; however, few adults receive systematic instruction for this perplexing and demanding role. Most parents undertake this duty with limited

knowledge of child development; consequently, many of their parenting techniques are simply survival strategies. To prevent fragmented and inconsistent interaction, parents need to have relevant information and interaction techniques related to the child's optimal social, physical, emotional, and intellectual development and acquisition of skills in these areas (p. 20).

In order to examine the relationship between knowledge of child development and parenting, it is necessary to be aware of the outcomes of recent research directed primarily toward parent groups. To review this area of research, this chapter has been divided into three parts. These parts are: 1) effects of parenting on child development, 2) adolescent knowledge of child development, and 3) college students' knowledge of child development.

Effects of Parenting on the Child's Development

Much emphasis has been placed on the parenting role and its effects and the growth of the child. How important is this role parents take in the process of their child's development? Pikunas (1969) stated that the parental treatment of an infant can either develop security and growth or prevent it. Pikunas further stated that a relationship between parent and child establishes harmonious balance, where the neglect of the parental responsibility may have negative conclusions later in the child's development.

In a study by Goldstein and Blackman (1976) results revealed that there was a relationship between children's cognitive style and the maternal attitudes toward the childbearing role, and that mothers who revealed positive attitudes of the homemaking role had children with higher levels of cognitive complexity.

Hoff (1978) stated that a child's personality development depends a great deal on the parent's acceptance and attitude toward the child.

Stevens (1984) conducted a study to determine if there was a relationship between parents, their skills in supporting development of their child and their knowledge about child development. Results revealed that what parents know is positively related to their skill in developing a supportive environment for their children, even though the relationship was a weak one. When parenting skills were examined more closely, parents who were more aware of the degree of their importance were those that were observed to behave in ways more supportive of mental development.

Related to the effect parents have on their children's development, DeLissovoy (1973) believed that a major component associated with unrealistic developmental and behavioral expectations of children is lack of child development and child rearing knowledge.

Along with the importance of a strong background of child development knowledge and a positive attitude toward parenting, Ford, Massey and Hyde (1985) stated that individuals must take seriously the responsibilities of parenthood. Hoff (1978) commented that the role of parent should not be entered into lightly, and that there is a great need for prospective parents to assess their attitudes toward parenting before taking on this demanding role.

What characteristics should prospective parents have before entering parenthood? Stevens (1984) stated that the key factor in being a skillful parent is the accumulation of knowledge about basic mechanism concerning developmental processes and information about the course of normal development. Of great importance is allowing individuals the opportunity to explore the parenting role from an emotional, cognitive and behavioral view through parent education (Ford, Massey, and Hyde, 1985).

Why is the role of parent so difficult? Herr and Gill (1975) concur that because of changes in our society, the role of parenting has become confusing. Roehl, Herr and Applehaus (1985) stated that in many societies individuals rely upon the passing of parenting information from generation to generation, but because of changes brought about by technology and urbanization, this means has been encroached upon and individuals are left to rely upon themselves.

Adolescent Knowledge of Child Development

Are adolescents adequately prepared for the role of parenthood? DeLissovoy (1973) commented that adolescent parents are less aware of how to stimulate development of their children and less sensitive to behavior signals from their infants. Gullo (1985) stated that children born to adolescents are at higher risk for delays because of the maternal lack of knowledge related to infant development.

In an influential study assessing high school drop-outs who were parents, DeLissovoy (1973) found that the young parents did not know about developmental norms associated with their child's development. Along with this lack of knowledge, the parents had unrealistic expectations for their children and used spanking and slapping as common practices of physical punishment once the child started to crawl. When asked how often they spanked, replies included "when I can't take it any longer," "when he deserves it," and "it depends on what he does." It was also concluded in the DeLissovoy (1973) study that experiences with siblings or baby sitting had not provided an understanding of how a child develops or what is entailed to raise a child.

When comparing older mothers and adolescent mothers in relation to child development knowledge, (1) adolescent parents were less likely to spend time interacting with their infants (DeLissovoy, 1973; Baldwin and Cain, 1980);

(2) adolescents were prone to use more physical punishment than older parents (DeLissovoy, 1973); and (3) adolescents were less aware of how to stimulate development and less aware of interpreting behavior signals from their infants (DeLissovoy, 1973; Baldwin and Cain, 1980).

Looking at adolescent knowledge of child development, Johnson, Loxterkamp and Albanese (1982) administered the Iowa Child Development Test to high school students in Iowa. Results of the study revealed that students in grades 9-12 had poor knowledge of child development and health maintenance. It was further found that those students who were least knowledgeable were found to respond with abusive approaches to discipline problems and that boys at all grade levels were found to be least knowledgeable about child development.

Using the Iowa Child Development Test, Showers and Johnson (1985) assessed the child health and development knowledge of urban adolescents in Ohio. The Iowa Child Development Test was administered to seniors and sophomores at three high schools. Results indicated the following there was no difference reported between schools, stating that there was a general lack of child development knowledge by adolescents; girls scored higher than the boys in each level in all high schools; both adolescent female groups and male groups scored higher on the health section than on the child development section; and none of the four groups scored higher than fifty-percent on the child development section.

Further concern was expressed because of some troubling responses made by the students. When the students were assessed, the following responses raised concern: only one-half (50%) recognized that shaking a child could cause danger; forty-seven percent stated that toilet training should start at age one, a task that is inappropriate for a one year old; sixteen percent said that

they would spank one and two year olds for having toileting accidents; and sixty-nine percent stated that when a three-year old sucked his/her thumb, this would be considered an abnormal behavior.

