

FACTORS RELATED TO SELF-MANAGING BEHAVIOR
IN KINDERGARTEN CHILDREN

By

TANA LEIGH STUBBLEFIELD

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1974

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, 1979

Thesis
1979
S932f
cop. 2



FACTORS RELATED TO SELF-MANAGING BEHAVIOR
IN KINDERGARTEN CHILDREN

Thesis Approved:

Frances Stromberg

Thesis Adviser

Judith A. Powell

Loore Lust

Norman D. Newham

Dean of the Graduate College

1031868

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Certain individuals deserve acknowledgment for their contributions to this study.

Appreciation and thanks are expressed to Dr. Frances Stromberg, for her time, expertise, and assistance in the initiation and completion of this thesis. Also, I wish to extend gratitude to Dr. Judith Powell and Miss Leone List, for their encouragement and positive criticisms.

The 33 participating kindergarten children and their parents deserve credit for their cooperation leading to the completion of this study.

I would like to thank my partner, Steve Grogan, in particular, whose love, support, and sense of humor have made achievement of this goal possible.

Loving gratitude is expressed to my parents, Jack and Olga Stubblefield, for their undying faith and the encouragement provided throughout my life. Special thanks is extended to my sister, Ginny Stubblefield, for her empathy, friendship, and summer lodgings.

Finally, appreciation is extended to Elaine Mosley, my principal, co-worker, and friend, for her calming smile.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
Purpose and Objectives	4
Hypotheses	5
Assumptions.	6
Limitations.	6
Definition of Terms.	7
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.	8
Theories of Affective Development.	8
Psychosocial Theory	9
Need Theory	10
Social Learning Theory.	11
Findings and Conclusions of Research	12
Clarifications and Indications of Independence.	12
Parent-Child-Home Factors	15
Socio-Economic Status	18
Sex and Ordinal Position.	19
Methods Used in Measuring Independence	20
Parent Questionnaires and Ratings	20
Observations at School.	21
Home Observations	21
Teacher Ratings	21
Other Instruments	22
Implications for the Present Research.	23
III. RESEARCH DESIGN	26
Type of Research	26
Subjects	26
Data Collection and Instruments.	27
Frequency of Self-Selection of Activities	27
Frequency of Seeking Assistance	29
Parent Perceptions.	30
Parent Reporting.	30
Ordinal Position.	31
Attendance of Child	31
Age of Child.	32
Procedures	32
Analysis of Data	34

Chapter	Page
IV. RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS	36
Introduction	36
Examination of Objectives and Hypotheses	37
Objective One	37
Objective Two	37
Objective Three	42
Objective Four.	43
Objective Five.	44
Conclusions and Discussion	45
V. SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	49
Summary.	49
Implications	50
Recommendations for Further Study.	51
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.	53
APPENDIXES	57
APPENDIX A - STUDENT INFORMATION FORM	58
APPENDIX B - PARENT PERCEPTIONS OF SELF-MANAGEMENT.	60
APPENDIX C - PARENT REPORT OF INDEPENDENT ACTIVITY.	63

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Description of Subjects by Activity Scores	38
II. Description of Subjects by Assistance Scores	39
III. Description of Subjects by PPSM Scores	40
IV. Description of Subjects by PRIA Scores	41

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A hierarchy of needs has been indicated by Maslow (1954, 1970). He postulated that meeting these needs is crucial for complete development of the individual. The satisfaction of the lower needs on the hierarchy, i.e., physiological, safety, and love and belonging needs, is usually a prerequisite to pursuing the ultimate higher needs, i.e., self-esteem and self-actualization needs. Maslow (1970, p. 45) stated, "Satisfaction of the self-esteem need leads to feelings of self-confidence, worth, strength, capability, and adequacy of being useful and necessary in the world."

Self-actualization is a "higher" need than self-esteem. Maslow (1970, p. 46) stated in definition of self-actualization, ". . . it refers to man's desire for self-fulfillment, namely to the tendency for him to become actualized in what he is potentially." In studying self-actualized individuals, Maslow (1970, p. 99) found that realization of this need produces ". . . more profound happiness, serenity, and richness of the inner life" and has ". . . desirable civic and social consequences."

Clearly, in order to achieve this desirable level, individuals require the ability to rely upon themselves for decisions and direction. Erikson (1950, 1963) recognized the beginnings of these higher needs of strivings in early divisions of the "Eight Stages of Man." In reference to Stage Two: Autonomy versus Shame, Erikson (1963, p. 254) said, "From

a sense of control without loss of self-esteem comes a lasting sense of good will and pride. . . ." Pertaining to Stage Three: Initiative versus Guilt, Erikson (1963, p. 255) commented that ". . . initiative is a necessary part of every act, and man needs a sense of initiative for whatever he learns and does. . . ."

To determine their relevance for a particular society, needs may be regarded within a certain cultural and attitudinal setting. The Committee on Fact Finding of the Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth echoed Erikson's writings. In A Healthy Personality for Every Child (1951, p. 12), the Committee concluded, "For a child to develop this sense of self-reliance and adequacy that Erikson calls autonomy, it is necessary that he experience over and over again that he is a person who is permitted to make choices." In regard to the particular culture, the Committee (1951, p. 13) further stated, ". . . personal autonomy, independence of the individual, is an especially outstanding feature of the American way of life."

Related to the developmental theory of needs is the concept of developmental tasks. Havighurst (1950, p. 8) defined the idea of developmental tasks as learning arising from a combination of ". . . physical maturation . . . the pressure of cultural processes upon the individual . . . and . . . desires, aspirations, and values of the emerging personality. . . ." Authors and researchers generally agree that some of the tasks relate to the child's learning self-care skills, learning to formulate goals and make decisions, and developing independence, competence, and autonomy (Havighurst, 1950; Dinkmeyer, 1965; Clausen, 1972; Bernard, 1970; and Leeper, Dale, Skipper, and Witherspoon, 1974).

The literature indicates that the home environment and the familial situation have an influence on the realization of these tasks.

Leeper et al. (1974) stated

Before the child comes to nursery school or kindergarten, he has experienced various types of behavior in response to parental guidance and expectations. Some children have become independent while others are unable to make decisions (p. 65).

In addition to environmental factors, there may exist other influences upon child behavior and development. The principle of multiple causation would be a worthwhile consideration at this point. Bernard (1970, p. 16) pointed out that "multiple causation means that heredity, organic factors, or learning can be considered only as contributing factors in a mosaic of internal and external developmental influences." It would be wise to consider that perhaps ordinal position, sex, age, socio-economic status, along with child-rearing practices and parent-child relations, could be contributing factors to a child's behavior. Since a child's ability to manage his or her own behavior and function as an autonomous individual can be a major determinant of that child's future; and since encouraging the maximum development of each child is a general goal of education, the school has a responsibility to enhance, in some cases even substitute for, parental and home teachings. Some kindergarten-aged children appear to be self-managing, i.e., independent, self-directive, and decisive in choosing activities and caring for themselves at school. Others consistently seek guidance or assistance in determining their activities or in self-care needs. What differences can be found between young children who exhibit self-managing behavior and those who do not? This study addresses itself to this question. In

order to understand and guide children toward self-direction, self-reliance, and eventual self-sufficiency, additional insight into those variables that have an impact upon the behavior of the self-managed child is needed.

Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this study was to ascertain if specified variables are related to children's self-managing behavior; and also, to examine the relationship between parent perceptions and reports of the children's behaviors at home and children's school behaviors. The specific objectives were as follows:

1. (a) To describe the self-managing ability of a group of kindergarten subjects in terms of an activity score (frequency of seeking assistance in activity selection or in situations pertaining to self-care).

(b) To classify the children as either high self-managers or low self-managers on the basis of ratings obtained through combining activity and assistance scores.
2. (a) To describe children in terms of parent responses to two instruments, the Parent Perceptions of Self-Management (PPSM) and the Parent Reporting of Independent Activity (PRIA).

(b) To compare the PPSM and PRIA ratings.
3. To compare the self-managing behavior exhibited at school with the parent responses to the PPSM and PRIA.
4. To determine the relationship of sex, ordinal position, age, and attendance to the child's self-management exhibited in the classroom.
5. To determine the relationship of the child's sex, ordinal position, age, and attendance to the parents' responses to the PPSM and PRIA.
6. To make recommendations for further study.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses of this research were based on the premise that the self is dynamic and that self-managed and self-directed behavior in young children is influenced by various forces acting upon the child, i.e., environmental, hereditary, and self-forces. The specific null hypotheses to be tested in this study were as follows:

- H₁: There will be no significant difference between the parents' PPSM ratings and the PRIA ratings.
- H₂: There will be no significant difference between the number of children who can be classified as high or low self-managers and those who cannot be classified as high or low self-managers.
- H₃: (a) There will be no significant difference between children's school activity ratings and their parents' PPSM ratings.
- (b) There will be no significant difference between children's school assistance ratings and parents' PPSM ratings.
- H₄: (a) There will be no significant difference between children's school activity ratings and parents' PRIA ratings.
- (b) There will be no significant difference between children's school assistance ratings and parents' PRIA ratings.
- H₅: There will be no significant difference in children's activity ratings according to:
- (a) Sex
 - (b) Ordinal position
 - (c) Age
 - (d) Attendance
- H₆: There will be no significant difference in children's assistance ratings according to:
- (a) Sex
 - (b) Ordinal position
 - (c) Age
 - (d) Attendance

H₇: There will be no significant difference between parents' PPSM ratings according to the child variables of:

- (a) Sex
- (b) Ordinal position
- (c) Age
- (d) Attendance

H₈: There will be no significant difference between parents' PRIA ratings according to the child variables of:

- (a) Sex
- (b) Ordinal position
- (c) Age
- (d) Attendance

Assumptions

There were several assumptions relevant to this study. They were as follows:

1. The parents were truthful in their responses on the Parent Perceptions Questionnaire (PPSM) and the Parent Reporting Checklist (PRIA).
2. Methods employed to determine socioeconomic status, parent perceptions, home behavior, and self-managing behavior at school were appropriate for use in this study with this sample.

