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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Preschool education, nursery education, prekindergarten education, and day care are all terms which have been used to designate the education or training of children in early childhood between the ages of two and five years.

While it has been reported that almost every society in which parents needed to be away from home has devised some form of preschool care and training, there is an increased awareness of the possible benefits of the downward extension of education to a larger portion of society. Several influences operating today are thought to be responsible for this interest:

1. The trend in child psychology...Longitudinal studies, observational methods, and a developmental orientation have largely been replaced or supplemented by short-term experimental studies of the effects of a particular variable on child behavior.

2. The push for excellence in education...is resulting in a trend toward extending more formalized content to the nursery school and kindergarten...

3. Interest in the culturally deprived child has grown rapidly...

4. Intensive work on meeting the needs of the mentally retarded child can be expected as a result of recommendations made by the President's Panel on Mental Retardation.
5. Day care is receiving heightened attention as a result of the work of the National Committee on Day Care and federal legislation that allocated money to the states to raise the level of day care services.1

Kindergartens, which in the United States are designed for five-year-olds, spread from roots in Europe which were educational in purpose. The nursery school or preschool, designed for three- and four-year-olds and sometimes two-year-olds, is a twentieth century development with a wider functional range.

Burgess summarizes the origin and development of the preschool or nursery school:

Nursery schools in the United States received their impetus in university centers where they were organized for the purpose of studying normal development of children. Day care centers or day nurseries arose two decades earlier in urban slum centers to provide for the essential needs of poor children. In the fifty years since these two types of programs were initiated, two major national crises instigated establishment of nursery schools for still other functions. The depression gave rise to WPA nursery schools for the purpose of feeding children and providing jobs for unemployed teachers. During World War II, the Lanham Act provided for the organization of nursery schools to provide care for young children so their mothers could become part of the needed work force for war industry...2

Goals of preschool education have been described by various groups, each giving emphasis to differing aspects of purpose. Jenkins and Others used broad categories to summarize objectives of preschool education:


2Ibid., p. 7.
Broad purposes around which most thoughtfully planned programs in nursery school and kindergartens are built today seem to fall into four areas in which teachers help each child to grow in self-understanding, developing satisfying relationships with people, increase awareness and knowledge about the world, and make use of developing powers to communicate and think. 3

It may be determined through the evaluation of the specific programs of particular schools, agencies, or school systems how these goals are being implemented.

As recently as 1965, in a summary of research on pre-school education, it was reported that while Education is a contributing influence, it had not exerted as much influence as psychiatry and mental health, behavioral psychology, and social work, and that these forces are "not always in fruitful communication." 4

Since the mid-1960's, education has become a focus of the pre-school demonstration programs. The "cognitive school" of psychologists, notably Harvard's Jerome Bruner, Chicago's Benjamin Bloom, and J. McVicker Hunt of the University of Illinois, have challenged the early childhood experts and have asserted that an individual's achievement in life depends very largely on what he has been helped to learn before the age of four. The period prior to age four is the time when human intelligence grows most rapidly and the roots of intellectual curiosity are laid. Pines reports that these psychologists

---


4 Burgess, p. 8.
also believe that "millions of children are being irreparably damaged because they do not learn enough during this crucial period."  

J. W. Getzels particularizes the influence of the environment. He states:

"Much of what may appear as somehow rising 'innately'—perception, language, value, what has been called the child's characteristic 'learning set' or what I should like to call his 'codes for future learning'—is in large measure acquired through the mediation of appropriate multiple and early experiences... Indeed, the term culturally deprived may be taken to mean lack of availability of such experiences at the appropriate time."

In a working paper on preschool education prepared for the 1965 White House Conference on Education, Getzels cited Dr. Bloom's hypothesis on the effects of environment: the long-term over-all effect of living in a culturally deprived as against a culturally abundant environment is likely to be 20 I.Q. points, spaced as follows: from birth to four years of age, 10 I.Q. units; from four to eight years of age, 6 I.Q. units; from eight to seventeen, 4 I.Q. units.