College Students' Knowledge of Child Development

What do our future parents and educators know about child development? Are they adequately prepared to enter parenthood and care for children? Most important of all are they prepared to care for children?

Shaner, Peterson and Roscoe (1985) conducted a study involving two hundred and eighty university students. Researchers administered a 16-item questionnaire consisting of items focusing on social and physical development of children ages birth to three. Results of the study indicated that students underestimated the age which children accomplish developmental skills and overestimated on nine times. Additionally, the males in the study had more difficulty estimating the achievement of social skills than did their female counterparts. A relationship between student classification and student age was not found. Results of this study conclude that caring for children is left to a trial-and-error process that may come too late.

Another study assessing child development knowledge of college students was conducted by Showers and Johnson (1984). The following results were noted: college students had inadequate knowledge concerning child development; those who most frequently chose harsh disciplinary methods in simulated child management situations, were least knowledgeable about child development; college men know less than college women about child development, and although non-education majors did not differ in regard to knowledge level of child development, they frequently chose punitive and abusive responses.

When measuring undergraduate students' knowledge in the area of child development, Fulton and Anderson (1986) utilized the Child Behavior and Development Inventory (Teleki, 1982). It was found that college students tended to have a higher knowledge level of older children than of younger children. In addition, knowledge of physical development was greater than knowledge of cognitive or social-emotional development. Overall, total scores of the college students tended to be low ($\bar{X} = 66.97$).

Summary

The following significant items summarize the research conducted in terms of the three sections reviewed:

1. The knowledge one has concerning child development has a significant effect on that individual's role as a parent.
2. Adolescents lack knowledge of normal child development and have inadequate knowledge of proper child health practices.
3. Many college students lack basic child development skills needed in parenting.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This study was undertaken in order to gain insight into the level of child development knowledge that undergraduates have as related to developmental milestones children accomplish as they grow and develop. An additional investigation included the comparison of senior and freshmen students based on selected variables.

To meet the objectives of this study, descriptive research was utilized as a research design. According to Issac and Michael (1981) descriptive research is used to describe characteristics, facts and make comparisons among given populations. Another purpose is to identify problems or justify current conditions and practices.

Procedure

The Child Behavior and Development Inventory (Teleki, 1982) was administered to 129 undergraduate students enrolled in "Career Explorations in Home Economics," a required course for freshmen enrolled in the College of Home Economics and "Home Economics: Professionalism, Issues and Actions," a required course for seniors in the College of Home Economics. Administration of the questionnaire took place in February of 1987. The questionnaire took approximately 45 minutes to administer. Prior to administering the questionnaire (Appendix A), the researcher read a statement to subjects explaining the completion of the questionnaire and stating that

participation was voluntary (Appendix B). To ensure confidentiality, the subjects used computerized answer sheets identified by subject numbers. In addition, the subjects were asked to refrain from putting their names on the questionnaire.

Subjects

The population upon which this study was based consisted of freshmen (n=21) and senior (n=80) students enrolled in the College of Home Economics at Oklahoma State University. Only females were included in this study because male enrollment was limited to one student. Subjects represented each department in the College of Home Economics: Family Relations and Child Development; Clothing, Textiles and Merchandising; Food Nutrition and Institution Administration; Home Economics Education and Community Services; and Housing, Interior Design and Consumer Studies. Subjects ranged in age from 18 years to 45 years and represented a non-random cluster sample.

Data Collection

The instrument used to assess child development knowledge was the Child Behavior and Development Inventory (Teleki, 1982). Student scores on the Child Behavior and Development Inventory as a whole and on the four subscales (infant-toddler development, preschool development, school age development, and adolescent development) were examined in relation to the following variables: age, prior coursework in child development, program of study, birth order, and parenthood status. Data was collected in two separate courses in the College of Home Economics during a fourteen day interval. All data was collected during February of 1987.

Instrument

The Child Behavior and Development Inventory (CBDI), developed by Teleki (1982), was utilized in gathering information on child development knowledge for this study. The short form version of the CBDI questionnaire consisted of 65 questions related to developmental milestones children go through from infancy to adolescence.

The following 4 data subscales were created from the inventory: infant-toddler development (n=17), preschool development (n=21), school-age development (n=13), and adolescent development (n=14). Subjects were asked to read developmental statements about children and select the appropriate response. Responses corresponded to the stage at which the subject thought most children first showed the behavior or reached the milestone. The following stages were provided as guidelines:

- A. Infancy-Toddlerhood: birth to 2 years,
- B. Preschool: 3 to 5 years,
- C. School Age: 6 to 11 years, and
- D. Adolescence: 12 to 18 years.

Subjects were also given 12 additional questions relating to demographic information. Demographic information included age, program of study, classification, prior coursework in child development, parenthood status, and birth order.

Analysis of Data

Data was analyzed via the SPSS-X statistical computer program with Analysis of Variance, Pearson Correlation Coefficient and t-test scores being

used in the study. The researcher used code labels for variables represented in this study (Appendix D).

Test-Retest Reliability

To measure reliability of the Child Behavior and Development Inventory (Teleki, 1982) for population being studied, a test-retest of the questionnaire was administered to 94 students. Useable data was collected from 80 subjects. The retest was administered one week after subjects completed the first questionnaire. Three days prior to the test-retest session, a statement was sent to instructors to remind students of the retest (Appendix C). Due to the lack of participation in the scheduled test-retest session, the researcher attended a scheduled class session of the senior level class "Home Economics: Professionalism, Issues and Actions." Pearson Correlation Coefficient was utilized in determining the reliability of the Child Behavior and Development Inventory on the four subscales: infant-toddler development; preschool development; school-age development; and adolescent development.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter will present and analyze the data of the Child Behavior and Development Inventory (Teleki, 1982). Reliability of the CBDI for the population of subjects studied was completed through a test-retest evaluation of the scores.

