

PRESCHOOL CHILDREN'S PERCEPTIONS OF  
AFFECTIONATE PHYSICAL CONTACT

By

CATHERINE CASTLE HUNT

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1978

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  
December, 1982

Thesis  
1982  
H939p  
cop. 2



PRESCHOOL CHILDREN'S PERCEPTIONS OF  
AFFECTIONATE PHYSICAL CONTACT

Thesis Approved:

*Frances Stromberg*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Thesis Adviser

*Althea Wright*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Lorne Lest*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Debra A. Taylor*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Norman M. Durbin*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean of the Graduate College

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer expresses appreciation to those persons who helped make this study possible.

Great appreciation is expressed to Dr. Delores Taylor for her tireless assistance, encouragement and support throughout this research. Appreciation is expressed to Dr. Frances Stromberg for helping me begin this research and encouraging me to pursue a topic of great interest.

I also thank Ms. Leone List for her patience throughout this study and her concern for me as an individual. I am grateful to Dr. Althea Wright for her advice and critical reading of the manuscript.

Finally, I would like to thank my family; my mother, Mrs. Ann Hunt, and my grandmother, Mrs. Jessie Briggs, for their constant encouragement in my studies, faith in my abilities, and most of all, for their love.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Chapter   | Page |
|---|------|
| I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .   | 1    |
| Purpose of the Study . . . . .  | 1    |
| Need for the Study . . . . .  | 1    |
| II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE . . . . .  | 5    |
| Sensory Deprivation and Animals . . . . .   | 5    |
| Infant Attachment (Bonding) . . . . .   | 6    |
| The Importance of Physical Contact to Young Children . . . . .                                  | 8    |
| III. METHOD AND PROCEDURE . . . . .   | 13   |
| Subjects . . . . .  | 14   |
| Research Instruments . . . . .  | 14   |
| Reliability . . . . .   | 19   |
| IV. DISCUSSION . . . . .  | 20   |
| Understanding . . . . .   | 20   |
| Valuing . . . . .   | 20   |
| Experiencing . . . . .  | 21   |
| V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .  | 30   |
| Purpose of the Research . . . . .   | 30   |
| Methods of Study . . . . .  | 30   |
| Results . . . . .   | 32   |
| Limitations of Research and Recommendations . . . . .   | 33   |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .  | 36   |
| APPENDICES . . . . .  | 38   |
| APPENDIX A - CHILD'S RESPONSE RATING FORM . . . . .   | 39   |
| APPENDIX B - CHILD'S RESPONSES TO PICTURES DEPICTING<br>AFFECTIONATE PHYSICAL CONTACT . . . . . | 41   |
| APPENDIX C - TEACHER RATING FORMS . . . . .   | 49   |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table  | Page |
|--|------|
| I. Children Who Scored High on Total Affectional Response<br>(Score of 9-12) . . . . . | 22   |
| II. Children Who Scored Low on Total Affectional Response<br>(Score of 0-3) . . . . .  | 24   |
| III. Children With High Response to Hugging Picture (Score<br>of 3) . . . . .          | 25   |
| IV. Children With High Response to Playing Picture (Score<br>of 3) . . . . .           | 26   |
| V. Children With High Response to Helping Picture (Score<br>of 3) . . . . .            | 27   |
| VI. Children With High Response to Pet Picture (Score of 3) . .                        | 28   |

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to find out if children, during the pre-school years, are able to communicate expressions of feelings about affectionate physical contact, specifically if they value and understand this contact and if they have experienced such contact.

#### Need for the Study

The importance of physical contact has been supported for many years. The effects of physical contact, or tactile experience upon human behavioral development is discussed by Montague (1971) in his book, Touching, The Human Significance of the Skin. Montague (1971, p. 12) asks the question, "In the course of early development must members of the species Homo Sapiens undergo certain kinds of tactile experience in order to develop as healthy human beings?" Montague (1971, p. 15) concludes that "for human beings, tactile stimulation is of fundamental significance for the development of healthy emotional or affectional relationships, in short, that one learns to love not by instruction, but by being loved." The child who receives inadequate tactile stimulation has suffered "a failure in the communication of the experience of love"

(Montague, 1971, p. 226). Failure in the experience of tactile affection will often affect the individual in such a way that he or she is awkward and crude in attempts at demonstration of affection.

Montague's feelings concerning affectionate physical contact are supported by American psychologist Harry Harlow who reported that "orphaned baby monkeys form deep emotional attachment to folded pieces of cloth or "inanimate surrogate mothers." When Harlow compared the time that the infant monkeys spent near their milk source against the time they spent clinging to their surrogate mothers, he discovered warmth and softness--not nourishment--to be the primal bond between infant and mother (Mitchell, 1975). Nursing seems to be more important to an infant emotionally because it insures "frequent and intimate body contact of the infant with the mother" (Mitchell, 1975, p. 76).

Mitchell (1975) has also carried out experiments concerning early social deprivation. He found that "monkeys deprived of physical contact with other monkeys from birth grow up to be aggressive, fearful, sexually abnormal adults" (p. 75).

Experiments, such as these in early deprivation of physical contact, are difficult to carry out with human subjects, but we must apply much of what has been found with the primates to humans. Therefore, since physical contact seems to be vital in the early years, it is necessary to learn if children are perceiving the importance of physical contact and being instilled with this value. Because people's values and beliefs cannot be recorded directly through observation, it is necessary to gain this information through other means.

People's behavior can be directly observed and recorded, but people's ideas such as an individual's moral values cannot be directly observed. What can be studied and recorded is the



report people give us about moral values when they are questioned. From this report we can infer what people's moral values may be (Childress, Fessler, and Greenblatt, 1972, p. 6).

The ideas children in this study express about affectionate physical contact may reflect their perception of how various important role models value and use touching. Teachers are one group of important role models who do influence and have an impact upon children's lives and values. According to Spodek (1976, p. 13), "in most early childhood classes it is the teacher who determines what is considered true and how that truth is tested." Johnson (1970, p. 6) goes on to say that "values play an important part in the selection of those traits and attitudes that will be nurtured in the nursery school and those which shall be discarded or suppressed." If teachers determine what is true and do nurture, in their students, those traits and attitudes that are important to them, then it is evident that we must examine the affectionate physical contact in the classroom to determine if it is a value that is possessed by teachers and shared with their pupils.

Artmann (1979, p. 31) contends that "the decade of the 70s has opened the question concerning the possibility that ethics and morality may be among the most important things the school has to offer." With a better understanding of how children are perceiving touching, specifically affectionate physical contact, it may provide insight into what future teaching roles entail. There may be a need to re-examine the behavior of teachers so that these important role models better reflect the value of physical contact in their daily interactions with children. Since teachers' behavior so influences their students' behavior, it appears necessary for teachers to be conscious of the types of values they are conveying through their behavior. The children need

to observe and experience affectionate physical contact from their teachers, as well as other role models, so that they will value touching and incorporate it into their behavior pattern. Teachers need to express, with actions as well as words, just how valuable affectionate contact is to human development.

This study will deal specifically with the preschool child's expressions which indicate value, understanding of, and experience with affectionate physical contact. The following questions will be considered:

1. Has the child experienced physical contact in the form of helping, playing, hugging and/or through interaction with pets?
2. Does the pre-school child express an understanding of this type of physical contact?
3. Does he/she express it as being valuable?

With an idea of how children are perceiving and valuing affectionate physical contact, and a realization of how important physical contact is, teachers and parents can make a conscious effort to provide role models who value touching and can communicate the importance of tactile stimulation to children.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Sensory deprivation is an important issue and has been extensively researched. The literature seems to be divided into three general categories on this topic: the studies having to do with sensory deprivation and animals, those dealing with infant attachment or bonding, and the research reporting the importance of physical contact to young children.