The implications of this finding are stated by Hechinger: "The most serious harm, in terms of real or potential retardation, is already done by the time the slum child reaches what for the privileged child is the nursery school age."
Preschool programs are growing rapidly in number and diversity. An inventory in 1965 of compensatory education programs, exclusive of Project Head Start, shows preschools in operation in some 70 cities. Over half of these preschools have been established within the past two years.9

Despite the variability in specific activities and auspices of preschool programs, the projects may be classified at least for analytic purposes into three broad categories: supplementary, academic-preparatory, and compensatory.10

Gestels states that the diversity in programs raises a serious issue: "Which of these alternatives is likely to be more fruitful than another?"11 He indicates that a categorical answer is not readily obtainable. A purpose in researching the issue systematically is to lead to criteria for selecting activities and evaluating outcomes.

Project Head Start

Project Head Start is a prekindergarten program designed to provide more than educational advantages to deprived children. It was created as an anti-poverty project and it provides a wide range of nonscholastic services as well. By September, 1966, it had enrolled 1.3 million disadvantaged children


10Gestels, Teachers College Record, LXVIII, p. 221.

11Ibid.
since its beginning in the summer of 1965. Two kinds of programs are operated: an eight-week summer program for four-and five-year-olds who will enter school the following fall, and a full-year program lasting from three to twelve months and three-, four-, and five-year-olds. 12

This program is a local community action program for helping preschool children of limited opportunity. The term, Community Action Program, means a program "...which is developed, conducted, and administered with the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the low income group." 13

Children of limited opportunity were defined for participation in the program as children in need-neighborhoods. Priority for admission to the program was given in 1965 to families with incomes of less than $3000, however, other factors were also considered. In the guide for sponsors of Project Head Start it was stated: "Family income need not be a specific requirement for admission as long as the program is primarily reaching the poor of the neighborhood." 14


The cost of the program was 90 percent reimbursable in 1965, 85 percent in 1966, and 80 percent in 1967 through funds provided by the federal government under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

Rationale for Experimentation

Currently the preschool programs among culturally disadvantaged children, mostly in urban areas, are testing whether three- and four-year-olds can achieve concepts and skills in a preschool program that will improve their chance of success in school.

The current preschool programs surveyed for Chapter II, "Review of the Literature," are reported to have in common an emphasis on language. These programs are reported to have varying degrees of emphasis on perception, concept formation, and self-concept. Available reports do not describe in detail the methods used to enrich the curriculum in the various areas. Reports of observations in several of these projects indicate a wide variety of method.

It appears that reliable evaluation of the learnings for children in prekindergartens requires attention to the particular experiences in any given program.

To expect that research alone can prove or disprove the values in early childhood education is an oversimplification. Research is most appropriately used for related questions that attempt to determine whether one or a group of conditions produce one or a group of outcomes.15

---

15 Burgess, p. 11.
Need for This Study

In the three years since the inception of Project Head Start, the Head Start program of the Chicago Public Schools has been the largest program operated by a single agency in the nation. 16

Evaluation of the effects of the Head Start program upon children, families, and communities was conducted at the national, regional, and local levels and was described in part in the Report of the 1967 Summer Head Start Program to the Chicago Board of Education as follows:

As part of the national evaluation, thirteen centers in Chicago were selected as sample centers. Data in the form of questionnaires relative to parent involvement, medical and dental findings, and information concerning staff was submitted to the Office of Economic Opportunity.

On the regional level, a study of the problems of preschool education is in progress through the Institute for Economic Development of the University of Chicago. Research is focused upon the child prior to his entry into the preschool program, and upon the effect of the preschool program's activities upon the child; specifically, the effect of the interaction between pupils, teachers, volunteers, and social workers.