Subjects

The subjects were a sample of undergraduate Home Economics students. Subjects represented a non-random sample of the population. Mean age of the subjects was 21 years. The Child Behavior and Development Inventory was administered to 129 subjects with useable data collected from 101 subjects. Twenty-one subjects were enrolled in a freshmen level course, and 80 subjects were enrolled in a senior level course.

Hypotheses

The results of this study will be presented in the order in which the hypotheses were presented in Chapter I.

Hypothesis #1. Senior students will have a significantly higher level of knowledge of child development than freshmen students. A t-test was performed to compare mean scores of senior subjects and freshmen subjects. The mean score on the CBDI for seniors was $\bar{X} = 38.0125$. Mean score for freshmen subjects was $\bar{X} = 35.8095$. Results of the data indicate that senior

students did not display a significantly higher level of child development knowledge than freshmen students, $F(2, 99) = 1.50, p < .094$.

Hypothesis #2. Senior students will have a significantly higher level of knowledge of child development than will freshmen students when examining the four subscales of the Child Behavior and Development Inventory. A t-test was performed on the data to compare the means of the four subscales. A significant difference was found in one of the four subscales of the Child Behavior and Development Inventory. A significant difference was found on the subscale of infant-toddler development with upper division students scoring significantly higher than lower division students, $F(2, 99) = 1.15, p < .0255$. When further examining undergraduate's knowledge of child development on the four subscales of the CBDI, no significant differences were found in the subscales of preschool development, $F(2, 99) = 1.01, p < .0925$; school age development, $F(2, 99) = 1.19$; and adolescent development, $F(2, 99) = 1.10, p < .2925$. A summary of the analysis can be found in Table I.

Hypothesis #3. There will be no significant difference between undergraduate student's knowledge of child development on the four subscales of the Child Behavior and Development Inventory on the basis of: a) prior coursework, b) age, c) program of study, d) parenthood status, and e) birthorder. Analysis of Variance was performed on the data of each of the selected variables as related to the four subscales of the Child Behavior and Development Inventory. Data was analyzed at the .05 level of significance. When examining the selected variables, prior coursework had no significant relationship with the subscales of infant-toddler development, $F(3,97) = .550, p < .460$, school age development, $F(3,97) = .093, p < .761$, and preschool development, $F(3,97) = 3.853, p < .053$. Prior coursework was found to be significantly related to adolescent development, $F(3, 97) = 5.010, p < .027$.

TABLE I
T-TEST ANALYSIS COMPARING FOUR SUBSCALES OF CBDI*

Variable	Number of Subjects	Mean Score	F Value	P
INF-TOD (n = 17)				
**Group 1	21	7.2381	1.15	.0255
***Group 2	80	8.7000		
PRESCH (n = 21)				
Group 1	21	12.0476	1.01	.0925
Group 2	80	13.0500		
SCHOOL (n = 13)				
Group 1	21	7.6667	1.19	.4655
Group 2	80	7.7000		
ADOL (n = 14)				
Group 1	21	8.8571	1.10	.2925
Group 2	80	8.5625		

*At .05 level of significance.

*Group 1 = Freshmen (n = 21)

**Group 2 = Seniors (n = 80)

When further examining selected variables, no significant relationships were found between age and the subscales of infant-toddler development, $E(4, 96) = .407, p < .748$; preschool development, $E(4, 96) = 1.357, p < .261$; school-age development, $E(4, 96) = .789, p < .503$; and adolescent development, $E(4, 96) = 1.088, p < .358$. When examining program of study and child development knowledge, no significant relationship was found in the areas of infant-toddler development, $E(9, 91) = 1.691, p < .159$; preschool development, $E(9, 91) = 1.531, p < .200$; school-age development, $E(9, 91) = .949, p < .439$; and adolescent development, $E(9, 91) = .523, p < .719$. These results are presented on Table II.

When examining parenthood status and its relationship to the four subscales, significant differences were found in the areas of infant-toddler development, $E(3,94) = 5.979, p < .016$; and adolescent development, $E(3,94) = 3.986, p < .049$. Parenthood status was not significantly related to the subscales of preschool development, $E(3,94) = .059, p < .809$; and school-age development, $E(3,94) = 1.783, p < .185$ (Table II).

Results indicated no significant relationship to birth order when making comparison to infant-toddler development, $E(8,85) = .392, p < .814$; school-age development, $E(8,85) = 1.487, p < .213$; preschool development, $E(8,85) = .215, p < .929$; and adolescent development, $E(8,85) = .706, p < .590$.

In summary, Hypothesis #3 was in part accepted and in part rejected in accordance to analysis of specific variables. Those accepted were prior coursework and its significant relationship to adolescent development and parenthood status and its significant relationship in the subscales of infant-toddler development and adolescent development. Other parts of Hypothesis #3 were rejected based on no significant difference among the selected variables.