#### Sensory Deprivation and Animals

In the late 1950s, American psychologist, Harry Harlow, realized the importance of physical contact and began to study its effects on animals. His studies with the rhesus monkeys who formed deep emotional attachments to folded pieces of cloth even though these "surrogate mothers" did not offer them nourishment, led to more studies of early sensory deprivation. "Emotionally," said Harlow, "nursing is not important because of the milk the infant receives, but because nursing insures frequent and intimate body contact of the infant with the mother" (Mitchell, 1975, p. 76).

Mitchell (1975) has also studied rhesus monkeys who were deprived of physical contact. The female monkeys who were raised in isolation without sensory stimulation became

. . . thoroughly inadequate mothers. Some became brutal toward their children, others indifferent. The children of these isolated monkeys were also likely to become aggressive as adults (p. 75).

### Infant Attachment (Bonding)

"Attachment" was first used by Bowlby in 1958 to refer to the nature of a child's tie to his mother. Ainsworth and Bleher (1975), other leading researchers in attachment, draw a number of inferences for practitioners working with children and mothers:

1. Interaction with a mother figure, with resulting attachment, is essential for healthy development.
2. Exploratory behavior is dependent upon a secure infant-mother attachment.
3. Although there is a "sensitive period" for the development of infant-mother attachment, under appropriate conditions, an attachment may develop beyond this phase (Kontos, 1978, p. 7).

Kontos (1978) reports that her research in Toronto examined the effects of extended contact in early post partum hours and days on the mother's attachment behavior. It was found that separating the mothers and newborns during this time does diminish the attachment behavior of the mothers and may be interfering with successful breastfeeding and establishment of affectional bonds. This interference "with the course of a mother's natural behavioral cycle may also have consequences for the infant's long-range development" (Kontos, 1978, p. 9).

Brown (1978), in her article, "Bonding: The First Basic in Education," urges us to look beyond the curriculum and the teacher in placing the blame for the large number of learning problems in our schools. The back to the basics movement does put the blame for the child's lack of

learning on the teacher and the curriculum. Brown (1978, p. 6) believes that "we have been looking on the wrong side of the teacher's desk for the solution to our problem." She describes the recent research in child development in the area of bonding:

This research suggests a new way of approaching what is truly basic for all children in order for normal growth and learning to occur. Bonding--a process that brings people together in a close, primary relationship--may well be a key to understanding why so many children who possess normal intelligence and are not brain damaged nevertheless do not succeed in the classroom and or fail to relate well with their schoolmates or teachers (p. 7).

Bonding is not the only factor involved, but it has been found that children who have been incompletely bonded in infancy and early childhood do not do well scholastically as they grow older. Their anxiety level may be "so high that they cannot handle the necessary stress of learning and the give-and-take of relationships in a normal size classroom of 25 or 30 students" (Brown, 1978, p. 8).

Later, in her article, Brown discusses the school-age effects of inadequate bonding. She believes that a child who has not been properly bonded in infancy will direct his energies toward satisfying that need. If the child continues to seek this fulfillment without any real satisfaction, it leads to anxiety and eventually to a chronic state of stress.

Children of any age, but particularly young ones, who seem driven to touch everything and everyone, who are always in motion, and who seek out motion-filled activities (swinging, rocking, twirling, etc.), may be trying to put back into the system something that never was completed at earlier stages of development. How appropriate that we label such children 'immature!' Rather than preventing the child from doing such things, as we usually do, the child may need more opportunities for touch and motion through acceptable, appropriate channels (p. 29).

The Importance of Physical Contact  
to Young Children

Harlow's animal studies, and many like them, led researchers to try and understand the importance of physical contact to children. Montague's (1971) principal concern, in his book, Touching: The Human Significance of the Skin, is what happens or fails to happen by way of tactile experience that affects man's subsequent behavioral development. Montague reports that what a child requires, if it is to prosper, is to be handled, carried, caressed, cuddled, and cooed to. A child can be deprived of sensory experiences in other respects such as light and sound as long as the sensory experiences at the skin are maintained. Montague calls affectionate tactile stimulation a primary need and states that it is a need that must be satisfied if the infant is to develop as a healthy human being. "And what is a healthy human being? One who is able to love, to work, to play, and to think critically and unprejudicedly" (p. 157).

The child who receives inadequate tactile stimulation has suffered a failure in the communication of the experience of love. By being stroked, and caressed, and carried, and cuddled, comforted, and cooed to, by being loved, the child learns to stroke and caress and cuddle, comfort and coo, and to love others (p. 226).

How the child relates to others later in his or her life may reflect earlier tactile stimulation and influence the type and amount of affectionate physical contact given to their own children.

In another study on tactile stimulation, Clay (1967) concludes that the amount and kind of tactile stimulation and contact that American mothers give their babies and young children is inadequate to their physiological and emotional needs. In this study, mothers were observed

much more often in controlling their child's behavior and attending to their physical needs such as food and proper clothing. They were "not so much concerned with holding, cradling, cuddling, caressing, or expressing love to their babies and young children" (Clay, 1967, p. 1770).

"Touch is the language of love" according to Bumgarner (1974, p. 6). She goes on to say that babies in hospitals or orphanages who do not get the special handling that mothers give, sometimes fail to develop normally or even die. On the other hand, a mother also needs contact with her baby in order to fully develop and enjoy her feelings as a mother.

A study by Ainsworth and Bleher (1975) found that

babies who show most enjoyment of close bodily contact with their mothers do not become addicted to it, they are the ones who are content to be put down and who by the end of the first year tend to move off into independent activity (p. 3).

This opposes the popular assumption that picking a baby up will make him/her clingy and dependent on the mother.

Van Stolk (1980) also discusses the importance of very early touching between the mother and infant. The baby has a need for touching and closeness. Unless these needs are met consistently, the infant is deprived; "its future self deeply scarred" (Van Stolk, 1980, p. 197). The culture is demanding that we bottle feed and wean our children early. This is severing the major avenue of contact which provides the closeness so vital to emotional as well as physical growth.

Van Stolk believes that our culture demands physical and emotional isolation and that the need for love expressed by a child is, in North America, often considered unrealistic, immature, and/or an indication of maladjustment.

In spite of all the talk, all the books, music, plays, radio, and television programs about 'love' the hard facts are that to give physical love or to need it is actually very culturally taboo (p. 198).

Van Stolk states that early tactile deprivation in children causes later problems for them as an adolescent and adult.

Children do not learn to do without, but rather, to hide these biological needs, sexual and otherwise, as best they can. Such denial, however, damages their subsequent human development, sowing the seeds for adolescent and adult feelings of isolation, loneliness, frustration, mental and physical illness, and violent behavior of all kinds (Van Stolk, 1980).

Sexual problems may be faced by many adults who have not learned to accept sexuality because they were not taught the lessons of deep and emotional contact in infancy and childhood. The personalities of people may continue to grow in many areas, but their ability to accept and give love can remain stunted. Van Stolk agrees with Montague that the ability to give and receive love is a learned process.

Van Stolk believes that the home and school need to teach their children the truth.

And the truth is that humans, like all other animals, have very real needs for close consistent human contact of both a sexual and non-sexual nature with others of their kind. No substitute will do (pp. 199-200).

Prescott (1975) also ties the deprivation of physical contact to the development of violent behavior. His point of view is that "the deprivation of physical pleasure is a major ingredient in the expression of physical violence" (p. 65). He supports a subtle connection between physical pleasure and physical violence. He is convinced that "the deprivation of physical sensory pleasure is the principal root



cause of violence" (p. 65). Such deprivation during the early, formative years of development will, he believes, create a predisposition for violence-seeking behaviors later in life. Conversely, infants and children provided with a great deal of physical affection (holding, touching, carrying) will show pleasure-seeking behaviors later in life.