On the local level, a long-term study is being conducted through the Department of Curriculum Development and Teaching in the Chicago Public Schools. Data from Draw-a-Man and the Peabody Picture Vocabulary tests, and from teacher observation information about each child have been gathered during the past two years, in each summer program. Pre-tests were given during the initial stages of the program; post-testing was completed in the seventh week.17

A follow-up study of the Head Start Child Development Program of the


17Ibid., p. 16.
Chicago Public Schools has not been conducted. Need for such research is indicated by Wilkerson in his summary of research on preschool education in the Review of Educational Research. He states: "The real test of these preschool programs is the performance of participating children when they enter the elementary school." 18

This follow-up and evaluation-opinion study of the Head Start program of the Chicago Public Schools will attempt to determine the effects of Head Start through teacher observations of former Head Start pupils now in the first grade, subsequent ratings of former Head Start pupils, readiness test results, and first grade teachers' evaluations of the value of the Head Start program as it may be indicated at the first grade, or Primary I, level.

Follow-up studies of demonstration programs prior to Head Start, and later, research funded by Project Head Start, have followed mainly a pattern of evaluating the test performance of Head Start pupils, former Head Start pupils, or children formerly enrolled in other preschool programs. Very little research has been conducted to determine whether there is a positive opinion on the part of elementary school teachers with respect to Head Start or other prekindergarten programs.

Obtaining the views of Primary I teachers with respect to the Head Start program is an important part of this study. While Federal guidelines form the

basic structure of the Head Start curriculum, the suggestions and other information given in the questionnaire by the elementary teachers may further guide practices in the Head Start program. It should also increase communication between Head Start personnel and teachers at the primary level of the elementary school.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the Head Start preschool program of the Chicago public schools and to determine the effects of the Head Start program on children's school readiness, skill development, attitudes, habits, and other factors related to success in the first grade.

**Limitations of the Study**

This survey is limited to a study of the effects of the Head Start program, conducted by the Chicago public schools in 1965, 1966, and 1967, on the attitudes, habits, and skills of selected children who are currently enrolled in the first grade, now labeled Primary I, in selected Chicago public schools during the 1967-68 school year.

The population sample of Primary I teachers is limited to teachers in schools of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago in which year-round Head Start centers are being operated. The schools are located in the north, south, and west sections of the city. The Primary I classes taught by these teachers represent the pupil population of the study.

The classifications of skills, habits, and attitudes in the questionnaire designed for this study were determined by the writer on the basis of her researching the goals of preschool and primary education and her years of
teaching in the primary level of the Chicago public schools. The writer also observed the 1967 Head Start program of the Chicago public schools.

The questionnaire method will be employed to obtain the information stated as sought in the purpose of this study, using both multiple-choice selection type items and free response items. Complete details of the design of this study are given in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

While much has been written about prekindergarten or nursery education for years, it has been only since the early 1960's that national attention and Federal aid has been focused on the three-, four-, and five-year-old child.

Shaw, in the Review of Educational Research, reports that the current interest in preschool education came partly from the findings of Deutsch, who viewed preschool programs as a means of accommodation between the school and the child and his family.\(^1\) Deutsch stated: "Children who have had preschool and kindergarten experience are more likely to cope with the kinds of things the school demands intellectually than the children who have not had this experience."\(^2\)

According to Shaw, preschool education is based also on research by Bloom who "discovered that the period of most rapid growth for general intelligence and intellectuality came at the age of four and that the child's environment was one of the principal determinants of school achievement." The early years of growth are crucial, Bloom found, for they serve as the base for later

---


development.3

While many studies of preschool and kindergarten attendance have a variety of purposes which do not extend beyond the year or several years of preschool or kindergarten attendance, the writer has limited this review of related literature to reports of follow-up studies that have been conducted to measure the effects of preschool and/or kindergarten attendance on later school success.

Throughout these research reports it may be noted that two opposing viewpoints exist and are reflected in the curriculum and organization of pre-kindergartens and kindergartens: the child development approach as opposed to the compensatory and academic-preparatory approaches.