TABLE II
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE RESULTS OF SELECTED VARIABLES*

Variable	F	Significance of F
<u>Prior Coursework</u>		
Infant-Toddler	.550	.460
School	.093	.761
Preschool	3.853	.053
Adolescent	5.010	.027*
<u>Age</u>		
Infant-Toddler	.407	.748
School	.789	.503
Preschool	1.357	.261
Adolescent	1.088	.358
<u>Program of Study</u>		
Infant-Toddler	1.691	.159
School	.949	.439
Preschool	1.531	.200
Adolescent	.523	.719
<u>Parenthood Status</u>		
Infant-Toddler	5.979	.016*
School	1.783	.185
Preschool	.059	.809
Adolescent	3.986	.049*
<u>Birth Order</u>		
Infant-Toddler	.392	.814
School	1.487	.213
Preschool	.215	.929
Adolescent	.706	.590

n = 101

*At .05 level of significance.

Additional Findings

To measure reliability of the instrument in this study, the researcher conducted a test-retest of the questionnaire with the senior subjects ($n=80$) in this study. A Pearson Correlation Coefficient was utilized in analyzing the relationship between test-retest scores of the instrument.

In test-retest scores on the infant toddler subscale (Table III), a medium positive relationship was demonstrated, $r(80) = .4934$, $p < .000$. A low positive relationship was displayed in the area of preschool development, $r(80) = .2617$, $p < .010$. In addition, a negative relationship was found in the school age subscale, $r(80) = -.0262$, $p < .409$, while a positive relationship was found in the adolescent subscale, $r(80) = .1327$, $p < .120$.

An examination of the test-retest results in this study suggest that further testing be conducted on the Child Behavior and Development Inventory in order that it may be further examined as a reliable instrument to evaluate child development knowledge. In reviewing results of the Pearson Correlation Coefficient with subjects in this study, a high correlation coefficient was not indicated.

TABLE III
CHILD BEHAVIOR DEVELOPMENT INVENTORY - SUBSCALES
PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENT

	r Value	Number of Subjects	p Value
R Test* INF TOD	.4934	80	.000
R Test PRESCHL	.2617	80	.010
R Test SCHOOL	-.0262	80	.409
R Test ADOL	.1327	80	.120

*R Test = test-retest reliability.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

The first major hypothesis stated that senior students will have a higher level of knowledge of child development as assessed by total scores on the CBDI than freshmen students. This hypothesis was tested in an effort to support or refute that classification has an effect on an individual's level of child development knowledge. Results of the analysis reveal that seniors did display a significantly higher knowledge level of child development than lower division students on the CBDI. The findings suggest that advanced studies do affect the knowledge level of child development in Home Economics students

The second major hypothesis stated that senior students will have a significantly higher level of knowledge of child development than will freshmen students when examining the four subscales of the CBDI. It was concluded in the analysis that the only subscale showing a significant difference was infant-toddler development.

The results of this analysis raise the question of whether students are adequately obtaining the child development knowledge needed for parenthood or for professions in the field of child development or early childhood education. Results suggest a need to provide students with more child development knowledge on all developmental ages.

When looking at the 65 items on the CBDI, seniors scored 51% correct on the subscale infant-toddler development (n=17), 62% correct on the

subscale preschool development (n=21), 59% correct on the subscale school-age development (n=13), and 61% correct on the subscale adolescent development (n=14). Freshmen scored 42% correct on the subscale infant-toddler development (n=17), 57% correct on the subscale preschool development (n=21), 58% correct on the subscale school-age development (n=13), and 63% correct on the subscale adolescent development (n=14).

The third major hypothesis for this study stated that there would be no significant difference between undergraduate's knowledge of child development on the four subscales of the CBDI on the basis of five selected variables. Analysis indicated that prior coursework had a significant relationship in relation to only one subscale of the CBDI, namely adolescent development. This indicates that students have a higher level of knowledge of older children than of younger children. This raises a concern that students are not adequately obtaining child development knowledge needed to adequately meet the needs of younger children.

When examining age and birth order and their effect on child development knowledge, no significant relationship were found on any of the four subscales of the Child Behavior and Development Inventory. One might assume that maturity would affect an individual's knowledge of child development. Further study is suggested to examine age as a separate variable with populations that would provide precise conclusions. In relation to birth order, it could be assumed that an individual born first in a family would be provided with the opportunity to experience younger siblings, therefore, experiencing more child development knowledge. However, this study did not support this assumption. Further investigation in this area is suggested.

When examining the relationship of parenthood status and child development knowledge, it was found that a significant difference was reported

in the subscales of infant-toddler and adolescent development. Since the population in this study provided a low number of subjects who were parents (n=8), further research is suggested with a population of subjects who are parents to better provide information on the relationship between parenthood status and child development knowledge.

In addition, program of study did not reflect a significant relationship with all four subscales of the CBDI. It was assumed that subjects enrolled in Family Relations and Child Development would reflect a higher level of knowledge of child development than in other programs of study. This assumption was based on the fact that Family Relations and Child Development students are provided with more courses in child development. In reviewing the subjects, it was noted that freshmen subjects may not have definitely declared a program of study, therefore affecting the outcome of the data. To provide further analysis of program of study and its relationship to child development knowledge, further research is suggested to focus on upper division students.

In conclusion, the results of this study have indicated that undergraduate students have a relatively low level of knowledge of child development. It should be emphasized that there is a need for students to obtain specific information on the different areas of child development. What is of utmost importance is to provide this information to students in order that these individuals may lead productive lives as parents or professionals.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are made:

1. Further research is indicated as needed for examining the underlying reasons for the relatively low level of child development knowledge undergraduate student demonstrated.
2. Results of this study indicated no significant differences when examining the five programs of study. It was interesting to note that Family Relations and Child Development, which requires more courses in child development, did not display a significant difference in scores. It is recommended that a more critical view of program of study be undertaken with the focus being upon upper division students.
3. When examining parenthood status and its relationship to child development knowledge, further study is warranted to expand the population of subjects who are parents.
4. Additional research needs to further examine the variables of age and birth order and their affect on child development knowledge.
5. The relationship of the number of prior courses in child development to child development knowledge of freshmen subjects and senior subjects needs further examination.
6. Additional variables that might be used to examine levels of child development knowledge are:
 - a. SAT scores
 - b. ACT scores
 - c. GPA
7. Further study of the Child Behavior and Development Inventory instrument is suggested. The question that needs to be answered is: Does this instrument adequately measure what it is intended to measure?