Limitations

There were several limitations of this study that merit mention. They are as follows:

1. This investigation was limited to a study of two selected groups of kindergarten students from a public elementary school in a city in Oklahoma.
2. The participating parents of the study may have responded on the PPSM and PRIA as they perceived that the investigator would have liked them to respond.
3. This study was limited to those aspects of self-managing behavior which could be measured or observed at school by the specific instruments employed.

4. The investigator recognized that behavior is subject to change; therefore, the behavior reported applied to those individuals studied at the time of the investigation.
5. The investigator recognized that maturity level at a given time may affect the behavior of the subjects.

Definition of Terms

Several terms relevant to this study merit clarification. They are as follows:

1. Independence--"A person is independent of others to the extent that he can satisfy his needs without requiring that others respond to him in particular ways" (Heathers, 1955, p. 277). Rosen and D'Andrade (1972, p. 567) cited "autonomy" and "self-reliance" as components of independence.
2. Dependency--Clausen (1972, p. 219) referred to dependency as ". . . the child's inability to act for himself, therefore, to rely habitually upon others." Kagan and Moss (1964, p. 439) viewed dependency as ". . . reluctance to start a task without help or encouragement. . . ." Munsinger (1971, p. 432) stated that dependency is ". . . a lack of self-reliance; the tendency to seek the help of others in making decisions or in carrying out difficult actions."
3. Self-Reliance--Rosen and D'Andrade (1972, p. 567) wrote that self-reliance includes ". . . areas involving self-care taking (e.g., cleaning, dressing, amusing, or defending oneself)." Baumrind (1967, p. 53) cited self-reliance as ". . . the ability of the child to handle his affairs in an independent fashion relative to other children his age."
4. Self-Direction--According to Kohn (1969, p. 36) ". . . self-direction implies thinking for oneself, making one's own decisions."
5. Self-Manager--For the purpose of this study, the term "self-manager" refers to the degree of independence, self-reliance, and self-direction shown by the child in selecting activities and satisfying self-care needs. Reference is made to two types of self-managing children.
 1. Low Self-Managers--Those children rated low in self-selection of activities and high in assistance seeking.
 2. High Self-Managers--Those children rated high in self-selection of activities and low in assistance seeking.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter seeks to present theories, findings, and methods relevant to an understanding of factors that contribute to the self-managing child. Implications for the present study are also discussed. Specifically, the literature review is divided into four sections: (1) theories of affective development; (2) findings and conclusions of research; (3) methods used in measuring independence; and (4) implications for the present research.

Theories of Affective Development

In reference to the individualities of children, development is sometimes divided into three domains: cognitive, affective, and psychomotor. The area of affective development is of primary concern in this study. As discussed by Tagatz (1976)

The affective domain consists of the feeling aspects of personal experience. It includes the appreciations, attitudes, interests, and values of individuals. . . . It also includes the emotional responses demonstrated by individuals as they contemplate themselves, their physical and ideational environment, and their interactions with other individuals or groups (p. 30).

There are various theoretical approaches to affective development. Three of these theories are: (1) Erikson's psychosocial theory (1950, 1963); (2) Maslow's needs theory (1954, 1970); and (3) Bandura and Walter's social learning theory (1963). A brief summary of each of these theories is presented.

Psychosocial Theory

Erikson (1950, 1963) developed a progression of eight stages through which individuals move in their internal emotional development. The concept is based on the idea that an individual is "healthy" or well-adjusted to the degree that he/she acquires the positive aspect, as opposed to the negative, of each stage. Tagatz (1976, p. 114) commented that Erikson's theory ". . . focuses on the intrapsychic factor of affective development . . ." and this ". . . theory is termed psychosocial . . . because of the initial strong influence of social circumstances on the development of internal emotional feelings."

The first three of Erikson's stages are the most relevant to this review. The first stage, Trust versus Mistrust, begins at birth and is critical during the next 18 months. During this time, the child may establish trust or insecurity, depending on the character of the relationship with his/her parents or caregivers. Unsatisfactory trust development in this stage may contribute to personality conflicts in later life (Erikson, 1950, 1963). The second stage, Autonomy versus Shame or Doubt, critical during the period from 18 months to approximately three years, is characterized by attempts at attaining a degree of self-possession and independence. Erikson (1963) wrote

A sense of rightful dignity and lawful independence on the part of adults around him gives to the child of good will the confident expectation that the kind of autonomy fostered in childhood will not lead to undue doubt or shame in later life. Thus the sense of autonomy fostered in the child and modified as life progresses, serves (and is served by) the preservation in economic and political life of a sense of justice (p. 254).

The third stage, critical during the preschool years (approximately three to six years), is the stage of Initiative versus Guilt. In this

period, children learn new skills of imagination, cooperation, and leadership. They want to do things for and by themselves, with less adult guidance than before. During this time, parental encouragement and praise help cultivate positive attitudes toward independence and task initiation. On the other hand, dependency and guilt about initiating tasks may result from discouragement and criticism of task initiation (Erikson, 1950, 1963; Dinkmeyer, 1965).

Need Theory

The second theory under discussion in relation to affective development is Maslow's need theory. Maslow (1954) developed a hierarchy of inborn needs that human beings strive to fulfill, beginning with basic physiological needs, i.e., food and shelter, climbing the scale to love and belonging, safety, and esteem needs, and finally, reaching the need for self-actualization. As basic "lower" needs are satisfied, individuals work toward satisfying "higher," more complex needs. Individuals strive for need fulfillment when the environment does not provide for the particular need their nature demands at that time.

Esteem needs are at the fourth level of Maslow's hierarchy, coming after physiological, safety, and love and belonging needs. Individuals at this level desire to feel capable and worthwhile. Maslow (1970, p. 45) used such terms as "adequacy," "mastery, competence, and independence" in reference to satisfaction of this need. He also wrote (1970, p. 45) "But thwarting of these needs produces feelings of inferiority, of weakness, and of helplessness."

The fifth, and last, level of Maslow's hierarchy is self-actualization, or total self-fulfillment. Maslow (1970, p. 47) wrote that "The clear emergence of these needs usually rests upon some prior satisfaction of the physiological, safety, love, and esteem needs."

This author further clarified this level of needs by writing

. . . relative independence of environment as is found in the healthy person does not, of course, mean lack of commerce with it; it means only that in these contacts the person's ends and his own nature are the primary determinants and that the environment is primarily a means to the person's self-actualizing ends (p. 68).

Social Learning Theory

A third theory of affective development under consideration is the social learning theory of Bandura and Walters (1963), who suggested that operant conditioning and modeling cause affective behavior of individuals. Basically, according to the principles of operant conditioning, learning occurs as a result of reinforcement of behavior; and thus, reinforcing behavior increases the chance that it will occur again in the future. Modeling, or imitation, is ". . . learning through observing the types of reinforcement others receive for particular social acts" (Tagatz, 1976, p. 125). The people who are observed and imitated are referred to as models.

The impact of these models upon the behavior of children can be viewed in three ways. One is when children have no prior experience with the observed behavior, and therefore, absorb the observation into their repertoire as new material, called the "transmission of novel responses" (Bandura and Walters, 1963, p. 61). This absorption hinges upon whatever reward or punishment the observed response may receive.

A second possible influence of models relates to behavior and responses already inhibited in the child's repertoire, which is either strengthened or weakened, referred to as ". . . inhibitory and disinhibitory effects," when the model is observed (Bandura and Walters, 1963, p. 60). If the model's behavior is punished, the possibility of imitation of that behavior is weakened. The third influence of model observation is to produce responses or behavior already known to the child. The role of the model in producing the "eliciting effect" is seen best when the behavior that is imitated is not punished or is socially approved (Bandura and Walter, 1963, p. 79).

Referring to the principle of multiple causation (Bernard, 1970) mentioned in Chapter I, it is apparent that none of the three theories is sufficient to account for all behaviors. Therefore, development needs to be considered within a framework encompassing all three views and their inter-relationships.