Prescott did a cross-cultural study of child-rearing practices, sexual behaviors, and physical violences. He proposes a principle from his study: "Physically affectionate human societies are highly unlikely to be physically violent" (p. 67). This basic premise is important because it illustrates the way that we could fashion a world of peaceful, affectionate, cooperate individuals.

After reviewing research concerning bonding, attachment, and sensory deprivation, it is important to look at studies which apply these findings to real-life situations in which human beings are in close contact with one another. One such situation is the classroom where teachers and students are in close contact daily. Many studies support the idea that this time spent with teachers can be a more positive experience for the students if there is a secure bond of love formed between the two. Brown (1978) recommends that "the daily interpersonal contact with each student ideally includes the four primary sensory elements of bonding: eye-to-eye contact, smiling, verbal or nonverbal communication, and touch (p. 34). She goes on to say that a student needs to form a bond with the teacher (as a parent figure) to ensure a successful environment for growth and learning. Brown believes that educators are in a unique position to support and give satisfaction to the child's need for the bond.

The child who is allowed to renew, and re-know the bond through us, has a safe place in which to learn and grow. To return to the basic needs of the child: a need to experience

the security of a bond: the primary bond with the parents and a strong secondary bond with parent substitutes (like teachers) (p. 42).

Clements and Tracy (1977) did a study showing the importance of touch in the classroom and how the teacher can help improve student performance by using this valuable reinforcer. "This study found that for attention to task, both the combination of tactile and verbal cues and tactile cues alone were significantly higher than either verbal cues alone or no cues" (p. 453).

Montague (1980), in his article entitled "My Idea of Education," supports the idea that "the greatest gift a teacher has to give a student is his or her love." He believes that goodness and love are what we should be teaching in our schools. Montague defines this love as "the ability to communicate by demonstrative acts to others our profound involvement in their welfare" (p. 49).

Eventually what teachers do in the classroom is going to determine what the world is going to be like, for it is there that children learn all about being human if they have not learned in the home. Each teacher can make a difference by doing what he or she ought to do; behaving as a warm, loving human being (p. 49).

## CHAPTER III

### METHOD AND PROCEDURE

The purpose of this study was to find out if preschool children are able to communicate expressions of feelings about affectionate physical contact, specifically if they value and understand this contact and if they have experienced such contact. This study was patterned after a research project done at the University of Maryland in June 1972, in which moral behavior was examined by recording the perceptions of physical contact by five year olds. In the current study, as in the Maryland study, the children were shown pictures and asked pre-determined questions relating to the pictures. To discover the extent to which children perceive affectionate physical contact, the children were shown pictures of people engaging in various types of affectionate physical contact. The study done at the University of Maryland used pictures also, and divided them into three categories; helping, playing and hugging. The present study used the same three categories of pictures, plus added the category of pet pictures, which was suggested as an interesting element to consider. The children were asked three questions about each picture: "What is going on in this picture" "Would you like to be in this picture?" "Why?" "Has this ever happened to you?"

The researcher also desired to examine the relationship between children's verbal responses to the pictures and their behavior in the classroom. This chapter includes a description of the children who

participated in the research, a description of the research instruments, and a brief discussion of the procedure used in analyzing the data.

### Subjects

The participants in this study were 79 preschool children, 40 boys and 39 girls, ranging in age from three years, five months, to five years, six months. The mean age for this group of children was four years, five months. All the children were in attendance at the five Oklahoma State University Child Development Laboratories. Six of the 79 children were members of the international community but were not separated in the study because they understood and communicated well in English.

The subjects included one female child with the handicapping condition, Downs Syndrome. Her responses were included because she is able to develop social relationships with the group and because she participated in the testing situation giving meaningful responses. No other children were judged to have handicapping conditions.

The data were collected during February and March of 1980. All the children had been part of the laboratories since at least September of 1979.

### Research Instruments

The instruments used in this study included four pictures showing affectionate physical contact, a Child Response Rating Form, and a Teacher Rating Form. Each of the first two instruments had been used previously in another form as reported in "Preliminary Investigation into Moral Behavior With an Emphasis Upon Perception of Physical Contact by Five Year Olds" (Childress, Tessler, and Greenblatt, 1972). The Teacher Rating Form was developed by the investigator for use in this study. A

more detailed description of each section of the research instrument follows.

### Pictures

The four pictures used to illustrate affectionate physical contact were selected by a process involving the children. Two specialists in Early Childhood Education reviewed all of the pictures from the Bowmar Early Childhood Series (Crume, 1968; Curry, 1967; Jaynes, 1967 and Radlauer, 1967). These pictures are real-life color pictures depicting many aspects of daily life experiences for children. From the total group of 271 pictures, 22 were selected as representing four categories: helping another person, playing with another person, hugging a person, and expressing affection for pets. Before beginning the actual testing these 22 pictures were seen by 16 children in one of the Oklahoma State University Child Development Laboratories. Each child was taken to a quiet area of the school to look at and react to the pictures. The 22 pictures included 8 helping pictures, 6 playing pictures, 4 pet pictures and 4 hugging pictures.

A description of the procedure used in allowing the children to select one picture representing each category is described below. The first day each child was shown the eight previously chosen pictures included in the helping category. The pictures were shown one at a time to the children and his/her responses were recorded. To gain these responses, the researcher said, "I am going to show you some pictures of people. Some show people helping each other and some don't. I want you to tell me which ones do show people helping each other." (Show picture 1). "Does this picture show people helping each other?" The researcher recorded their responses as either "yes" or "no" to each

question. The next day the children looked at the pictures chosen to represent the category of playing. They were asked the question, "Does this picture show people playing?" Their responses were recorded as either "yes" or "no". On the third day, the children were shown the pet picture and asked the question, "Does this picture show someone hugging their pet?" They were also shown the pictures of people hugging and asked, "Does this picture show people hugging?" Their responses were recorded as either "yes" or "no".

For the final instrument, one picture was needed to represent each of the categories of helping, playing, hugging and pets. The picture the children recognized most often as a helping picture was chosen to represent that category. Each of the other three pictures were chosen in the same way. Because of concern that the sex of the people in the pictures might influence the children's reactions, the responses were broken down according to the sex of the child. For example, could a boy be responding unfavorably to a picture of a mother hugging a little girl because both were female? After analyzing their reactions, no significant differences were found in the responses of the boys versus those of the girls. The children did not recognize and respond to the pictures in relation to the sex of the adult and/or child in the picture. They seemed to be responding more to the action in the picture.

Each of the final pictures chosen is from a separate book in the Bowmar Early Childhood Series. The titles of the books are My Friend Is Mrs. Jones (Curry, 1967), (hugging picture p. 9), Friends, Friends, Friends (Jaynes, 1967), (playing picture, p. 5), Father is Big (Radlauer, 1967), (helping picture, p. 9), and I Like Cats (Crume, 1968), (pet picture, p. 12).

Child's Response Rating Form

The Child's Response Rating Form was used in the actual testing of the 79 children. This form was used to record the children's open end responses to three questions about each of four pictures, and would be used to determine the extent to which the children valued, understood, and had experienced the affectionate physical contact shown. An example of this form may be found in Appendix A. Each child was taken to a quiet, secluded area within their school building and asked three questions about each of the four pictures. A book holder was used to keep the book open to the specific page being discussed so that the child would have a clear view of each picture and their responses could be recorded easily.

The questions were:

"What is going on in this picture?"

(To determine if they understood the contact)

"Would you like to be in this picture? 'Why?'"

(To determine if they value the contact)

"Has this ever happened to you?"

(To determine if they have experienced the contact)

Each child's response to a question was scored as a 1, 2, or 3 on the Child's Response Rating Form. The scoring key is explained below:

1. does not understand, value, or has not experienced contact
2. does not know
3. understands, values, or has experienced contact

All responses given by the children may be found in Appendix B.