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Baldwin, W. and Cain, V. S. (1980). The children of teenage parents. Family Planning Perspective, 12(1), 34-43.
- DeLissovoy, V. L. (1973). Child care by adolescent parents. Children Today, 2(44), 22-26.
- Enrlich, E. and others (Eds.). (1980). Oxford American Dictionary. New York: Avon Publishers.
- Ford, D. S., Massey, K. K. and Hyde, D. (1985). Factors related to authoritarian versus nonauthoritarian attitudes toward parenting among college students. Health Education, 16, 26-28.
- Fulton, A. M. and Anderson, S. L. (1986). A comparison of child development knowledge of undergraduate students. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of American Home Economics Association, Kansas City, Kansas.
- Goldstein, K. M. and Blackman, S. (1976). Cognitive complexity, maternal child rearing, and acquiescence. Social Behavior and Personality, 4(1), 97-103.
- Gullo, D. F. (1985). Knowledge of infant development: a comparative study of adolescent mothers, older mothers, and never married pregnant teenagers. Early Child Development Care, 22(4), 259-273.
- Herr, J. and Gill, S. (1978). Planning a child development laboratory for secondary schools. Illinois Teacher, 22(2), 96-101.
- Hoff, L. (1978). People in crisis understanding and helping. Menlo Park, California: Addison-Wesley.
- Issac, S. and Michael, W. B. (1981). Handbook in Research and Evaluation. California: EDITS Publishers.
- Johnson, C. F., Loxterkamp, D. and Albanese, M. (1982). Effects of high school students' knowledge of child development and child health on approaches to child discipline. Pediatrics, 69, 558-563.
- Larsen, J. J. and Juhasz, A. M. (1985). The effects of child development and social maturity on adolescent attitudes toward parenting. Adolescence, 20, 823-839.

- Pikunsas, J. (1969). Human Development: A Science of Growth. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Roehl, J. E., Herr, J. and Applehaus, D. J. (1985). Parenting education - now more than ever. Lifelong Learning, 9, 20-27.
- Shaner, J. M., Peterson, K. L. and Roscoe, B. (1985). Older adolescent females' knowledge of child development norms. Adolescence, 20(77), 53-59.
- Showers, J. and Johnson, C. F. (1984). Students' knowledge of child health and development: effects on approaches to discipline. Journal of School Health, 54(3), 122-125.
- Showers, J. M. and Johnson, C. F. (1985). Child development, child health and child rearing knowledge among urban adolescents: Are they adequately prepared for the challenges of parenthood? Health Education, 16, 37-41.
- Stevens, J. H. (1984). Child development knowledge and parenting skills. Family Relations, 33, 237-244.
- Teleki, J. (1982). Child Behavior and Development Inventory. Available from author, School of Home Economics, East Carolina University, Greenville, North Carolina, 27858.
- Wolfendale, S. (1983). The place of parents in child development. Early Child Development and Care, 12, 85-109.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

CHILD BEHAVIOR AND DEVELOPMENT
INVENTORY QUESTIONNAIRE

CHILD BEHAVIOR AND DEVELOPMENT INVENTORY

Instructions

Individual children vary in the age at which they show certain behaviors (such as imitating adults) or reach certain milestones of development (such as walking). On the average, however, children show such behaviors or reach such milestones at a particular stage of development.

On the following pages are 65 statements about children. Please read each statement carefully. On the answer sheet, write the letter which corresponds to the stage at which you think MOST children FIRST show the behavior or reach the milestone.

- A. INFANCY/TODDLERHOOD: BIRTH TO 2 YEARS
- B. PRESCHOOL: 3 TO 5 YEARS
- C. SCHOOL-AGE: 6 TO 11 YEARS
- D. ADOLESCENCE: 12 TO 18 YEARS

If you are not sure about an item, give your best guess.

Be sure to make ONE response for each statement.

-
- 1. LEARN TO WALK
 - A. infancy/toddlerhood
 - B. preschool
 - C. school-age
 - D. adolescence
 - 2. ACHIEVE NEW AND MORE MATURE RELATIONS WITH AGE MATES OF BOTH SEXES (GENDERS)
 - A. infancy/toddlerhood
 - B. preschool
 - C. school-age
 - D. adolescence
 - 3. BEGIN TO DEVELOP A CONSCIENCE
 - A. infancy/toddlerhood
 - B. preschool
 - C. school-age
 - D. adolescence
 - 4. GET FIRST TOOTH
 - A. infancy/toddlerhood
 - B. preschool
 - C. school-age
 - D. adolescence

2

- A. INFANCY/TODDLERHOOD: BIRTH TO 2 YEARS C. SCHOOL-AGE: 6 TO 11 YEARS
 B. PRESCHOOL: 3 TO 5 YEARS D. ADOLESCENCE: 12 TO 18 YEARS
-