Findings and Conclusions of Research

Research and conclusions pertaining to self-reliance and independence in young children may be divided into various categories. Those categories pertinent to this study include: (1) clarifications and indications of independence; (2) parent-child-home factors; (3) socio-economic status; and (4) sex and ordinal position. A brief review of some of the literature involving these research areas follows:

Clarifications and Indications of

Independence

Researchers and authors have employed various terms, definitions,

and views in describing independent and decisive behavior of children. Some of the terms relevant to this study were defined in Chapter I. Further elaboration and clarification of these definitions and views are included here.

Heathers (1955) delineated some forms of dependence and independence. A person's dependency requires that other people respond in ways so as to satisfy that person's needs. Two types of dependence are noted by Heathers: instrumental, as in seeking help in reaching goals; and emotional, where the responses of other people are the desired outcomes. Heathers further divided emotional dependence into three forms--desires or needs for assurance, for affection, and for approval. In definition, Heathers (1955) stated

The need for reassurance occurs in situations when a person anticipates undesired or feared outcomes--failure, rejection, injury, etc. Seeking reassurance is a matter of placing oneself in the care of another person as a way of avoiding such outcomes. . . . A person's need for affection is the need for others to respond with physical signs of affection. . . . A person's need for approval is the need for others to make positive responses toward him on the basis of his performance or . . . characteristics. . . . (p. 278).

In keeping with these definitions, Heathers (1955, p. 278) referred to instrumental independence as ". . . the obverse of instrumental dependence" and emotional independence as ". . . the obverse of emotional dependence." Instrumental independence involves initiating activities and dealing with problems without seeking help; and emotional independence is referred to as "emotional self-reliance" or having no need for reassurance, affection, or approval.

Factors that determine whether a child will exhibit instrumental independence are outlined in some hypotheses proposed by Heathers

(1955). Four of the five hypotheses follow:

1. The more a child expects that help is available, the more will he tend to seek it.
2. The more a child expects he can reach his goal unaided, the less will he tend to seek help.
3. The more reassurance a child receives while performing an activity, the less is he apt to seek help.
4. The more a child expects approval for reaching a goal unaided, the less will he tend to seek help (pp. 285-286).

These hypotheses imply that the set of expectations developed for a child by other people in the child's environment largely determine the expectations a child has for him/herself. These expectations, in turn, help determine the type of response the child will have in a given situation. The roles of expectation and demand are discussed under research related to parent-child relations.

Kagan and Moss (1964) have used ideas similar to those of Heathers in research with four "childhood dependency variables."

1. Tendency to behave in a passive manner when faced with environmental obstacles or stress.
2. Tendency to seek support, nurturance, and assistance . . . when under stress.
3. Tendency to seek affection and emotional support. . . .
4. Tendency to seek instrumental assistance . . . (p. 439).

These authors (p. 439) defined "instrumental dependency acts" as ". . . seeking help with tasks, seeking help when physically threatened."

Baumrind (1972a, p. 180) used the term "instrumental competence" in reference to ". . . behavior which is socially responsible and independent." Defining "realistic help-seeking," Baumrind (1967, p. 53) wrote ". . . the child searches for help in order to perform a task

too difficult for him to accomplish alone." However, in contrast to the definitive forms of emotional dependence, i.e., reassurance, approval, and affection, outlined by Heathers (1955), Baumrind (1967) believed the self-reliant child seeks help as an avenue of learning or achieving a goal and not as a tactic to relate to others or avoid something.

In discussing socialization, Baumrind (1972a, p. 181) mentioned a dimension of this process called "Independent versus Suggestible." This dimension pertains to related facets of behavior, one of which is "Purposive versus Aimless Behavior" referring to ". . . confident, charismatic, self-propelled activity versus disoriented, normative, goalless behavior" (p. 181).

Self-confidence has been related to independence and self-reliance. Hurlock (1970, p. 182) wrote in relation to self-confidence, ". . . teach the child to do things for himself as soon as he is capable of doing so. Helplessness tends to break down self-confidence, while independence fosters it." Goodman (1959, p. 180) implied that independence fosters self-confidence by saying the more children ". . . carry out individual tasks, the more they act and move and do so on their own, adventuring forth into the world and accepting its challenges, the surer they feel they can handle whatever comes up."

Parent-Child-Home Factors

This section of review pertains to parent-child relationships, child-rearing practices, and general home conditions that might foster

or inhibit independent or self-managing behavior. Research results and conclusions of various authors and researchers follow.

Research indicates that child-rearing practices have a relationship to the development of independence and self-reliance in young children. Baumrind (1967) found that parents of children who were self-reliant, explorative, self-assertive, and self-controlled were consistent, firm, and secure in their child-rearing methods. These parents respected the child's independent choices, engaged in independence training, and accompanied a disciplinary decision with a reason or explanation. In another study, Baumrind (1972b) found that parental techniques to encourage self-reliance

. . . whether by placing demands upon the child for self-control and high level performance, or by encouraging independent action and decision-making, were associated in the child with responsible and independent behavior (p. 401).

Those children exhibiting little self-reliance had parents who were unsure about their relation with their children; they engaged in little independence training; and they "babied" their children.

In reference to parents of self-reliant children, Baumrind (1967, p. 401) stated, "These parents balanced much warmth with high control and high demands with clear communication about what was required of the child." Also in relation to warmth, Mussen and Parker (1970) found that maternal nurturance was correlated with independence.

The type of discipline in use in the home contributes to the amount of independence and decision-making ability the child is allowed to acquire. Baumrind (1972a) defined three categories of parents; the authoritative, the authoritarian, and the permissive. The authoritative parent exercises firm control and demand, but provides environmental stimulation

and encouragement of autonomy and independence. Referring to firm control, Baumrind (1972a, p. 190) wrote, "The controlling, demanding parent can train the child to tolerate increasingly intense and prolonged frustration. . . ."

The restrictive, authoritarian parent uses control that limits the child's ability to try new things. These parents do not value willfulness in the child and use punishment and force to curb self-will. Related to this, Sears, Maccoby, and Levin (1957) found that punitive measures for dependent behavior only served to make children more dependent. According to Symonds (1949), children of overstrict parents lose the ability to think through situations and make decisions and will become dependent on their parents for judgments since the parents have always made decisions for them.

Independence is based on security that is free from anxiety and frustration. Extreme parental dominance may cause infants and young children to feel anxious and frustrated. A child's inability to make decisions may be a result of parental over-domination of decision-making even in the early years (Donovan, 1968).

Permissive parents are non-controlling and passive in making regulations. Baumrind (1972a, p. 189) found that "Parental passive-acceptance and overprotection inhibits the development of independence." The positive quality of permissiveness involves allowing children to make their own decisions within reason while guiding them to comply reasonably to societal demands (Donovan, 1968). A negative aspect of permissiveness involves overprotecting the child. Symonds (1949, p. 68) stated that ". . . an overprotected child remains overdependent and helpless. . . ."

Continued parental intervention into children's attempts to initiate new tasks or do things for themselves ". . . may prevent both skill learning and development of a sense of competence and autonomy" (Clausen, 1972, p. 219).

The home environment is a consideration as a contributor to personality traits and behavior. Baumrind (1972a, p. 401) found that the homes of self-reliant children were not "marked by discord or dissensions." The households were coordinated and limits were specified and enforced. Leeper et al. (1974, p. 66) referred to a home where ". . . physical punishment, threats, and abuse" are employed, and expected that a child from such a home may be unable to make decisions, for he/she may have been told exactly how to behave. Sears et al. (1957) concluded that the most dependent children have mothers that openly express affection, but often threaten the affectional bond by withholding love for discipline and punishing displays of parent-directed aggression.

Socio-Economic Status

Relating to socio-economic status, research has indicated that middle-class parents, as opposed to lower-class parents, are more likely to stress and encourage self-reliance and independence in their children (Ericson, 1947; Stendler, 1964; Kohn, 1969; Rosen and D'Andrade, 1972; Kerckhoff, 1972). Middle-class parents tend to make more demands on children for responsibility in self-needs and helping in the home (Ericson, 1947; Stendler, 1964).

One explanation for this discrepancy between the two classes is that middle-class parents stress internal control and lower-class parents stress external control (Kohn, 1969; Kerckhoff, 1972). Kohn

(1969) referred to internal dynamics and control in relation to self-direction and the external aspect as closer to conformity and obedience to authority. Kohn further clarified by adding that middle-class parents are more likely to value self-control and consideration for others; while working or lower-class parents value obedience. Kohn (1963, 1969) and Kerckhoff (1972) both suggested the difference in parent values of the two classes may be related to occupational values and circumstances for their specific class. Kohn (1963, p. 549) stated, "Middle-class occupations require a greater degree of self-direction; working-class occupations, in large measure, require that one follow explicit rules set down by someone in authority."

Sex and Ordinal Position

Researchers have suggested that general independence and initiative is culturally considered a masculine trait and that dependence and conformity are thought of as female traits (Barry, Bacon, and Child, 1957; Ross, 1966; Kagan, 1971). Kagan and Moss (1964) found that females who were dependent as children tended to be passive and dependent in adulthood; but this is not the case for males. This may indicate that this type of behavior was socially acceptable for the females and was reinforced. This also supports the thought that dependency in boys is increasingly thwarted following the preschool age. Ross (1966), therefore, concluded that preschool boys would be expected to exhibit more independent behavior, in general, than girls. Sears et al. (1957), however, found no sex difference in summary ratings of research concerning dependency.