At present there are no systematic comparisons of the relative effectiveness of the programs labeled supplementary, academic-preparatory, or compensatory. There are also no systematic comparisons of "the relative effectiveness of different points of intervention within what have been called the specialized or compensatory education programs."4

Gertels has defined three broad categories of preschool programs as follows:

Supplementary—the predominant assumption is that the observed deficiencies of the culturally deprived child are more superficial than fundamental—the differences are in quantity rather than in kind—and the pre-school experiences that are needed are supplementary; from this point of view, if a nursery or preschool

---


4 Gertels, Teachers College Record, LIVIII, p. 225.
activity is good for the middle class child it is good also for the lower class child.

Academic-preparatory—the assumption is that significant deficiencies reside in the lack of familiarity with school-related objects and activities—pencils, books, and the use of crayons, following directions—and the preschool experiences that the culturally-deprived child needs are predominantly academic-preparatory.

Compensatory—the assumption is that, because of powerful environmental effects, the culturally deprived child becomes fundamentally different in self-concept, language, values, and perceptual process; from this point of view neither the supplementary nor the preparatory activities in themselves are sufficient; what is required are specialized programs that will compensate for, in the sense of counteract, the deleterious environmental effects.5

In a recent article Hartman also warned that the nature of a program which will give disadvantaged children an equal footing with advantaged children upon entrance to school is not yet known. He states: "Some evidence slowly being gathered suggests that a good preschool for disadvantaged children may not be the same as the preschool programs that school districts have been running for years."6

The good prekindergarten or kindergarten, as formulated by child development authorities is supplementary, and builds its programs around the needs of the "total" child. These needs are categorized in different ways by different authorities, however, "they invariably refer to the social, emotional, aesthetic, manipulative, health, intellectual, and language needs of

5Thid., p.224.

Differences in some current experimental programs lie in the following factors:

More systematic attention to presentation, more deliberate interchange between child and teacher, more careful checking to find out what the child is getting...In general, all the experimental programs seem to have in common great emphasis on language.8

Several programs for disadvantaged children at the University of Illinois, the Institute for Developmental Studies, George Peabody College, Indiana University, U.C.L.A., and Ypsilanti may be contrasted with the child development preschool programs in the following ways:

1. The whole or portions of the classroom program are highly structured.
2. The program has in whole or in part an intense academic focus.
3. A remedial or corrective approach as against a developmental one to the child's deficiencies is used.
4. The program is either diagnostically or prescriptively based rather than interest or experience oriented.
5. Concern for the child's language difficulties predominates and it is assumed that, if the child can successfully handle language and reading after entrance to school, many of the psychological problems which normally impede his progress will be alleviated.9

This chapter will treat the follow-up studies of 1) child development-oriented kindergartens and preschools, 2) experimental academic-preparatory or compensatory preschool programs, and 3) Project Head Start studies in selected

---

7Ibid.
8Burgess, p. 53.
9Hurtman, Nations Schools, LXXVII, p. 58.
cities. An attempt is made in this chapter to select from the literature those studies which contribute different ideas, have apparently adequate research designs, and which at the same time have a bearing on this follow-up and evaluation study.

Child Development-Oriented Kindergartens and Preschools

Early studies in the mid-twenties to mid-thirties established that children who had attended kindergarten entered first grade with greater readiness, more of them progressed satisfactorily, and fewer failed when compared with children who entered school at first grade. Some studies in the fifties indicated greater readiness and higher achievements among those who attended kindergarten when compared with those who did not. The later studies are reported to be "more equivocal, pointing to the significance of factors other than kindergarten attendance which affect children's achievements."

10

Williamsport, Pennsylvania

In an unpublished study in 1955, Trusal found that when a group of 400 first graders without kindergarten experience was compared with a group of 350 first graders with kindergarten experience, the kindergarten group was decidedly superior. However, when 100 pairs of these children matched on mental age and sex were compared, there was no significant difference between

10 Burgess, p. 53.
those members of the pairs who had kindergarten experience and those who had not.

Syracuse, New York

Another study in the 1950's measured the effects of prekindergarten education on the acquisition of social skills among middle-class children attending kindergarten, first, and second grades in one elementary school in Syracuse, New York. A sociometric instrument was designed to ascertain whether nursery school experience produced any changes that could be perceived by the child's own peers when they attended kindergarten, first, and second grades.