### Teacher Rating Form

To discover whether the children's responses to the physical contact in the pictures correlated with their classroom behavior concerning affectionate physical contact, the Teacher Rating Form was devised. Two teachers from each of the five Oklahoma State University Child Development Laboratories rated their students' behavior according to the categories of:

Perceiving affection (child's reception to hugging and giving hugs)

Perceiving play (size of child's play groups)

Perceiving help (child's reception to help and giving help)

The teachers rated each of their students before the children were tested. They did not discuss their ratings with each other or with the researcher. So as not to be influenced by the ratings, they were sealed in an envelope until after the children were tested. On each rating form given to the teachers, the names of the children in their class were randomly ordered to avoid response set. To further avoid response set, all the children were rated on the same page. For example, all the children in Lab II were randomly ordered on one page and the teacher rated them according to how receptive they were to hugging. Then, on the next page, all the children in Lab II were again put in random order and the teacher rated them according to how they felt about giving hugs. These rating forms done by the teachers were used to determine if the child's behavior in the classroom (as seen by the teachers) correlated with what they expressed verbally about the pictures depicting affectionate physical contact. Examples of these rating forms may be seen in Appendix C.



### Reliability

In order to assess each child's affectional classroom behavior, two teachers in each of the five classrooms rated their sixteen students according to the extent of their hugging, playing and helping behavior. Therefore, teacher ratings were gained from ten different teachers for a total of seventy-nine children. Pearson's "r" was used as a best estimate of the relationship between each set of teacher ratings for each of the children. The inter-rater reliability between the pairs of teachers who rated the same children, was high ( $r = .815$ , ranging from .78 to +1.00), indicating that the teachers were viewing each child's classroom behavior in basically the same way.

In order to determine the reliability of the instrument used to gain the children's responses to the physical contact in the pictures (Child's Response Rating Form), a retest was done using the same instrument with twenty of the original seventy-nine children. The McNemar Test for Significance of Changes was used with  $\chi^2 = .372$ . No significant changes were shown between the responses on the first test and the responses on the retest, indicating that the instrument has stability. Overall, the validity of the affectional responses tapped (measured by the Child's Response Rating Form) and the reliabilities (measured by test-retest and by the stability of responses over time) seem to justify the conclusions as set forth in this study.

## CHAPTER IV

### DISCUSSION

In order to test whether or not preschool children are able to communicate their feelings about affectionate physical contact, seventy-nine three to five year old children were asked questions as they looked at four pictures depicting affectional contact. The children had an opportunity to verbalize their understanding of, experiencing of, and valuing of each picture.

#### Understanding

In order to assess the children's understanding of the contact shown in the pictures, they were asked: "What is happening in this picture?" If the child verbalized that he/she understood the contact shown in the picture, they would receive a score of one point. If the child verbalized that he/she did not know or did not understand the contact, they received a score of zero.

#### Valuing

In order to assess whether or not children valued the contact shown in the pictures, they were asked: "Would you like to be in this picture?" If the child verbalized that he/she valued the contact shown in the picture, the subject received a score of one point. If the child verbalized that he/she did not know or did not value the contact shown

in the picture, the subject received a score of zero.

### Experiencing

In order to assess the children's experience with the contact shown in the pictures, they were asked: "Has this ever happened to you?" If the child verbalized that he/she had experienced the contact shown in the picture, the subject received a score of one point. If the child verbalized that he/she had not experienced the contact or did not know, the subject received a score of zero.

After the children were shown these four pictures, each depicting a type of affectionate physical contact (hugging, playing, helping, pets) and asked the previously stated questions, a total affectional score was computed for each child. There was a possibility of scoring 0-12 points after responding to all four pictures, with zero being the lowest affectional response and twelve being the highest affectional response. A child receiving a total of 9-12 points was determined to have a high affectional response. The child had scored high in his/her understanding of, valuing of, and experiencing of the physical contact involved in each picture. In analyzing the data according to this criteria, 18 of the 79 children scored high on affectional response, with ten of these being girls and eight being boys. The mean age of the children who had a high affectional score was four years, five months (Table I).

A child receiving a score of 0-3 points was determined to have a low affectional response to the four pictures. The child had scored low in his/her understanding of, valuing of, and experiencing of the physical contact shown in each picture. In analyzing these data, 15 of the 79 children scored low on affectional response with eight being girls and seven being boys. The mean age of the children who scored low

TABLE I  
CHILDREN WHO SCORED HIGH ON TOTAL AFFECTIONAL  
RESPONSE (SCORE OF 9-12)

| Subject | Sex | Age in Months | Total Score |
|---------|-----|---------------|-------------|
| 02      | F   | 61            | 11          |
| 03      | F   | 42            | 10          |
| 07      | F   | 53            | 11          |
| 14      | M   | 47            | 11          |
| 22      | M   | 66            | 9           |
| 26      | M   | 61            | 10          |
| 28      | F   | 62            | 10          |
| 29      | F   | 62            | 11          |
| 37      | F   | 46            | 9           |
| 41      | F   | 54            | 9           |
| 46      | M   | 54            | 10          |
| 47      | M   | 60            | 11          |
| 51      | F   | 53            | 12          |
| 52      | F   | 49            | 10          |
| 58      | M   | 46            | 9           |
| 62      | M   | 49            | 11          |
| 70      | F   | 63            | 9           |
| 79      | M   | 60            | 9           |

Total number of children = 18

Total females = 10

Total males = 8

Mean age = 54.8 months (4 years, 5 months)

Mean total score = 10.1

Standard deviation = 1.6

Variance = .88

affectional response was four years and four months (Table II).

The standard deviation and analysis of the variance were computed for the children who scored high on affectional response and for the children who scored low on affectional response. For the high affectional children. The standard deviation was 1.6, and for the low affectional children, it was .64. The variance for the high affectional children was .88, and for the low affectional children, it was .73.

Each child's responses were also scored in relation to the individual pictures as opposed to the total score of 0-12 for all four pictures. There was a range of 0-3 points possible in response to each picture. For example, if the child expressed an understanding of, valuing of, and experiencing of the physical contact in the picture, he or she would receive three points. If the child expressed an understanding of and valuing of the picture, he/she would receive two points. If the child expressed that he/she did not understand, value or had not experienced the physical contact in the picture, he/she received zero points. Tables III through VI show the children who scored high in response to each of the four categories of hugging, helping, playing, and pets.

Table III shows that 17 out of 79 children verbalized that they understood, valued and had experienced the contact of hugging depicted in the picture. Nine of these children were girls and eight were boys. The mean age was four years, four months.

Table IV shows that nine out of 79 children verbalized that they understood, valued, and had experienced the contact of playing shown in the picture. Six of these children were males, and three were

TABLE II  
CHILDREN WHO SCORED LOW ON TOTAL AFFECTIONAL  
RESPONSE (SCORE OF 0-3)

| Subject | Sex | Age in Months | Total Score |
|---------|-----|---------------|-------------|
| 02      | F   | 42            | 1           |
| 12      | M   | 48            | 2           |
| 13      | M   | 54            | 2           |
| 16      | M   | 54            | 3           |
| 18      | F   | 60            | 2           |
| 23      | F   | 48            | 2           |
| 24      | M   | 45            | 2           |
| 25      | F   | 46            | 2           |
| 27      | F   | 63            | 3           |
| 32      | M   | 55            | 1           |
| 34      | M   | 53            | 2           |
| 49      | F   | 62            | 3           |
| 57      | F   | 41            | 3           |
| 63      | M   | 51            | 3           |
| 65      | F   | 65            | 0           |

Total number of children = 15

Total females = 8

Total males = 7

Mean age = 52.5 months (4 years, 4 months)

Mean score = 2.1

Standard deviation = .64

Variance = .73

TABLE III  
 CHILDREN WITH HIGH RESPONSE TO HUGGING  
 PICTURE (SCORE OF 3)

| Subject | Sex | Age in Months |
|---------|-----|---------------|
| 02      | F   | 61            |
| 03      | F   | 42            |
| 05      | F   | 48            |
| 07      | F   | 53            |
| 14      | M   | 47            |
| 26      | M   | 61            |
| 28      | F   | 62            |
| 29      | F   | 62            |
| 33      | M   | 58            |
| 37      | F   | 46            |
| 46      | M   | 54            |
| 47      | M   | 60            |
| 51      | F   | 53            |
| 62      | M   | 49            |
| 70      | F   | 63            |
| 75      | M   | 48            |
| 76      | M   | 46            |

Total Number of children = 17

Total females = 9

Total males = 8

Mean age = 53.7 months (4 years, 4 months)

were females. The mean age was four years, four months.