Pertaining to ordinal position, some literature suggests that the first-born child is more dependent on others (Altus, 1972; Helmreich, 1973; Boroson, 1975). Some authors maintain that only children also tend to be dependent (Symonds, 1949; Helmreich, 1973). However, Falbo (1976) found that only children are independent, perhaps because they spend more time with only adults during the early years, therefore learning more adult behavior.

Methods Used in Measuring Independence

Research methods that have been employed in the study of independence and self-reliance of young children include: (1) parent questionnaires and ratings, (2) observations at school, (3) observations in the home, (4) teacher ratings, and (5) other instruments. A brief discussion of the use of these methods follows.

Parent Questionnaires and Ratings

Sears et al. (1957) used parent questionnaires concerning areas of child socialization, including the area of dependency. The interview questionnaire used consisted of specific questions with a choice of answers, but free responses were encouraged. A drawback was expressed by the researchers relating to the different ways mothers individually interpreted the meaning of dependency. Winterbottom (1953) used a questionnaire pertaining to parental attitudes toward independence and achievement. Parents were also asked to rate their children in comparison to other children.

Observations at School

Baumrind (1967) rated aspects of self-reliance of children observed at school in relation to parents, teachers, other children, and themselves. Marshal and McCandless (1957) measured dependency as the number of observed social interactions children have with adults at nursery school. A time-sampling technique was used that categorized behavior at the time of the observation. Martin (1964) used a time-sampling observation of social behavior at school. Two of the categories used were dependency and autonomy achievement. Hartup (1964) observed certain categories and summarized the frequencies within the categories to determine the observed measure of dependency of the child upon the teacher.

Home Observations

Baumrind (1972b) commented that home observations of the child-rearing practices are more valid than psychological tests or self-report alone, though it is valuable to combine home visits and self-report. Highberger (1955) rated child behavior at school in conjunction with home visits in which mothers spoke about themselves and answered questions.

Teacher Ratings

Beller (1955) used a non-bipolar scale measuring the separate components of independence and dependence. The scales consisted of an operational definition of the goal and some representative instrumental acts to serve as guides or examples. The teacher observers were trained

to be alert to behavior in specific situations during the times of observation. Winterbottom (1953, p. 145) used "Independent Items" as a category on a Teacher's Rating Scale.

Hartup (1964, p. 226) used a scale for teacher rating of dependency shown by children in a preschool situation. Such items as "seeks unnecessary help, seeks recognition, and seeks necessary help" on a seven-point scale were used for ratings by the two teachers of the children. A summary was then obtained by adding the ratings of the two teachers for all categories.

Mussen and Parker (1970) used a teacher rating to assess children's dependency on four scales. A score of one on each scale represented the lowest amount of dependency, and a score of four, the highest. A dependency rating was the sum of ratings on all four scales for each child.

Other Instruments

Hartup (1964, p. 226) used various behavior categories for laboratory observation. Frequencies in such categories as "asks for verbal help and information, asks for maternal help, and seeks reassurance and rewards" were tabulated to give a measure of dependence on the experimenter.

Starkweather (1967) developed the Independence Test for Preschool Children. This test measures the degree of independence of dependence according to refusal or acceptance by the child of help in completing tasks.

Johnson (1976, pp. 547-548) referred to the Spaulding Coping Analysis Schedule for Educational Settings (CASES) for measuring personality

development and the process of socialization occurring in school. One of the categories assessed "self-directed activity" defined as ". . . productive working; reading, writing, constructing with interest; self-directed dramatic play (with high involvement)."

Implications for the Present Research

Knowledge of some of the views pertaining to affective development is beneficial to an understanding of the multiple contributors to the development of this domain. Maslow's and Erikson's theories give insight to the internal aspect of affective development; and Bandura and Walter's theory gives insight into the external aspect.

These three theories have significant implications from an educational view. Through knowledge of Erikson's stages (1950) educators can better understand some of the doubt, mistrust, and guilt they may encounter in some children.

Pertaining to Maslow's need theory (1954), educators need to desire to teach not just to satisfy lower levels of needs, but also to fulfill higher needs. Concerning the children, generally, families or the children's home bases are sources for satisfying lower needs. Therefore, the schools are more concerned with providing for esteem needs, thereby enhancing the possibility that the self-actualization need will be satisfied (Tagatz, 1976).

The social learning theory of Bandura and Walters (1963) has implications for the classroom setting. Self-reliance and independent behavior may be enhanced by consistent positive reinforcement. Also, adults in the classroom may have significant impact as models for children's behavior.

In considering all of these ideas, it is evident that knowledge of these theories helps educators recognize affective levels, promote positive affective development, and change undesirable behavior. In keeping with an educational frame of reference, Hunter (1974) stated

The learner who is in charge of himself, who can make wise choices of activities and pursue his own interests, and who can carry on learning activities without constant teacher direction is likely to become a self-propelling, lifelong learner (p. 24).

The present study found substance in and derived direction from this thought.

In consideration of Heathers' (1955, p. 278) types of dependence and independence, the focus of the present study involved aspects of the definitions of those types. Instrumental independence, i.e., ". . . initiating activities and dealing with problems without seeking help" and the reassurance aspect of emotional dependence, i.e., ". . . when a person anticipates undesired or feared outcomes--failure, injury, etc." are under examination in this research.

Research suggests differences in self-managing behavior, i.e., independence and self-reliance, are possibly influenced by sex of the child, ordinal position in the family, and socio-economic status. Those variables were included in this study.

The literature also has indicated that parental intervention or encouragement of independent or self-reliant tendencies can have an impact upon manifestations of this behavior. These factors, along with those of parental perceptions of independence and the child's school attendance, were considered in contrast with expressions of self-managing behavior at school.

Various methods and instruments have been employed in studying independence and self-reliance in children. Some of these methods, such as parent questionnaires and ratings and school observation, were adapted and utilized in the present study.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

This chapter is divided into five sections: (1) type of research; (2) subjects; (3) data collection; (4) procedures; and (5) analysis of data. A description of each of these areas follows:

Type of Research

As this study involved human behavior within the home and the classroom, a nonexperimental, descriptive type of research was utilized. Observations, questionnaires, and checklists were used as data-gathering devices in the examination of child behavior. The non-manipulable variates were sex, attendance, socio-economic status, age, and ordinal position. The manipulable variates were parent perceptions of child self-management and parent reporting of home behavior. The variates were not manipulated in this study. The criterion variable was the degree of self-managing behavior exhibited by the child at school.

Subjects

The study involved all of the students who were consistently enrolled in a morning session and an afternoon session of kindergarten during a data collection period extending from the first of December to the eighteenth of January. Both sessions were held in an elementary school in a city in Oklahoma. There were 17 children in the morning

class and 16 children in the afternoon class consistently enrolled for the data collection. The total number of subjects was 33; there were 12 females and 21 males. Any child withdrawing or enrolling during the data collection period was not included as a subject, with the exception of one child, who enrolled the day before data collection was initiated.

Pertaining to the socio-economic levels of the subjects, the parents were asked on the Student Information form, found in Appendix A, to report the occupations and the positions of the working parents of each child's home. Out of 33 parent responses, there were two mothers reported as being registered nurses and one father listed as a mail carrier. All other mothers and/or fathers reported occupations which were either skilled, semi-skilled, or unskilled, or were on public relief as a major source of income. For example, some of the other occupations named were truck driver, laundry worker, crane operator, bindery worker, etc. Therefore, the occupational variations were judged not to indicate a range wide enough to merit inclusion of the socio-economic level as a factor in the analysis of the data.

Data Collection and Instruments

This section includes: (1) frequency of self-selection of activities; (2) frequency of seeking assistance; (3) parent perceptions; (4) parent reporting; (5) ordinal position; (6) attendance of child; and (7) age of the child. Methods used for each of the above follows:

Frequency of Self-Selection of Activities

For use in tabulation of self-selection of activities, each child

was given four laminated, cardboard tags labeled with that child's name. Although an individual child's tags were all the same shape and color, four different shapes and colors of tags were utilized within a class session. A fifth tag for each child was kept aside by the investigator in the event a tag was lost by a child. Prior to the initiation of this study, the kindergarten children were assigned to a specific group within the class, primarily for ease of transition and other activities. For example, if a child was in the red circle group, that child was given four red circle tags. Each kindergarten session had a poster chart with attached envelopes, one for each child. The individual envelopes contained the tags and were labeled with the names of the individual children.

The classroom was divided into five areas: (1) art area; (2) block area; (3) manipulative or shelf activity area; (4) daily life area; and (5) the quiet area. Each area contained a slotted box placed on a child-sized desk. Taped on the wall or shelf above the box was a sign with the word "Remember" and an arrow pointing to the box.

During the daily, free-choice activity period in each of the kindergarten sessions, morning and afternoon, the children placed their own tags in the box each time they entered an area. Daily tallies were made of the number of areas each child used. The collection of data for analysis in this study began the first of December and ended the eighteenth of January.