5. CONSIDER A PERSON WHO BROKE SIX DISHES WHILE TRYING TO HELP NAUGHTIER (MEANER) THAN ONE WHO BROKE ONE DISH WHILE TRYING TO GET A COOKIE WITHOUT PERMISSION
 - A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 - B. preschool D. adolescence
6. ARE CONCERNED WITH HOW THINGS ARE MADE, HOW THEY WORK, AND WHAT THEY DO
 - A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 - B. preschool D. adolescence
7. DRAW SIMPLE DESIGNS OR SHAPES WHEN USING CRAYONS OR PENCILS
 - A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 - B. preschool D. adolescence
8. BEGIN TO DRINK FROM A GLASS
 - A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 - B. preschool D. adolescence
9. ACQUIRE PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF AN ADULT
 - A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 - B. preschool D. adolescence
10. BEGIN TO SHOW SPECIAL CLOSENESS (ATTACHMENT) TO PERSONS WHO USUALLY TAKE CARE OF THEM (SIGNIFICANT OTHERS)
 - A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 - B. preschool D. adolescence
11. ARE ABLE TO USE TOILET WITHOUT ADULT ASSISTANCE
 - A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 - B. preschool D. adolescence

- A. INFANCY/TODDLERHOOD: BIRTH TO 2 YEARS C. SCHOOL-AGE: 6 TO 11 YEARS
 B. PRESCHOOL: 3 TO 5 YEARS D. ADOLESCENCE: 12 TO 18 YEARS
-

12. BEGIN TO SHOW SOME INTEREST IN PLAYING NEAR OTHER CHILDREN
 A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence
13. CAN HOP ON ONE FOOT
 A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence
14. LEARN TO CUT PAPER WITH SCISSORS
 A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence
15. COMPLETE MOST OF THE CHANGES FROM TEMPORARY TO PERMANENT TEETH
 A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D.adolescence
16. REACH PHYSICAL MATURITY
 A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D.adolescence
17. MAY HAVE IMAGINARY COMPANIONS (PRETEND FRIENDS)
 A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence
18. BEGIN TO NEED INCREASINGLY MORE APPROVAL FROM PEER GROUP (FRIENDS) AND LESS APPROVAL FROM FAMILY
 A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence
19. HAVE STRONG FEELINGS ABOUT BEING TREATED "FAIR"
 A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence

4

- A. INFANCY/TODDLERHOOD: BIRTH TO 2 YEARS C. SCHOOL-AGE: 6 TO 11 YEARS
 B. PRESCHOOL: 3 TO 5 YEARS D. ADOLESCENCE: 12 TO 18 YEARS
-

20. LEARN TO READ AND WRITE
 A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence
21. WILL LOOK FOR AN OBJECT THAT HAS BEEN MOVED OUT OF SIGHT
 A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence
22. BEGIN TO MAKE PREPARATION FOR EARNING A LIVING
 A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence
23. UNDERSTAND THAT THE SAME OBJECT MAY LOOK DIFFERENT FROM DIFFERENT POINTS OF VIEW
 A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence
24. USE CRYING AS MAIN WAY TO CALL ATTENTION TO THEIR NEEDS, DEMANDS, DISCOMFORTS
 A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence
25. BEGIN NAME-CALLING AND BRAGGING
 A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence
26. PUSH OBJECTS SUCH AS BOXES ACROSS THE FLOOR
 A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence
27. SLEEP THROUGH MOST NIGHTS WITHOUT WETTING
 A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence

- A. INFANCY/TODDLERHOOD: BIRTH TO 2 YEARS C. SCHOOL-AGE: 6 TO 11 YEARS
 B. PRESCHOOL: 3 TO 5 YEARS D. ADOLESCENCE: 12 TO 18 YEARS
-

28. STRIVE TO ACHIEVE EMOTIONAL INDEPENDENCE FROM PARENTS AND OTHER ADULTS
- A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence
29. DEVELOP SKILLS IN READING, WRITING, AND ARITHMETIC
- A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence
30. REACH ABOUT ONE-HALF OF THEIR ADULT HEIGHT
- A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence
31. SCRIBBLE WHEN USING A CRAYON OR PENCIL
- A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence
32. BEGIN TO BE ABLE TO PLAY COOPERATIVELY WITH ONE OR TWO OTHER CHILDREN
- A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence
33. BEING TO SHOW FEAR AT BEING LEFT ALONE
- A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence
34. ARE ABLE TO SAY OWN FIRST NAME
- A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence
35. GROWN MORE SLOWLY THAN AT OTHER STAGES
- A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence

- A. INFANCY/TODDLERHOOD: BIRTH TO 2 YEARS C. SCHOOL-AGE: 6 TO 11 YEARS
B. PRESCHOOL: 3 TO 5 YEARS D. ADOLESCENCE: 12 TO 18 YEARS
-

36. PREFER FRIENDS OF OWN SEX (GENDER)
- A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
B. preschool D. adolescence
37. BELIEVE THEY ARE SOMEHOW PROTECTED FROM THINGS (SUCH AS ACCIDENTS) THAT CAN HAPPEN (ONLY) TO OTHER PEOPLE
- A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
B. preschool D. adolescence
38. HAVE COMPLETED ALMOST ALL BONE (SKELETAL) DEVELOPMENT
- A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
B. preschool D. adolescence
39. CAN FEED THEMSELVES WITH A SPOON
- A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
B. preschool D. adolescence
40. OBEY SIMPLE COMMANDS OR REQUESTS
- A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
B. preschool D. adolescence
41. CAN PICK OUT THE LARGER OF TWO CIRCLES WHEN ASKED "WHICH IS BIGGER?"
- A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
B. preschool D. adolescence
42. SHOW PREFERENCE FOR RIGHT OR LEFT HAND
- A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
B. preschool D. adolescence
43. DEVELOP OWN IDEAS OF WHAT A GOOD PERSON IS
- A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
B. preschool D. adolescence