Table V shows eight out of seventy-nine children verbalized that they understood, valued and had experienced the contact of helping shown in the picture. Five of these children were females, three were males. The mean age was four years, five months.

Table VI shows that twenty-five out of seventy-nine children verbalized that they understood, valued and had experienced the contact with pets shown in the picture. Thirteen of these children were girls and twelve were boys. The mean age was four years and five months.

TABLE IV  
CHILDREN WITH HIGH RESPONSE TO PLAYING  
PICTURE (SCORE OF 3)

| Subject | Sex | Age in Months |
|---------|-----|---------------|
| 02      | F   | 61            |
| 11      | M   | 63            |
| 14      | M   | 47            |
| 19      | M   | 56            |
| 35      | M   | 52            |
| 51      | F   | 53            |
| 52      | F   | 49            |
| 58      | M   | 46            |
| 62      | M   | 49            |

Total number of children = 9

Total females = 3

total males = 6

Mean age = 52.9 months (4 years, 4 months)



TABLE V  
CHILDREN WITH HIGH RESPONSE TO HELPING  
PICTURE (SCORE OF 3)

| Subject | Sex | Age in Months |
|---------|-----|---------------|
| 07      | F   | 53            |
| 29      | F   | 62            |
| 41      | F   | 54            |
| 49      | M   | 60            |
| 51      | F   | 53            |
| 68      | M   | 46            |
| 70      | F   | 63            |
| 74      | M   | 47            |

Total number of children = 8

Total females = 5

Total males = 3

Mean age = 54.7 months (4 years, 5 months)

Further analysis of the data compared the children by age and sex to determine if there was a difference in the total affectional scores of the males versus the females or the younger children versus the older children.

The mean of the total affectional score was determined for the males (6.45) and for the females (6.38). The standard deviation and an analysis of the variance was also done according to the sex of the child. The standard deviation for the females was 2.4 and the variance was 8.9. This compared to a standard deviation of 2.1 and a variance of 6.8 for the males.

TABLE VI  
 CHILDREN WITH HIGH RESPONSE TO PET  
 PICTURE (SCORE OF 3)

| Subject | Sex | Age in Months |
|---------|-----|---------------|
| 02      | F   | 61            |
| 03      | F   | 42            |
| 05      | F   | 48            |
| 07      | F   | 53            |
| 11      | M   | 63            |
| 14      | M   | 47            |
| 15      | M   | 50            |
| 22      | M   | 66            |
| 26      | M   | 61            |
| 28      | F   | 62            |
| 29      | F   | 62            |
| 35      | M   | 52            |
| 39      | F   | 46            |
| 41      | F   | 54            |
| 44      | F   | 60            |
| 46      | M   | 54            |
| 47      | M   | 60            |
| 51      | F   | 53            |
| 52      | F   | 49            |
| 58      | M   | 46            |
| 62      | M   | 49            |
| 69      | F   | 53            |
| 72      | F   | 53            |
| 73      | M   | 56            |
| 79      | M   | 60            |

Total number of children = 25

Total females = 13

Total males = 12

Mean age = 54.4 months (4 years, 5 months)

Further analysis did not seem warranted, since by inspection, there were no apparent differences by sex in the children's understanding of, valuing of, or experiencing of the physical contact shown in the pictures.

The children were also grouped according to age to determine if there was an age difference in relation to their responses. The mean of the total affectional score was determined for each age group: 3 year olds = 6.21, 4 year olds = 6.26, and 5 year olds = 6.83. Further analysis did not seem warranted, since by inspection, there were no apparent differences by age in the children's understanding of, valuing of, and experiencing of the physical contact shown in the pictures.

The seventy-nine children were also rated individually by the two teachers in their schools. The two teachers rated each child in the categories of hugging, playing, and helping. These categories were chosen to correspond with the hugging, playing, and helping pictures that the children had responded to. The teacher's overall rating of each child ranged from 5-15, with 5 being low observed affectional response at school and 15 being high observed affectional response at school. The teachers tended to rate all of the children relatively high, and therefore, there was no relationship between the children who scored low on total affectional response to the pictures and the teacher's rating of that child's observed affectional behavior at school.

From these data, it was concluded that, although some children (15 out of 79) have minimal affectional response as defined by this study, they cannot be discriminated from highly affectionate children on the basis of sex, age, or their teacher's judgements.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

#### Purpose of the Research

The research questions were:

1. Can children verbalize their feelings about affectionate physical contact as presented in two-dimensional colored pictures of "every-day" life activities?

2. Can children verbalize an understanding of the affectionate physical contact presented in these pictures?

3. Can children verbalize that value in the activity pictured and would like to have it happen to them?

4. Can children verbalize whether or not they have had personal experience with the behavior in the picture?

#### Methods of Study

The participants in this study were seventy-nine preschool children, forty boys and thirty-nine girls, ranging in age from three years, five months to five years, six months. All the children attended the Oklahoma State University Child Development Laboratories.

The instruments used in this study included four pictures showing affectionate physical contact, a Child Response Rating Form, and a Teacher Rating Form. The first two instruments had been used previously

in another form, but the Teacher Rating Form was developed by the investigator for use in this study.

The four pictures used to illustrate affectionate physical contact were real-life color pictures depicting many aspects of daily life experiences for children. They represented four categories:

1. helping another person
2. hugging a person
3. playing with another person
4. expressing affection for pets

Each of the pictures chosen is from a separate book in the Bowmar Early Childhood Series (Curry, 1967; Jaynes, 1967; Radlauer, 1967, and Crume, 1968).

The Child Response Rating Form was used in the actual testing of the children to record their responses to questions about each picture. The questions were used to determine the extent to which the children valued, understood, and had experienced the affectionate physical contact shown.

The questions were:

1. "What is going on in this picture?" (To determine if they understood the contact)
2. "Would you like to be in this picture?" "Why?" (To determine if they value the contact)
3. "Has this ever happened to you?" (To determine if they have experienced the contact)

Each child's response to a question was scored 1, 2, or 3 on the Child's Response Rating Form. The scoring is explained below:

1. = does not understand, value or has not experienced contact
2. = does not know

3. = understands, values, or has experienced contact

To discover whether the children's responses to the physical contact in the pictures correlated with their observed classroom behavior concerning affectionate physical contact, the Teacher Response Rating Form was devised. Each of the children were rated by their two teachers according to the categories of:

Perceiving affection (child's reception to hugging and giving hugs)

Perceiving play (size of child's playgroups)

Perceiving help (child's reception to help and giving help)

### Results

The major results were:

1. Eighteen out of 79 children scored high on affectional response. (These children had scored high on their understanding of, valuing of, and experiencing of the physical contact involved in all four pictures.)

2. Fifteen out of 79 children scored low on affectional response. (These children had scored low in their understanding of, valuing of, and experiencing of the physical contact involved in all four pictures.)

3. Seventeen out of 79 children verbalized that they understood, valued and had experienced the contact in the picture depicting hugging.

4. Nine children out of 79 verbalized that they understood, valued and had experienced the contact in the picture depicting playing.

5. Eight children out of 79 verbalized that they understood, valued and had experienced the contact in the picture depicting helping.

6. Twenty-five out of 79 children verbalized that they understood, valued and had experienced the contact in the pet picture.