To insure reliability, two aspects of the system were checked. First, to allow for the possibility that some children may not have been able to recognize their names, the children were checked for this

ability before data collection began. Flash cards of the children's names and sample tags were used to determine that each child could recognize his or her name when written in manuscript form. Had there been children unable to recognize their names by the time of data collection, those children would have been assigned individual symbols to be used on their tags.

Second, it was necessary to determine if the children were actually placing the tags in the box when they entered that area. For nine activity periods prior to initiation of data collection, tabulations were made of the children in the various areas during the activity period. The investigator was stationed in an area enabling all other areas to be within view. Tabulations made by the investigator were then compared to the tags found in the boxes of the five specific areas during the last few minutes of the class session. If there was a discrepancy between the tally marks and the tags found in the boxes, the class was gently reminded to "Please remember to use your tag when you go into an area." Also, the class was sometimes praised with a statement such as, "I'm glad you remembered your tags today."

A measure of reliability was found to be at a 95% agreement between the recorded tallies and child tags. On the basis of this level of agreement of the observations of the recorder and the tallies of tags of the children, it was assumed that this tag system used by the children yielded reasonably accurate information.

Frequency of Seeking Assistance

Frequency of seeking assistance for activity selection and self-care needs, i.e., asking to use the bathroom or get a drink after having

been told it was unnecessary to ask, or asking for assistance with clothing or activity selection, was tabulated on a daily basis. These tabulations were made in spiral index card booklets, one booklet per kindergarten session. Each card in the booklet contained an individual child's name and the card was divided into columns for marking the date and frequency of seeking assistance for activity selection and self-care needs. Another list of the children's names was placed near the exit door for use in tallying when individual children asked for assistance with outer clothing before going outside or leaving the school.

Parent Perceptions

Parent perceptions of their child's self-managing ability was determined by the Parent Perceptions of Self-Management (PPSM) questionnaire given to the parent at the time of the child's enrollment in the kindergarten class, prior to collection of data from children's behavior at school. The questionnaire consisted of six questions, using a five-point scale, pertaining to the parents' perceptions of the child's independent and self-reliant behavior at home. A complete copy of the instrument may be found in Appendix B. The questionnaire contained portions adapted from The Interview Schedule developed by Sears et al. (1957) and the Teacher's Rating Scale and Questionnaire Given to the Mothers, both developed by Winterbottom (1953).

Parent Reporting

A checklist, Parent Reporting of Independent Activity (PRIA), was also administered to parents at enrollment time. A complete copy of

the checklist may be found in Appendix C. The checklist contained items indicative of the amount of child independent activity exhibited and allowed in the home. The parent indicated those behaviors actually exhibited at that time by the child. The checklist contained items adapted from the Age Independence Scale, Form II (Preschool), developed by Keith, Blair, and Markee (1976); the Age Independence Scale, Elementary School Form, developed by Gray and Keith (1976); and a list of responsibilities compiled by Walters, Stromberg, and Lonian (1959).

Pertaining to the validation of both of the above mentioned, the PPSM and the PRIA, these instruments were partially adapted from published instruments; therefore, construct validity was assumed. The parents were given a reasonable explanation for filling out the forms, as it pertained to the need of teacher knowledge of the children. This explanation can be found in Appendix B, at the beginning of the PPSM. The parents were not told that the information obtained from the forms was for use in research, due to the possibility of biased responses that would invalidate the data.

Ordinal Position

Shortly before the initiation of the data collection, the parents were asked to complete a form eliciting information about the family. The Student Information form contained an item pertaining to the ordinal position of the child. This form may be found in Appendix A.

Attendance of Child

The attendance of each child was recorded daily. The regular

school attendance form was used during the data collection period for this tabulation.

Age of Child

The birth date of each child was obtained from birth certificates seen at enrollment. This date was recorded on an enrollment card and kept with school records. The child's age in terms of years and months as of the data collection period was recorded.

Procedures

During a daily, free choice activity period of approximately 45 minutes, each child was allowed to use from one to four tags labeled with that child's name. The tags were housed in individually labeled envelopes attached to a chart hanging within accessible reach of the children. The classroom was divided into five areas: (1) art area; (2) manipulative area; (3) block area; (4) daily life area; and (5) quiet area. Each area contained a slotted box placed on a child-sized desk. The children were instructed to put one of their tags into the slotted box of an area whenever they entered that area to work. They were told that if they left a specific area to work in another area, they were to place a tag in the box of the new work area. If they decided to return to the first work area, they would also need to place a tag in the box of that area again. However, if they were working in an area, and left for a short time to use the bathroom, get a drink, or whatever, and then returned to resume work in that area, it was not necessary to use another tag upon re-entering the area. At the end of the

activity period, or after the students had vacated the room for the day, the tags were taken from the boxes and the names were listed on a form divided into five columns, one for each area.

In addition, the number of times individual children sought assistance in selecting activities, i.e., asking, "What can I do now?" and in taking care of self-care needs, i.e., asking to use the bathroom or get a drink (even after being told it was not necessary to ask), or asking for assistance with clothing, was tallied daily in a spiral index card booklet carried by the investigator. A separate tally sheet was placed near the exit door to mark assistance sought for dressing.

During the regular school enrollment, prior to the data collection, the parents of the children were asked to fill out the Parent Perceptions of Self-Management questionnaire and the Parent Report of Independent Activity checklist. The PPSM consisted of six questions, with answers chosen from a five-point scale for each question. (See Appendix B for a copy of the PPSM.) The ratings on these scales were combined to yield a score for each child of high or low for self-managing behavior at home as perceived by the parent. The PRIA was a checklist of 17 items pertaining to independent and self-managing activity actually exhibited at that time by the child at home. According to the number of items checked, each child was rated high or low in exhibited independent or self-managing behavior in the home.

At the end of the data collection period, which included 23 daily, self-selected activity periods, the individual tabulations of independent activity selections were divided by the total number of days the child was present to yield an activity score for each child. For an assistance score, the total number of requests for assistance made by each

child was divided by the total number of days the child was present during the data collection. Medians were established for activity and for assistance scores and each child was rated high or low for activity selection and high or low for assistance seeking.

The school activity rating was compared with the PPSM rating and also the PRIA rating, as was the school assistance rating. In addition, the PPSM rating and the PRIA rating were compared. Daily school attendance by individual children during the data collection was recorded on the regular school attendance forms. Other information, such as sex, ordinal position, and age, was obtained through the regular school enrollment cards and the Student Information form (see Appendix A). These four variables were individually compared to the school activity rating, the school assistance rating, the PPSM rating, and the PRIA rating.

Analysis of Data

This study involved nonparametric nominal levels of data. Medians were established for PPSM and PRIA scores and subjects were assigned a high (above median) or low (median or below) rating for each of the two instruments. The McNemar Test for significance of changes was used to compare the PPSM and PRIA. A school activity score for each child was determined by dividing the total number of activities selected by the total number of days the child was present during the data collection. Individual school assistance scores were determined by dividing the total number of requests for assistance or permission by the number of days present. A median was then established for the activity scores. A high (median or above) or low (below median) rating for frequency of

activity selection was determined for each child. Assistance ratings of high (above median) and low (median and below) were determined for each child. Also, each subject was assigned an attendance rating of either high (above median) or low (median and below) according to the median found for the number of days present during the 23 day data collection period.

Each child was identified as younger or older on the basis of an age median. The ages of the children were listed in terms of years and months and a median was determined. Those identified as younger had ages that were below the median and children identified as older had ages that were above and included the median age. In addition, an ordinal position classification was determined for each child. As it was necessary to have no more than two categories for facility of data analysis, subjects were either placed into a category of last-born or not-last-born (which included first-born, only, or middle-born children).

The Median Test was then used to analyze the significance of differences concerning the school activity rating and PPSM; the school assistance rating and PPSM rating; the school activity rating and PRIA rating; and the school assistance rating and PRIA rating. For analysis of the significance of differences of the variables of sex, ordinal position, age, and attendance according to the ratings determined from the activity, assistance, PPSM, and PRIA scores, the Median Test was again used.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter is devoted to presentation of results and conclusions related to hypotheses found in Chapter I. This chapter has three sections: (1) Introduction; (2) Examination of Objectives and Results of Hypotheses; and (3) Conclusions and Discussion.

Introduction

The purpose of this investigation was to determine if specified variables are related to observed self-managing behavior at school and to parent perceptions and reports of this behavior at home. Self-managing behavior at school was also compared to parent perceptions and reports of self-managing and independent activity at home.

Thirty-three kindergarten children were observed and given a system for use in tallying the frequencies of self-selection of activities; and their requests for assistance in activity selection and self-care needs were tallied by the investigator. An activity rating and an assistance rating for school were calculated. The parents of the subjects completed instruments to yield information concerning parent perceptions of the child's self-management and parent reporting of self-management and independent activity at home. These instruments, Parent Perceptions of Self-Management (PPSM) and Parent Reporting of Independent Activity (PRIA), can be found in Appendixes B and C. Data concerning sex, age,

ordinal position, and attendance were available from school records and were compared to school activity ratings, school assistance ratings, PPSM ratings, and PRIA ratings.