7

- A. INFANCY/TODDLERHOOD: BIRTH TO 2 YEARS C. SCHOOL-AGE: 6 TO 11 YEARS
 B. PRESCHOOL: 3 TO 5 YEARS D. ADOLESCENCE: 12 TO 18 YEARS
-

44. MAKE SIMPLE CAUSE AND EFFECT ASSOCIATIONS
- A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence
45. BOY'S VOICES CHANGE (DEEPEN)
- A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence
46. CAN POUR LIQUID FROM SMALL PITCHER WITHOUT SPILLING
- A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence
47. KNOW THAT THEY ARE A BOY OR A GIRL
- A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence
48. UNDERSTAND THAT A GROUP OF TEN COINS SPACED OUT IN A LINE CONTAINS THE SAME NUMBER OF COINS AS TEN COINS PILED ON TOP OF EACH OTHER
- A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence
49. DEVELOP ATTITUDE TOWARD THE WORLD AND THE PEOPLE IN IT AS BEING FRIENDLY OR UNFRIENDLY
- A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence
50. CAN IDENTIFY AND NAME THE MAIN COLORS: RED, YELLOW, BLUE, GREEN, PURPLE, AND ORANGE
- A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence
51. ARE CAPABLE OF REPRODUCTION
- A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence

- A. INFANCY/TODDLERHOOD: BIRTH TO 2 YEARS C. SCHOOL-AGE: 6 TO 11 YEARS
 B. PRESCHOOL: 3 TO 5 YEARS D. ADOLESCENCE: 12 TO 18 YEARS
-

52. ARE LIKELY TO CRY AND TRY TO FOLLOW A PARENT WHO HAS JUST LEFT THEM
- A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence
53. REACH ABOUT THREE-FOURTHS OF THEIR ADULT HEIGHT
- A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence
54. ARE LIKELY TO EXPRESS FEAR OF PEOPLE THEY DO NOT KNOW
- A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence
55. FEEL THAT THEY ARE BEING CONSTANTLY WATCHED BY EVERYONE AND THAT OTHERS ARE AS ADMIRING OR AS CRITICAL OF THEM AS THEY ARE OF THEMSELVES
- A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence
56. HAVE ACQUIRED MOST OF THE SKILLS NECESSARY FOR USING SPOKEN LANGUAGE
- A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence
57. INCREASE IN MUSCULAR STRENGTH MUCH MORE THAN AT ANY OTHER STAGE
- A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence
58. BEGIN TO BE ABLE TO SHARE TOYS
- A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence
59. CAN COPY A SHAPE
- A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence

9

- A. INFANCY/TODDLERHOOD: BIRTH TO 2 YEARS C. SCHOOL-AGE: 6 TO 11 YEARS
 B. PRESCHOOL: 3 TO 5 YEARS D. ADOLESCENCE: 12 TO 18 YEARS
-

60. GIRLS BEGIN HAVING MENSTRUAL PERIODS
 A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence
61. LEARN WORDS TO IDENTIFY NUMERALS AND LETTERS
 A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence
62. ARE ABLE TO THINK IN TERMS OF WHAT MIGHT BE TRUE RATHER THAN ONLY IN TERMS OF WHAT ACTUALLY EXISTS IN A CONCRETE SITUATION (IN OTHER WORDS, CAN IMAGINE IDEAL SITUATIONS)
 A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence
63. POINT TO NOSE WHEN ASKED TO DO SO
 A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence
64. LEARN TO DRESS AND UNDRESS THEMSELVES
 A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence
65. PULL THINGS FROM DRAWERS AND CABINETS
 A. infancy/toddlerhood C. school-age
 B. preschool D. adolescence

GENERAL INFORMATION

Please complete the following information in the space provided. Write directly on these pages.

1. In which Department are you enrolled or plan to enroll?

_____ A. Clothing, Textiles and Merchandising
_____ B. Food, Nutrition and Institution Administration
_____ C. Family Relations and Child Development
_____ D. Home Economics Education and Community Services
_____ E. Housing, Interior Design and Consumer Studies
_____ F. Hotel and Restaurant Administration

2. In what course are you enrolled?

_____ A. 1111
_____ B. 4113

3. What is your classification?

_____ A. Freshman
_____ B. Sophomore
_____ C. Junior
_____ D. Senior

4. Did you take any child development classes while in high school?

_____ yes
_____ no
_____ how many?

5. How many courses have you completed in child development?

_____ A. None
_____ B. One
_____ C. Two
_____ D. Three
_____ E. Four or More

6. What is your age? _____

7. What is your marital status?

- _____ A. Single, never married
_____ B. Single following divorce, separation or death
_____ C. Married, first time
_____ D. Remarried following divorce, separation or death
_____ E. Other, specify _____

8. Do you have children?

- _____ A. Yes
_____ B. No

9. If you have children, list sex and birthdate of each child.

SEX	BIRTHDAY
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

10. How many children are in your family of origin, including yourself?

- _____ A. One
_____ B. Two
_____ C. Three
_____ D. Four
_____ E. Five or more

11. Which child in the family were you?

- _____ A. 1st
_____ B. 2nd
_____ C. 3rd
_____ D. 4th
_____ E. Other, specify _____

12. How many years older are you than your youngest sibling? _____

APPENDIX B

STATEMENT TO SUBJECTS

STATEMENT TO SUBJECTS

My name is Michelle King and I am a graduate student in the Department of Family Relations and Child Development. As a part of my thesis research, I am administering a questionnaire to investigate the child development knowledge of freshmen and senior level students in the College of Home Economics. The questionnaire consists of 65 multiple choice questions that relate to developmental milestones children go through in normal development. The second section consists of 12 demographic questions.