7. There were no apparent differences by sex in the children's understanding of, valuing of, or experiencing of the physical contact shown in the pictures.

8. There were no apparent differences by age in the children's understanding of, valuing of, or experiencing of the physical contact shown in the pictures.

9. On the Teacher Response Rating Form, the teachers tended to rate all of the children relatively high, and therefore, there was no relationship between the children who scored low on total affectional response to the pictures and the teacher's rating of that child's observed affectional behavior at school.

#### Limitations of Research and Recommendations

The pictures used to elicit the children's responses to affectionate physical contact included four different categories; hugging, playing, helping and pets. The pictures may have tapped too many variations of affectional response. It may have been more productive to concentrate on one readily recognizable type of affection, such as hugging, instead of examining four different types of affection.

The pictures may also have been tapping something other than physical affection and instead may have been portraying more of a concern for the welfare of others. If this was the case, then the results may have tapped the children's altruism instead of their feeling about affectional physical contact.

The use of pictures may also have presented a problem. It may have been more productive to have provided more concrete examples of physical contact to children this young. This could have been done

through films the children watched prior to answering the questions or by having the children actually observe people engaged in various types of affectionate physical contact.

The scoring of the responses to each picture may also have been a problem. A child scoring a total of nine-twelve points in response to all four pictures was designated as having a high affectional response. Very few of the children actually scored this high (18 out of 79), and it may be, that at this age, children cannot verbalize a high standard of affection. It is not clear precisely what would constitute a standard of affection at various age levels.

The teacher's written ratings of each child's affectional responses at school could also have been improved. These ratings were of no real value since the teachers tended to rate each child high in observed affectional response. It may have been better to have an outside observer record the child's affectional physical responses over a period of time.

It may also be worthwhile to do a study of this type with older children to be more sure of their understanding of the contact involved and to be sure of assessing whether they are valuing and experiencing this important type of contact.

A question that is still important, but could not be answered by this research, pertains to teachers as role models reflecting their value of affectionate physical contact in the classroom. Because only 18 out of 79 children scored high on total affectional response, it could be argued that a large majority of the children were not verbalizing an understanding of, valuing of, or experiencing of the physical contact shown in the pictures, and therefore, were in need of more or better



role models who could express their value of affectionate physical contact in a way that was readily understood by young children. As previously stated, teachers are important role models, and children need to observe and experience affectionate physical contact from them as well as other role models, so that they will value touching and incorporate it into their own behavior pattern. Further research could be done in classrooms of children with very physically affectionate teachers and in those with teachers who were not openly affectionate to their children. The children in each classroom could then be compared to find out if one group was more physically affectionate than another. This type of study may help teachers make a conscious effort to be the type of role models who can communicate the importance of touch to children.

This research has tapped many feelings and ideas that young children have about affection and touch, and has provided some potentially important ideas for future fruitful research in the area of physical contact and its importance to young children.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ainsworth, M. D. and Blehar, M. C. Development change in behavior of infants and their mothers relevant to close bodily contact. Paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Denver, Colorado, April 10-13, 1975.
- Ainsworth, M. D. and others. Individual differences in the development of some attachment behaviors. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1972, 18, 123-143.
- Artmann, S. Morals or mouthings--Caregiver interaction makes the difference, Journal of the Association for Childhood Education International, 1979, 56, 31-35.
- Blehar, M. C.; Lieberman, A. F. and Ainsworth, M. D. Early face-to-face interaction and its relation to later infant-mother attachment. Child Development, 1977, 48(1), 182-194.
- Brown, N. M. Bonding: the first basic in education. Bloomington, Ind., Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1978.
- Bumgarner, N. J. "Helping love grow: some hints for mothering your adopted baby." Revised edition. Unpublished booklet available from 1712 Lane Drive, Norman, Oklahoma, 1974.
- Childress, M. O.; Fessler, R. and Greenblatt, M. Preliminary investigation into moral behavior with an emphasis upon perception of physical contact by five year olds. College Park, Maryland: Center for Young Children, College of Education, University of Maryland, 1972.
- Clay, V. S. The effect of culture on mother-child tactile communication. Dissertation Abstracts, 1967, 28 (3-B), 1770.
- Clements, J. E. and Tracy, D. B. Effects of touch and verbal reinforcement on the classroom behavior of emotionally disturbed boys. Exceptional Children, 1977, 43 (7), 453-453.
- Crume, Marion W. I Like Cats. Glendale, California: Bowmar Publishing Corporation, 1968.
- Curry, Nancy. My Friend is Mrs. Jones. Glendale, California: Bowmar Publishing Corporation, 1967.
- Jaynes, Ruth. Friends! Friends! Friends. Glendale, California: Bowmar Publishing Corporation, 1967.

- Johnson, H. School Begins at Two. (Reissued) New York: Agathon Press, 1970 (original publication, 1936).
- Kontos, D. K. Proceedings of the subcommittee on childhood experiences as causes of criminal behavior. Senate of Canada, Third Session, Thirtieth Parliament 1977-78, Issue No. 12, 1978, 1-26.
- Mitchell, Gary. "What Monkeys can Tell us About Human Violence." The Futurist, 1975, 9-10, 76.
- Montague, A. My idea of education. Today's Education, 1980, 69, 48-49.
- Prescott, J. Body pleasure and the origins of violence. The Futurist, 1975, 9-10, 64-74.
- Radlauer, E. and Radlauer, R. Father is Big. Glendale, California: Bowmar Publishing Corporation, 1967.
- Schenk, C. The politics of primary schools and the family. Oxford Review of Education, 1976, 2 (1), 85-89.
- Spodek, B. Fostering intellectual development--re-examined 22 years later, 1976. Paper presented at the Bicentennial Conference on Early Childhood Education, University Miami, Miami, Florida, June 30, 1976.
- Van Stolk, M. Sexual information: birth right of the child. Journal of the Association for Childhood Education International, 1980, 56 (4), 195-201.

## APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

CHILD'S RESPONSE RATING FORM

## Child's Response Ratings

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Sex \_\_\_\_\_ Age \_\_\_\_\_ Group \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Scoring Key: 1= does not understand, value, or has not experienced contact; 2=does not know; 3=understands, values, or has experienced contact

## CATEGORY:

Understanding - "What is happening in this picture?" 1 2 3

Child's Comments:

Valuing - "Would you like to be in this picture?" 1 2 3

Child's Comments:

Experiencing - "Has this ever happened to you?" 1 2 3

Child's Comments:

## CATEGORY:

Understanding - "What is happening in this picture?" 1 2 3

Child's Comments:

Valuing - "Would you like to be in this picture?" 1 2 3

Child's Comments:

Experiencing - "Has this ever happened to you?" 1 2 3

Child's Comments:

APPENDIX B

CHILD'S RESPONSES TO PICTURES DEPICTING  
AFFECTIONATE PHYSICAL CONTACT

### "Hugging" Picture, Understanding of

Score "1" - Response indicates child recognizes some action is occurring but the child does not understand the nature of the contact.

Examples: They are happy; they are playing, laughing, happy, mother is happy. (N = 10)

Score "2" - "Does not know" This rating given only to children who responded verbally with "don't know" or with a shrug of the shoulders and no verbal response. (N = 17)

Score "3" - Response suggests the child had some understanding of the physical contact displayed in the picture.

Examples: Hugging; hugging each other; they're hugging; boy hugging mom; mom is hugging; a big hug; she is giving her daughter a smile and hugging; he was crying and his mommy is hugging him; she's kissing and hugging. (N = 31)

Loving, people; they're loving; she's loving her; mom loving that boy; the boy is loving his mom; they're loving each other; loving him, kissing and loving. (N = 20)

She's holding onto her. (N = 1)

### "Hugging" Picture, Valuing

Score "1" - Response indicates that the child would not like to be in the picture and suggests the contact shown is not of value to him/her.