Examination of Objectives and Hypotheses

This section contains a listing of the objectives of the study and tables that apply to part of those objectives. In addition, hypotheses relating to specific objectives are stated along with the results related to those hypotheses. The specific objectives and hypotheses were as follows:

Objective One

Objective One was to describe the self-managing ability of the subjects in terms of an activity score (frequency of self-selection of activities at school) and an assistance score (frequency of seeking assistance in activity selection or pertaining to self-care needs). These descriptions are presented in Table I and Table II.

Objective Two

Objective Two was divided into two parts; first, to describe the subjects in terms of the Parent Perception of Self-Management (PPSM) and the Parent Reporting of Independent Activity (PRIA). These descriptions are presented in Tables III and IV.

The second part of Objective Two was to compare the PPSM and PRIA ratings. To achieve this objective, Hypothesis One was tested.

H_1 : There will be no significant difference between the PPSM rating and the PRIA rating.

The McNemar Test for significance of changes was used to test this

TABLE I
DESCRIPTION OF SUBJECTS BY ACTIVITY SCORES

Score by Group	Median	Range
<u>Total Group</u> (N=33)	1.739	.950-2.684
<u>Sex</u>		
Girls (N=12)	1.816	1.190-2.429
Boys (N=21)	1.666	.950-2.684
<u>Age</u>		
Younger (N=15)	1.739	.950-2.666
Older (N=18)	1.701	1.190-2.684
<u>Ordinal Position</u>		
Firstborn and only (N=8)	1.602	.950-2.666
Middle born (N=8)	1.688	1.190-2.500
Last born (N=17)	2.048	1.368-2.684
<u>Attendance</u>		
High (N=16)	1.810	.950-2.666
Low (N=17)	1.625	1.222-2.684

TABLE II
DESCRIPTION OF SUBJECTS BY ASSISTANCE SCORES

Scores by Group	Median	Range
<u>Total Group</u> (N=33)	.214	.000-1.125
<u>Sex</u>		
Girls (N=12)	.359	.095-1.125
Boys (N=21)	.174	.000-0.750
<u>Age</u>		
Younger (N=15)	.238	.048-1.125
Older (N=18)	.146	.000-0.900
<u>Ordinal Position</u>		
Firstborn and only (N=8)	.150	.000-0.368
Middle born (N=8)	.055	.000-0.750
Last born (N=17)	.304	.000-1.125
<u>Attendance</u>		
High (N=16)	.200	.000-0.905
Low (N=17)	.214	.000-1.125

TABLE III
DESCRIPTION OF SUBJECTS BY PPSM SCORES

Score by Group	Median	Range
<u>Total Group</u> (N=33)	23	17-27
<u>Sex</u>		
Girls (N=12)	24	17-27
Boys (N=21)	23	17-25
<u>Age</u>		
Younger (N=15)	24	18-26
Older (N=18)	23	17-27
<u>Ordinal Position</u>		
Firstborn and only (N=8)	24	18-27
Middle born (N=8)	23	17-25
Last born (N=17)	23	17-25
<u>Attendance</u>		
High (N=16)	23	17-25
Low (N=17)	23	17-27

TABLE IV
DESCRIPTION OF SUBJECTS BY PRIA SCORES

Score by Group	Median	Range
<u>Total Group</u> (N=33)	11	5-15
<u>Sex</u>		
Girls (N=12)	11.5	5-14
Boys (N=21)	12	7-15
<u>Age</u>		
Younger (N=15)	11	7-14
Older (N=18)	12	5-15
<u>Ordinal Position</u>		
Firstborn and only (N=8)	12	8-14
Middle born (N=8)	12	5-14
Last born (N=17)	11	6-15
<u>Attendance</u>		
High (N=16)	10.5	5-15
Low (N=17)	12	9-14

hypothesis. The resulting chi-square value was .75, and did not allow rejection of the hypothesis. The parent responses were similar for both.

Objective Three

Objective Three was to compare self-managing behavior exhibited at school with the PPSM and the PRIA. To achieve Objective Three, three hypotheses were tested. These hypotheses and the results follow:

H₂: There will be no significant difference between the number of children who can be classified as high or low self-managers and those who cannot be classified as high or low self-managers.

The resulting chi-square value, 3.66 (d.f.=1), did not allow rejection of the hypothesis; the hypothesis was accepted. The result was not significant at the .05 level of significance. Therefore, it was not possible to classify children as exclusively high or low self-managers at school. There were, in fact, 66% who did not conform to the previously established definition of either type of self-manager. This finding indicated a need to compare activity rating and assistance rating individually with the parent instruments and the non-manipulable variates.

H₃(A): There will be no significant difference between school activity ratings and PPSM ratings.

The results were not significant at the .05 level, as the chi-square value was 2.36 (d.f.=1); and the hypothesis was accepted. There was no association between school activity rating and PPSM rating.

H₃(B): There will be no significant difference between school assistance ratings and PPSM ratings.

The resulting chi-square value was 3.76 (d.f.=1) and did not allow rejection of the hypothesis. The PPSM responses were not significantly associated with the assistance ratings reflecting requests for help with routine kinds of activities at school.

H₄(A): There will be no significant difference between school activity ratings and PRIA ratings.

The results were significant at the .05 level, as the chi-square value was 5.6 (d.f.=1); therefore, the hypothesis was rejected. The results indicated that those children low in activity selection at school were rated high by parents in independent activity at home; and those high in activity selection at school were rated low by parents in independent activity at home.

H₄(B): There will be no significant difference between school assistance ratings and PRIA ratings.

The resulting chi-square value was 3.65 (d.f.=1) and did not allow rejection of the hypothesis. The amount of independent activity as reported by the parents that the child exhibited at home was not significantly associated with the assistance a child required at school.

Objective Four

Objective Four was to determine the relationship of sex, ordinal position, age, and attendance to the amount of observed self-management in the classroom. To achieve Objective Four, two hypotheses were tested. These hypotheses and results follow:

H₅: There will be no significant difference in school activity ratings according to:

- (a) Sex
- (b) Ordinal position
- (c) Age
- (d) Attendance

The hypothesis was not rejected for any of the four variables (a. Sex, $\chi^2=.027$; b. Ordinal position, $\chi^2=.737$; c. Age, $\chi^2=.292$; and d. Attendance, $\chi^2=1.12$). Frequent activity selection was not significantly

associated with the child's sex, age, ordinal position, or school attendance.

H₆: There will be no significant difference in school assistance ratings according to:

- (a) Sex
- (b) Ordinal position
- (c) Age
- (d) Attendance

The resulting chi-square value for sex was 5.02 (d.f.=1, $p < .05$). Therefore, the hypothesis was rejected. Among subjects in this study, males did show less assistance-seeking behavior than females.

The resulting chi-square value for ordinal position was 8.80 (d.f.=1, $p < .01$). Therefore, the hypothesis was rejected. Due to the small number of subjects, it was necessary to combine categories to include first-born, only, and middle-born children in one category and last-born children in another category. Findings indicate that assistance seeking behavior was significantly associated with ordinal position; last-born children sought more assistance than children who were not born last.

The hypothesis was not rejected for the difference in assistance rating and age. The resulting chi-square value was .737 (d.f.=1). The hypothesis was not rejected for the difference in assistance rating and school attendance. The resulting chi-square value was .003 (d.f.=1).

Objective Five

Objective Five was to determine the relationship of sex, ordinal position, age, and attendance to PPSM and PRIA ratings. To achieve Objective Five, two hypotheses were tested. These hypotheses and results follow:

H₇: There will be no significant difference between PPSM ratings and variables of:

- (a) Sex
- (b) Ordinal position
- (c) Age
- (d) Attendance

On the basis of the resulting chi-square values (a. Sex, $\chi^2=.489$; b. Ordinal position, $\chi^2=0.25$; c. Age, $\chi^2=.737$; and d. Attendance, $\chi^2=.007$), the hypothesis was not rejected for any of the four variables. There was no significant difference in the PPSM ratings according to the variables of sex, ordinal position, age, or attendance.

H₈: There will be no significant difference between PPSM ratings and variables of:

- (a) Sex
- (b) Ordinal position
- (c) Age
- (d) Attendance

On the basis of the resulting chi-square values (a. Sex, $\chi^2=.001$; b. Ordinal position, $\chi^2=.076$; c. Age, $\chi^2=.737$; and d. Attendance, $\chi^2=.737$), the hypothesis was not rejected for any of the four variables. There was no significant difference in the PRIA ratings according to the variables of sex, ordinal position, age, or attendance.

Conclusions and Discussion

On the basis of the results of analysis of the hypotheses, some conclusions were drawn. These conclusions are stated and discussed in the following paragraphs.

As there was no significant difference between PPSM ratings and PRIA ratings, it was concluded that the parent responses on the instruments were similar. Parents who perceived their child as high in self-managing behavior at home also rated them high in exhibited independent

activity. Similarly, parents who perceived their child as low in self-managing behavior rated them low in exhibited independent activity. Apparently, the parent perceptions of behavior were in accord with actual behavior, or the parents were expressing consistent perceptions of their child's behavior.