I would like to thank your instructors for allowing me to visit your class and administer my questionnaire and thank you for participating in my research study. I would like to tell you that participation in this study is strictly voluntary should you wish not to participate, however, I would appreciate your help in completing this study. To ensure confidentiality, please refrain from putting your name on any part of the questionnaire.

I would be more than happy to share the results of the study with you should you be interested. As soon as the results are in, I will see that your instructor has a copy to share with you.

Thank you for your time.

Michelle King

APPENDIX C
CORRESPONDENCES

To: Karlene Sheets, Instructor HEC 1111

From: Michelle King

Please read the following message to your students concerning my re-test that is scheduled for today.

I would like to thank each of you for taking part in my thesis project. To ensure that the questionnaire you completed last week is a reliable tool to evaluate child development knowledge, I will be giving a re-test of the questionnaire today in Room 103 in the Child Development Lab behind Home Economics West (look for a map to locate the room). The re-test will take place between the hours of 12:30 and 2:30. Please come if you are available, refreshments will be served while you take the questionnaire.

Thank you for your time,

Michelle King

To: Instructors of HEECS 4113

From: Michelle King

Please read the following message to your students concerning my re-test that is scheduled for Monday, February 2nd.

I would like to thank each of you for taking part in my thesis project. To ensure that the questionnaire you completed this week is a reliable tool to evaluate child development knowledge, I will be giving a re-test of the questionnaire on February 2nd from 12:30 to 3:30 in the Child Development Lab behind Home Economics West (look for a map to locate the room, one will be posted on the entrance doors). The re-test should take approximately 30 minutes to complete. Please come if you are available, refreshments will be served while you take the questionnaire.

Thank you for your time,

Michelle King

Dear Student,

To ensure that the questionnaire I am using in my research is reliable, I will be needing volunteers for a re-test of the questionnaire.

I will need as many volunteers as possible from your class. It should take approximately 30 minutes to complete the questionnaire.

If you are available, please come to Room 103 in the Child Development Lab (behind Home Economics West) on January 20th anytime between 12:30 and 2:30. Refreshments will be served.

Thank you,

Michelle King

APPENDIX D

VARIABLE CODE LABELS

Variable Code Labels

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Codes</u>
1	Department enrolled in	1 = Clothing, Textiles & Merch. 2 = Food & Nutrition 3 = Family Rel/Child Development 4 = Home Ec Ed/Comm. Service 5 = Housing, Int. Des./Con. Studies
2	Courses enrolled in	1 = 1111 2 = 4113
3	Classification	1 = Freshman 2 = Sophomore 3 = Junior 4 = Senior
4	Had child development courses in high school	1 = Yes 2 = No
5	Number of child development courses in high school	
6	College courses completed in child development	1 = None 2 = One 3 = Two 4 = Three 5 = Four or More
7	Age	1 = 17-24 2 = 25-33 3 = 34-42 4 = 43-48
8	Marital Status	1 = Single, Never married 2 = Single following death, divorce or separation 3 = Married, first time 4 = Remarried following divorce, death, or separation 5 = Other

- | | | |
|----|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| 9 | Children | 1 = Yes
2 = No |
| 10 | Sex of first child | 1 = Male
2 = Female |
| 11 | Birthmonth of first child | |
| 12 | Birthdate of first child | |
| 13 | Birthyear of first child | |
| 14 | Number of children | 1 = One
2 = Two
3 = Three
4 = Four
5 = Five or More |
| 15 | Number of children in family of origin, including self | 1 = One
2 = Two
3 = Three
4 = Four
5 = Five or More |
| 16 | Position in family of origin | 1 = First
2 = Second
3 = Third
4 = Fourth
5 = Other |
| 17 | Years older than youngest sibling in family of origin | |
| 18 | Test or retest | 1 = Test
2 = Retest |
| 19 | Student identification number | |
| 20 | Birthmonth of second child | |

- 21 Birthdate of second child
- 22 Birthyear of second child
- 23 Birthmonth of third child
- 24 Birthdate of third child
- 25 Birthyear of third child
- 26 Birthmonth of fourth child
- 27 Birthdate of fourth child
- 28 Birthyear of fourth child

VITA

Michelle Glozier King

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: KNOWLEDGE OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT OF HOME ECONOMICS STUDENTS

Major Field: Family Relations and Child Development

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Dyersburg, Tennessee, February 16, 1963, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Bobby J. Glozier. Married to Jeffrey Allen King on July 8, 1983.

Education: Graduated from Dyersburg High School, Dyersburg, Tennessee, in May 1981; received Associate of Science Degree in Liberal Arts and Sciences from Dyersburg State Community College, Dyersburg, Tennessee, in June, 1983; received Bachelor of Science Degree in Home Economics from University of Tennessee, Martin, Tennessee, in June, 1986; completed requirements for the Master of Science Degree at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, in July, 1988.

Professional Experience: Graduate Teaching Assistant, Department of Family Relations and Child Development, Oklahoma State University, January, 1986, to May, 1987. Coordinator of Hutchinson Community College Child Care Center, Hutchinson, Kansas, July 6, 1987, to present.