Examples: No, because; no cuz; no, I only want my picture in the newspaper; no, I don't like to; no like; no; no, I don't know; no, well because I couldn't get in there; no, I would be in a happier picture; no, just because; don't like to; because it's not nice; no, cuz I don't like that shirt on; no, I couldn't cuz I don't have this kind of book; no, cuz I don't want to; no, well I just only want to do it with my family or best friends. (N = 31)

Score "2" - "Does not know" This rating was given only to children who responded verbally with "don't know" or with a shrug of the shoulders and no verbal response. (N = 3)



Score "3" - Responses indicates child would like to be in the picture and suggests the contact shown is of value to him/her.

Examples: Ok; yes, because; yes, I like it; yes; yes, don't know; yes, cuz; yes, because it's nice; yes, because it's fun; yes, I like to be happy; yes, I want to; yes, because then I could play with them; yes, cuz I like to hug my sister; yes, cuz I like to; I guess, I don't know; yes, I love my momma; yes, I'd like to be on t.v.; yes, cuz I don't know how they are; yes, because I like to see pictures; yes, just my mom; yes, it's nice; I would; yes, I hug Courtney; yes, because it's hot; yes, cuz I just like it; yes, I just would; yes, I don't know; it looks pretty; yes, I just do; yes, cuz I like to hug my mommy. (N = 45)

#### "Hugging" Picture, Experiencing

Score "1" - Response indicates that the child does not recall having experienced the contact shown in the picture.

Examples: No; shook head no; nope; no, I dreamed it; no, I smiled when my mom gave me a present for Christmas; no, my daddy does that to my mommy. (N = 48)

Score "2" - "Does not know" This rating was given only to children who who responded verbally with "I don't know" or with a shrug of the shoulders and nonverbal response. (N = 1)

Score "3" - Response indicates child does recall having experienced the contact shown in the picture.

Examples: Shook head 'yes'; yea; yes; yes, lots of times to my mom; yes, Michol hugged me once; yes, lots of times; yes, with my mom; I hugged my momma; yes, sometimes at home; yes, I love my mom sometimes. (N = 30)

#### "Playing" Picture, Understanding

Score "1" - Response indicates child recognizes some action is occurring but the child does not understand the nature of the contact.

Examples: They're having cupcakes; holding a doll; two dolls; at school; sharing; they're happy; they're sharing the doll; they're sewing; they're sharing toys; eating apples; taking off the cuff; they're in school; being friends; looking at something; they're doing beanbags; they're giving presents to each other; they're looking at Easter Eggs; they're looking at things; she's taking her dolly, she's mad. (N = 29)

Score "2" - "Does not know" This rating given only to children who responded verbally with "don't know". (N = 16)

Score "3" - Response indicates that the child has some understanding of the physical contact displayed in the picture.

Examples: Playing; playing with the doll; they're playing house; they're playing silly things; they're playing something; they're playing with each other smiling; they're playing with a beanbag. (N = 34)

#### "Playing" Picture, Valuing

Score "1" - Response indicates that the child would not like to be in the picture and suggests the action shown is not of value to him/her.

Examples: No, I don't know; no, cuz; no, cuz I don't feel like it; no, I hate it; no, I don't; no, cuz my hair ain't that color; no, cuz my mom won't let me and I don't have a dress like that; no, I don't like a girl; no, cuz my sister won't let me with her dolls; no, I would be kinda' sad; no, I could play in it, me and Amy; no; don't like it; you're black; don't like to play that; no, cuz I don't want to; no, because they are inside, I like outside; no, just because I don't like black kids. (N = 25)

Score "2" - "Does not know" This rating given only to children who responded verbally with "don't know". (N = 2)

Score "3" - Response indicates child would like to be in the picture and suggests the action shown is of value to him/her.

Examples: Yes, I like to; yes, because; yes, I would like to play; yes, I do; yes, cuz I would like to; yep, because it is so nice to be at school; yes, I want to; yes, because it looks fun; yes, because I want to be happy and playful; yes, because then they would be your friend; yes, I don't know; yes, cuz I see it every day; yes, I don't know, I guess I just like to; yes, I like to eat apples; yes I just want to; yes holding something; yes, because it's good; yes, I like to be in pictures; yes, cuz I like to share; yes, it's fun; yes, I like that thing on her arm; yes, I would feel like it; yes, cuz Robin always does; yes, I couldn't; yes, play with someone; yes, not with black people; yes, I only want to with my family; yes, I like this; yes, cuz it looks good; yes, that would be fun; yes, cuz I think it looks kind of cute; yes, because I like my friend. (N = 52)

"Playing " Picture, Experiencing

Score "1" - Response suggests that child has not experienced the contact shown in the picture.

Examples: No; no, 'cept my friends; nope; no sir; no, but I have hugged my dog. (N = 52)

Score "2" - "Does not know" This rating given only to children who responded verbally with "don't know". (N = 0)

Score "3" - Response suggests child has experienced contact shown in the picture.

Examples: Yes; yes, I've been playing with that dolly; yes, I've done it with my brother; yea; yes, one time; yes, I holded that guinea pig; yes, only with John; yes, don't like it; yes, I always share. (N = 27)

"Helping" Picture, Understanding of

Score "1" - Response indicates child recognizes some action is occurring but the child does not understand the nature of the contact.

Examples: Trying to ride bike; his daddy is fixing his trike; he's riding on the bike; a boy is riding a bike; somebody's riding a trike; a kid is riding a bicycle; that boy is trying to ride a bike; he's learning to ride a bicycle; practicing to ride a bike; he's trying to train his brother how to do a bicycle; trying to get the little boy to put his feet on the handles; daddy finding him a bike and he's a bike; getting ready to ride his bike; his daddy is teaching him how to ride a bike; the little boy is riding his small tricycle. (N = 48)

Score "2" - "Does not know" This rating was given only to children who responded verbally with "don't know". (N = 6)

Score "3" - Response suggests child has some understanding of the physical contact displayed in the picture.

Examples: He's helping him ride; he's trying to ride a bike; daddy is helping him; daddy helping him ride a two wheel bike; he's helping; the little boy's dadding is helping him ride his bicycle; the man is helping the boy ride on his bike; his dad is helping him get on a bike; father helping him ride; he doesn't have training wheels, his father is helping him; helping a boy play on his bike; helping the boy; he's helping his son ride a bike; they're helping. (N = 25)

### "Helping" Picture, Valuing

Score "1" - Response indicates that child would not like to be in the picture and suggests the action shown is not of value to him/her.

Examples: No, cuz I don't like it; nope, cuz; no, I don't like to ride a bike; no, don't know; no, I don't have a big trike; no, I don't like the boots; no, well it looks kinda' different; no, I don't like to; no, I can't have one of those; no, cuz it has a boy on it; no, don't like that; no way, cuz I would not like to fall down. (N = 23)

Score "2" - "Does not know" This rating given only to children who responded verbally with "don't know". (N = 2)

Score "3" - Response indicates child would like to be in the picture and suggests the action shown is of value to him/her.

Examples: Yes, I just would; yea, I want to be in any picture; yes, because it's so nice to have a bike like that; yes, cuz; I guess, I don't know; yes, don't know; ok; yes, because when I grow up I would help my daddy; yep, I want to; yes, cuz I want to ride my bike; yes, because it's fun; yes, because I like to be in pictures; yea, with my bike; yes, I already have a bike; yes, I know how to ride my bike; yea, when I grow up; yes, because I like my riding in pictures; yes, cuz I like to ride bicycles; yes, cuz I got a bigger bike for Christmas; yes, yes, but I got a big bike already; yes, because I could ride my blue bike; yes, because I like to; yes, because he has a star on his boot; yes, because I got a little orange bike; yes, it's nice for a daddy or mommy to help; yes, learn to ride bikes; yea, cuz I already got a 10-speed; yes, because I didn't do it ever; yes, because I want to have lots of pictures; yes, because I want to learn to ride a bike; yes, only with my family. (N = 54)

### "Helping" Picture, Experiencing

Score "1" - Response suggests that child has not experienced the contact shown in the picture.