Pertaining to classifying children as either high self-managers or as low self-managers on the basis of a combined activity and assistance score, it was deemed not possible to classify children as exclusively high or low self-managers. The previously stated definition of high self-manager was a child rated high in self-selection of activities and low in assistance seeking. A low self-manager was defined as a child low in self-selection of activities and high in assistance seeking. However, findings indicated that there were 66% who would have to be classified as mixed, i.e., high activity selection plus high assistance seeking, or low activity selection plus low assistance seeking. As a result of these findings, it was decided that the activity and assistance ratings must be compared individually with the other variables.

As no significant association was found between school activity ratings and PPSM ratings or school assistance ratings and PPSM ratings, it is possible that the device or system used to measure school behavior was not measuring the same type of behavior as the parent instrument was measuring. The school measurement may have included just a portion of what should be considered in defining self-managing behavior. Also, it is possible that the children may respond to school environment differently than to the home environment.

Regarding the relationship between the school activity ratings and the PRIA ratings, it was found that there was a significant association

between the two ratings. However, from the results it was concluded that those children low in activity selection at school were rated by parents as high in independent activity at home; and inversely, those high in activity selection at school were rated low by the parent in independent activity at home. There are several implications that can be regarded concerning these findings. Perhaps the parents did not judge their children's behavior within a realistic framework; or perhaps the children were not consistent with their school behavior and behavior they exhibited in the home. It is also possible that the school instrument or method and/or the parent instrument may not be tapping a clearly identified dimension of child behavior. As for the insignificant association found between the school assistance rating and the PRIA rating, it was concluded that the amount of assistance required at school by a child was not related to the amount of independent activity exhibited at home by that child.

Considering the difference in school activity according to variables of sex, ordinal position, age, and attendance, this type of behavior, i.e., frequent activity selection at school, was not significantly associated with those variables. Similarly, there was no significant difference in school assistance ratings according to age or attendance. However, there was a significant association between school assistance ratings and sex and school assistance ratings and ordinal position. The results indicated that among subjects in this study, males did show less assistance seeking behavior than females. This conclusion is supported by the research findings in the literature that suggest that general independence is culturally considered a masculine trait and thereby encouraged in males and not in females.

As stated before, another finding that emerged as relevant was the significant association between the school assistance rating and ordinal position. Due to the small number of subjects, it was necessary to collapse categories concerning ordinal position. The investigator decided to identify last-born children as compared to children who were not last-born, i.e., first-born, only, and middle-born. On the basis of the results, it was concluded that the last-born children sought more assistance or guidance in activity selection or with self-care skills. This conclusion is consistent with the findings of some authors that only or first-born children are independent, perhaps because they spend more time with adults during their early years and learn more adult behavior. Also, it should be considered that the last-born children had older siblings who very well could have contributed to the younger children's dependency by doing things for them. So, the last-born children could have been used to having parents and older siblings fulfill assistance requests.

The analysis of results of significant difference in PPSM ratings and in PRIA ratings according to variables of sex, ordinal position, age, and attendance yielded no significant results. It can be concluded that parent perceptions of self-managing behavior or reporting of exhibited independent activity is not affected by the variables tested in this study. This may indicate that these parent instruments do not measure adequately the facets of self-managing behavior to enable any kind of association to be shown.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This concluding chapter provides a summary of the findings of the study. Implications and recommendations for further study are also included.

Summary

The investigation involved a study of self-managing behavior at school as it compared to parent perceptions and parent reporting of this behavior in the home, and the association of this behavior to variables of sex, ordinal position, age, and school attendance. Observations and self-tabulations of 33 kindergarten children were used to yield ratings of "high" or "low" regarding activity selection and assistance seeking of the children at school. These ratings were compared to ratings of "high" or "low" yielded from each of two instruments administered to parents, the PPSM, and the PRIA. In addition, the school activity ratings and school assistance ratings were separately compared to the four other variables, as were the ratings on the PPSM and the PRIA.

Significant results were found in only the area of assistance ratings and their association with sex and ordinal position. The results indicated that among subjects in this study, males did show less assistance seeking behavior than females. Also, it was found that last-born

children sought more assistance than did first-born, only, or middle-born children.

Implications

A finding that yielded no significant difference, but that has certain implications, pertains to classifying children as high or low self-managers. On the basis of the investigator's definition of high self-manager, i.e., high frequency of activity selection plus low assistance seeking; and low self-manager, i.e., low frequency of activity selection plus high assistance seeking; the subjects could not be classified as exclusively high or low. It was found that the number of children with a mixed rating, either high activity plus high assistance or low activity plus low assistance, exceeded the number of children who could be classified according to the definition by a ratio of two to one.

These findings may imply that a frequent changing of activities may reflect a lack of maturity and independence rather than an advanced state of maturity and independence. It is possible that consistently high frequency of activity selection may indicate an inability to get involved or stay with an activity for a period of time. Seen in this way, the child unable to stay involved might also be the child requiring more assistance due to either a dependency pattern or level of maturity. The high number of children exhibiting the mixed rating according to the original definition would seem to support this implication. Those children with a high activity rating may, in fact, be the very children not able to manage themselves.

Another aspect of the study that presents implications from a functional view is the system used by the children to tally their activity frequencies. This method may not be a particularly appropriate one to measure self-managing behavior, but it does have potential as a classroom management technique. The investigator feels that this management system has definite potential in programs for young children, particularly those involving children from less structured home environments. The tag system may be valuable as a way to help children and teachers be aware of what activities the children do engage in the most or the least. This knowledge could be helpful in program planning. Also, it may help teachers focus on needs of individual children. In this study, the use of the tags seemed to give the students a certain structure that enabled them to clarify to themselves what activities they had engaged in and with what activities they were going to get involved. The investigator noted that after discontinuation of the system at the end of the data collection, it did take several weeks to eliminate the pattern of using the tags and that the general activity period atmosphere was somewhat more chaotic. Another possibility to consider is that the use of the tags may have changed the children's behavior from the very outset of the data collection.

Recommendations for Further Study

A need for further research of the contributing factors to self-management in young children is indicated as a result of this study. Results of assistance requests yield information that is consistent with the literature; however, the activity scores or the system utilized to measure activity frequency does not give clear results. This

causes the investigator to question the theoretical base for that measurement. The earlier notion that a high self-manager is a child that has a high frequency of activity changes and a low number of requests for assistance may need to be revised to describe the child with low activity frequencies and low assistance seeking, as discussed previously. This possible revision creates cause for further study.

Another area could be explored in relation to the quality of activity selection. It may be worthwhile to conduct careful observations of the types of activities selected, the actual amount of time spent with that activity, and the degree or depth of involvement the child reaches with an activity.

The instruments administered to the parents may need to be examined to determine if the range and scope of items included are sufficient and appropriate to glean the desired information. A possible drawback to the PPSM utilized in this study could be the variations in the way parents interpreted the meanings of independence and dependence. However, the parents did respond consistently on the two instruments, indicating that perhaps the PRIA was measuring behavior referred to in the PPSM.

The investigator is hopeful that future study pertaining to self-management of young children is pursued on the basis of a particular belief concerning behavior and management. As Parks (1974) has so aptly stated

Because children are usually managed almost entirely by the adults around them instead of being required to direct their own behavior, they frequently have little idea of how to organize their activities to achieve specific objectives. If they are to be taught effective self-direction, they must be shown how to establish themselves, to organize a goals-oriented system of behavior, and to provide feedback on their own progress toward these goals (p. 162).

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- A Healthy Personality for Every Child. A Digest of the Fact Finding Report to the Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth. Raleigh, North Carolina: Health Publications Institute, 1951.
- Altus, W. D. Birth order and its sequelae. In U. Bronfenbrenner (Ed.), Influences on Human Development. Hillsdale, Illinois: Dryden Press, Inc., 1972.
- Bandura, A. and Walters, R. H. Social Learning and Personality Development. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1963.
- Barry, H. B. III, Bacon, M. K., and Child, I. L. A cross-cultural survey of some sex differences in socialization. Journal of American and Social Psychology, 1957, 55, 327-332.
- Baumrind, D. Child care practices anteceding three patterns of pre-school behavior. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1967, 75, 43-88.
- Baumrind, D. Socialization and instrumental competence in young children. In I. B. Weiner and D. Elkind (Eds.), Readings in Child Development. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1972a.
- Baumrind, D. Some thoughts about childrearing. In U. Bronfenbrenner (Ed.), Influences on Human Development. Hillsdale, Illinois: Dryden Press, Inc., 1972b.
- Beller, E. Dependency and independence in young children. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1955, 87, 25-35.
- Bernard, H. W. Human Development in Western Culture. (3rd ed.) Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1970.
- Boroson, W. First-born--fortune's favorite? In Annual Editions, Readings in Human Development, 75/76. Connecticut: Duskin Publishing Group, Inc., 1975.
- Clausen, J. A. Perspectives in childhood socialization. In I. B. Weiner and D. Elkind (Eds.), Readings in Child Development. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1972.
- Dinkmeyer, D. C. Child Development, The Emerging Self. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.

- Donovan, F. R. Raising Your Children, What Behavioral Scientists Have Discovered. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, Co., 1968.
- Ericson, M. C. Social status and child-rearing practices. In T. M. Newcomb and E. L. Hartley (Eds.), Readings in Social Psychology. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1947.
- Erikson, E. H. Childhood and Society. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1950.
- _____. Childhood and Society (2nd ed.). New York: W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1963.
- Gray, A. W. and Keith, R. A. Age Independence Scale, Elementary School Form. In O. Johnson (Ed.), Tests and Measurements in Child Development, Handbook II, Vol. Two. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1976.
- Goodman, D. A. Parent's Guide to Emotional Needs of Children. New York: Hawthorn Books, Inc., 1959.
- Falbo, T. Does the only child grow up miserable? Psychology Today, 1976 (May), 9(12), 60-65.
- Hartup, W. W. Nurturance and nurturance-withdrawal in relation to the dependency behavior of preschool children. In C. Stendler (Ed.), Readings in Child Behavior and Development (2nd ed.). New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1964.
- Havighurst, R. J. Developmental Tasks and Education. Chicago: The University at Chicago, 1950.
- Heathers, G. Acquiring dependence and independence: a Theoretical orientation. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1955, 12, 277-291.
- Helmreich, R. Birth order effects. In J. P. Rosenblith, W. Allinsmith, and J. P. Williams (Eds.), Readings in Child Development--Causes of Behavior. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1973, 166-168.
- Highberger, R. The relationship between maternal behavior and the child's early adjustment to nursery school. Child Development, 1955 (Mar.), 26, 49-61.
- Hunter, M. Helping children to become independent learners. Instructor, 1974 (Jan.), 83, 24.
- Hurlock, E. Child Growth and Development (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.
- Johnson, O. G. Tests and Measurements in Child Development, Handbook II, Vol. One. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1976.

- Kagan, J. and Moss, H. A. The stability of passive and dependent behavior from childhood through adulthood. In C. Stendler (Ed.), Readings in Child Behavior and Development (2nd ed.). New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1964.
- Kagan, J. Understanding Children; Behavior, Motives, and Thought. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovitch, Inc., 1971.
- Keith, R. A., Blair, M. A., and Markee, G. S. Age Independence Scale, Form II (Preschool). In O. Johnson (Ed.), Tests and Measurements in Child Development, Handbook II, Vol. Two. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1976.
- Kerckhoff, A. C. Socialization and Social Class. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.
- Kohn, M. L. Social class and parent-child relationships: an interpretation. American Journal of Sociology, 1963, 68 (4), 471-480.
- Kohn, M. L. Class and Conformity. Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1969.
- Leeper, S. H., Dales, R. J., Skipper, D. S., and Witherspoon, R. L. Good Schools for Young Children. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1974.
- Marshal, H. R. and McCandless, B. R. Relationships between dependence on adults and social acceptance by peers. Child Development, 1957 (Dec.), 28, 413-419.
- Martin, W. E. Singularity and stability of profiles of social behavior. In C. Stendler (Ed.), Readings in Child Behavior and Development (2nd ed.). New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1964.
- Maslow, A. H. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, Inc., 1954.
- _____. Motivation and Personality (2nd ed.). New York: Harper and Row Publishers, Inc., 1970.
- Munsinger, H. Fundamentals of Child Development. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1971.
- Mussen, P. H. and Parker, A. L. Mother nurturance and girls' incidental imitative learning. In P. H. Mussen, J. J. Conger, and J. Kagan. Readings in Child Development and Personality (2nd ed.). New York: Harper and Ros, 1970.
- Parks, Lee. You can teach self-direction. Instructor, 1974 (Aug.), 84, 162.
- Rosen, B. C. and D'Andrade, R. The psycho-social origins of achievement motivation. In U. Bronfenbrenner (Ed.), Influences on Human Development. Hillsdale, Illinois: Dryden Press, Inc., 1972.

- Ross, D. Relationship between dependency, intentional learning, and incidental learning in preschool children. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4(4), 374-381.
- Sears, R. R., Maccoby, E. E., and Levin, H. Patterns of Child Rearing. New York: Row, Peterson, and Co., 1957.
- Starkweather, E. The Independence Test for Preschool Children. Research Foundation, Oklahoma State University, 1967.
- Stendler, C. (Ed.). Readings in Child Behavior and Development (2nd ed.). New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1964.
- Symonds, P. The Dynamics of Parent-Child Relationships. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1949.
- Tagatz, G. E. Child Development and Individually Guided Education. Wisconsin: The Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin, 1976.
- Walters, J., Stromberg, F., and Lonian, G. Perceptions concerning development of responsibility in young children. Elementary School Journal, 1957, 57, 209-216.
- Winterbottom, M. R. The Relationship of Childhood Training in Independence to Achievement Motivation. (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1953), Microfilm T118.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

STUDENT INFORMATION FORM

STUDENT INFORMATION FORM

Student _____ Grade _____

Address _____ Phone _____

Family Information

	Mother	Father
Name		
Address		
Place of Employment		
Position Title		
Business Phone		
Marital Status		

With whom does the child reside? _____

Names and ages of other children in the family:

1.	Age: 5.	Age:
2.	Age: 6.	Age:
3.	Age: 7.	Age:
4.	Age: 8.	Age:

APPENDIX B

PARENT PERCEPTIONS OF SELF-MANAGEMENT

ENROLLMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Name of Child _____

Name of Parent _____

Your child is different from all other children in the way he or she will learn and grow. In planning an educational program, it is helpful to know something about the children in the class. This form has some questions on it about some of the ways your child may or may not act. The answers are only for my use; I am hoping they will give me an idea of the different needs of children in the kindergarten class this year. It helps me to know where the children are in their development, so I can know where to begin with teaching and setting up the room.

The form has been divided into two parts: first, there are some questions with different answers. Please choose the answer under each question that best describes your child; second, there is a list of things your child may or may not do now. Please choose only the ones your child does now.

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this form. I appreciate your cooperation.

Please check ONLY the answer to each question that BEST describes your child.

1. How is your child at entertaining or keeping himself occupied?
 - Can keep busy and occupied without any suggestions.
 - Needs an occasional suggestion.
 - Needs a fair number of suggestions and directions about what to do.
 - Needs many suggestions and directions.
 - Needs constant suggestions and directions.

2. How well can your child do such things as eating, putting on own clothes, and using the bathroom?
 - Looks after self completely.
 - Does most everything by self.
 - Does some things by self, needs some help.
 - Needs quite a lot of help.
 - Can do very little by self.

3. How much attention does your child want from you?
- Practically none, only when hurt.
 - A little.
 - Some, at certain times of the day.
 - Quite a bit.
 - A great deal.
4. How much help does your child need?
- Wants and likes to do things on own. Resists help when offered.
 - Likes to do things on own. Asks for help only if needs it.
 - Does some things alone. Asks for help fairly often.
 - Does very few things on own without asking for help.
 - Constantly asks for help. Doesn't like to do things on own.
5. Does your child ask for help or guidance with something you know could be done alone?
- Never.
 - Very few times.
 - Fair number of times.
 - Many times.
 - All of the time.
6. Generally, how would you rate your child's overall independence?
- Extremely independent.
 - Very independent.
 - Moderately independent.
 - Very dependent.
 - Extremely dependent.

APPENDIX C

PARENT REPORT OF INDEPENDENT ACTIVITY

Check ONLY the things your child IS DOING NOW.

1. Dresses self completely (zippers, buttons, shoes).
2. Combs hair.
3. Makes a sandwich without help.
4. Plays without guidance for two to three hours.
5. Walks several blocks alone to school or a friend's house.
6. Goes to bed without help (gets dressed and into bed).
7. Does little chores around the house.
8. Eats without help in cutting and handling food.
9. Stays home alone for short periods of time.
10. Looks after own things, picks up toys.
11. Tries new things without help.
12. Answers the telephone.
13. Bathes self with no adult help after being reminded.
14. Dresses self if clothes are laid out.
15. Puts things in their place without being told to by an adult.
16. Puts coat, sweater, hat, mittens, etc. on without help.
17. Puts dirty clothes in a hamper without being asked to do so.

VITA²

Tana Leigh Stubblefield
Candidate for the Degree of
Master of Science

Thesis: FACTORS RELATED TO SELF-MANAGING BEHAVIOR IN KINDERGARTEN CHILDREN

Major Field: Family Relations and Child Development

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Bartlesville, Oklahoma, April 11, 1952, the daughter of Jack and Olga Stubblefield.

Education: Graduated from Sooner High School, Bartlesville, Oklahoma, in May, 1974; received Bachelor of Science degree with a major in Family Relations and Child Development from Oklahoma State University in May, 1974; completed requirements for the Master of Science degree with a major in Family Relations and Child Development at Oklahoma State University in July, 1979.

Professional Experience: Intermediate Four educator for Rice Elementary, Topeka, Kansas, 1974-75; Kindergarten Educator, Belvoir Elementary, Topeka, Kansas, 1975-77; Kindergarten Educator for Lincoln School, Bartlesville, Oklahoma, 1977-79; Board of Directors, Tulsa Area Association for Children Under Six, 1978-79.