Examples: No; no, I can only ride three wheels; no, it has to my sister but not to me; no sir; no, but I do have a bike; nope; no, I don't have a bike. (N = 46)

Score "2" - "Does not know: This rating given only to the children who responded verbally with "don't know". (N = 0)

Score "3" - Response suggests child has experienced the contact shown in the picture.

Examples: I guess, I ride bikes fast; yep; yea, I got a bike; yea; yes, dad let me ride with him; yes; yes, George helped me; yes, well sometimes my brother help me get on my bike; yes, to my sister; yea, Lori took me; yes, not for awhile; yes, I been riding a bike; I always ride trikes; yes, dad watches me ride; yes, I got one of those bicycles. (N = 33)

#### "Pet" Picture, Understanding of

Score "1" - Response indicates child recognizes some action is occurring but the child does not understand the nature of the contact.

Examples: People having this cat; there's a kitty; a kitty; she likes the cat; she's got a cat, I like cats; she's looking at her kitty; cat's scared; they have a pet. (N = 8)

Score "2" - "Does not know" This rating given only to children who responded verbally with "don't know" or with a shrug of the shoulders and no verbal response. (N = 5)

Score "3" - Response suggests the child has some understanding of the physical contact displayed in the picture.

Examples: Holding a kitty; she's holding a cat; a little girl is holding that cat; she's loving a kitty; she's hugging a little kitty; somebody hugging a kitty; petting a kitten; a girl is hugging her cat; a kitty, the girl is holding a kitty; they're hugging; she's loving that cat; loving a cat; giving kitten a hug; she's playing with her kitty in her arms. (N = 66)

#### "Pet" Picture, Valuing

Score "1" - Response indicates that child would not like to be in the picture and suggests the action shown is not of value to him/her.

Examples: No, not with a girl; no cuz, nope, cuz; no, don't know; no, I wouldn't like to be in a girl picture; no sir, I don't like her; no, cuz my hair ain't that color; nope, I want to be in those other pictures, this has a girl in it; no, cuz a cat would poop on me; no a cat would bite me; no, only like a cat; no way, because, just because. (N = 20).

Score "2" - "Does not know" This rating given only to children who responded verbally with "don't know" or with a shrug of the shoulders and no verbal response. (N = 1)

Score "3" - Response indicates child would like to be in the picture and suggests the action shown is of value to him/her.

Examples: Yea, cuz; yep, it is a nice kitty cat; yes, I like to hold cats; yes, I don't know; yes, it is sweet; ok; yes, cuz I have done it; yes, cuz cats are soft; yes, because then I could play with a cat; yes, I want to; yes; yes, I just do, my mom won't let me have a kitten; yes, cuz I would be happy to have a kitten or dog; yes, because it's good; yes, I like cats; yes, because I like to be in pictures; yes, it would be fun; yea, better than the others; I like to pick my cat up; yea, cuz its' real fun; yes, because it looks nice; yes, because I got a doggie; yes, because I like holding my cat Prissy; yes, I have a kitten, but it died; yes, holding my cat; yes, I'm going to get a kitten; yes, cuz it has a little girl; yes, I want to; yes, I like to hold baby kittens; yes, I have a cat and a dog; yes, nice of me to do that to my cats; they don't have anyone to love them; yes, I like cats; yes, but my cat is too heavy for me; yes, cuz I think it looks cute; yes, because if I hold a real cat it will scratch me but I could hold a play one. (N = 58)

#### "Pet" Picture, Experiencing

Score "1" - Response suggests that the child has not experienced the contact shown in the picture.

Examples: No; nope; no sir; no, I'm allergic to cats; no, I saw at cat at my grandma's; no, I don't have a cat; no, one came to my window; no, I can't have kitty's cuz my dad's allergic; no, I don't have a kitty. (N = 49)

Score "2" - "Does not know" This rating is given only to children who responded verbally with "don't know" or with a shrug of the shoulders and no verbal response. (N = 0)

Score "3" - Response suggests child has experienced the contact shown in the picture.

Examples: Yes, I have two dogs; yea; yes; I have hugged my dog; yes, not me but my sister; yes, I have four cats; not often; yea, I holded my big cat; yea, I have 10 cats; yes, cat bit me; yes, I've held my kitty. (N = 30)

APPENDIX C

TEACHER RATING FORMS

## Teacher Rating Form

Teacher's Name \_\_\_\_\_

Lab \_\_\_\_\_

---

| Children's<br>Names | Dislikes Receiving<br>Hugs | Sometimes Likes<br>Receiving Hugs | Likes to Receive<br>Alot of Hugs |
|---------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
|---------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|

---

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

16.



## Teacher Rating Form

Teacher's Name \_\_\_\_\_

Lab \_\_\_\_\_

---

| Children's<br>Name | Does Not<br>Give Hugs | Sometimes Gives<br>Hugs | Gives Lots<br>of Hugs |
|--------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1.                 |                       |                         |                       |
| 2.                 |                       |                         |                       |
| 3.                 |                       |                         |                       |
| 4.                 |                       |                         |                       |
| 5.                 |                       |                         |                       |
| 6.                 |                       |                         |                       |
| 7.                 |                       |                         |                       |
| 8.                 |                       |                         |                       |
| 9.                 |                       |                         |                       |
| 10.                |                       |                         |                       |
| 11.                |                       |                         |                       |
| 12.                |                       |                         |                       |
| 13.                |                       |                         |                       |
| 14.                |                       |                         |                       |
| 15.                |                       |                         |                       |
| 16.                |                       |                         |                       |

## Teacher Rating Form

Teacher's Name \_\_\_\_\_

Lab \_\_\_\_\_

---

| Children's<br>Names | Plays<br>Alone | Sometimes Plays With<br>Other Children | Plays Alot With<br>Other Children |
|---------------------|----------------|--|-----------------------------------|
|---------------------|----------------|--|-----------------------------------|

---

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

16.

## Teacher Rating Form

Teacher's Name \_\_\_\_\_

Lab \_\_\_\_\_

---

| Children's<br>Names | Dislikes Receiving<br>Help | Sometimes Likes To<br>Receive Help | Desires Alot<br>of Help |
|---------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|
|---------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|

---

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

16.

## Teacher Rating Form

Teacher's Name \_\_\_\_\_

Lab \_\_\_\_\_

---

| Children's<br>Names | Does Not Give<br>Help | Sometimes Gives<br>Help | Gives Alot<br>of Help |
|---------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
|---------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|

---

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- 6.
- 7.
- 8.
- 9.
- 10.
- 11.
- 12.
- 13.
- 14.
- 15.
- 16.

VITA

Catherine Castle Hunt

Candidate for the Degree of  
Master of Science

Thesis: PRESCHOOL CHILDREN'S PERCEPTIONS OF AFFECTIONATE PHYSICAL CONTACT

Major Field: Family Relations and Child Development

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Corona, California, May 9, 1956, the daughter of Mrs. Ann Trimble Hunt and Mr. James C. Hunt, Jr.

Education: Graduated from Jenks High School, Jenks, Oklahoma, in May, 1974; received the Bachelor of Science degree from Oklahoma State University in 1978 with a major in Family Relations and Child Development; completed requirements for the Master of Science degree at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, December, 1982.

Professional Experience: Graduate Assistant, Oklahoma State University Child Development Laboratories, Stillwater, Oklahoma, September, 1978 to May, 1980; Lead Teacher, Oklahoma State University Child Development Laboratories, Stillwater, Oklahoma, September, 1980 to present.

Professional Organizations: Omicron Nu, National Association for Education of Young Children, Friends of Day Care, Parents and Teachers of Young Children.