Thirty-four children with nursery school experience and 82 children without nursery school experience were given a battery of five near-sociometric questions. The two groups were equated in terms of scores on the Vineland Social Maturity Scale, extent of parents' education, age, and sex.

The differences between the two groups did not reach statistical significance in kindergarten or first grade. Significant differences were recorded in the second grade. Allen and Hasling conclude that the nursery school subjects were seen by their classmates as being "more prestigious, more

spontaneous, and more intelligent. 12

St. Louis, Missouri

In a study published in 1961, Brown and Hunt compared teachers' ratings of social adjustment of 64 kindergarten children equally divided between those who had preschool training and those who had not. Half of the 64 kindergarten children, mostly of upper-middle and lower-upper class families, had attended Washington University Nursery School during the year preceding the study, 1957-58. Each former nursery school child was matched with a non-nursery school child from the same kindergarten for sex, I.Q., sociometric status, and ordinal position in the family. 13

Twenty-three teachers were involved in rating children on four independent graphic rating scales and on an additional scale for Relative Brightness. None of the differences were statistically significant. Brown and Hunt conclude that the results failed to support the hypothesis that nursery attendance enhances later school adjustment. Nonattenders were seen by their teachers as generally better adjusted. 14

Two more recent studies of the effects of experience in a preschool or


14Ibid.
kindergarten with a child development approach differ from earlier studies in that the more recent studies have focused on the culturally deprived child.

Racine, Wisconsin

The Racine, Wisconsin project was undertaken with culturally deprived children in 1962. In this program, Larson and Olson focused on providing an abundance of field trips and supportive language experience for the children. The rationale for this child development curriculum for culturally deprived children is stated as follows:

This program was developed on the assumption that the children's limited experience had limited the development of a reservoir of concepts. By increasing the breadth of experience, it was assumed that there would be an increase in the children's accumulation of concepts necessary for successful school achievement.15

While early findings indicated effectiveness in raising intelligence test scores and vocabulary level, the follow-up of these children through first grade reports that "the initial differences tended not to be maintained in the regular school situation." Differences between experimental and control groups "disappeared and in several areas the rate of growth of both groups regressed during the first grade."16

Gentaels quotes the conclusions of the Racine study as follows:

Potentially, the most useful conclusion which can be drawn from these data is that 'one-shot' compensatory programs would seem to be a waste of time and money. The fact that differences

---


between groups disappeared and that in several areas the rate of growth of both groups regressed during the traditional first grade supports this contention. If these implications are supported by future research it would seem that curricular revision over the entire twelve year school curriculum is a necessary part of any lasting solution to the basic problem of urban public school education.17

Pennsylvania

Interim findings on an experimental preschool and kindergarten program begun in 1963 in seven school districts in Pennsylvania, also considered to be child development-oriented, are the following:

1. Few statistically significant differences between experimental and control groups at the end of the nursery year on either the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities or the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test;
2. No significant differences on the Metropolitan Readiness Test between children attending two years of preschool and those attending only a kindergarten program.18

Academic-Preparatory and Compensatory Programs

Demonstration projects in several cities are currently testing whether newer methods and curricula in contrast to the child development approach will be effective in preparing the culturally deprived preschool child for later schooling. Several writers have indicated that it is impossible to say, in view of the differing procedures used in these programs, what it is specifically in the preschools and kindergartens which accounts for the


positive effects.

Carl Bereiter, a director of an experimental preschool at the University of Illinois, claims that it is unnecessary to treat the disadvantaged child as a "stereotype, possessed of certain characteristics by virtue of his social status." The task of the preschool, according to Bereiter, is outlined as follows:

It is enough to know what required learnings a child lacks and to have available means of producing them...The preschool educator has not only the responsibility of teaching disadvantaged children material relevant to the content of later instruction but also the responsibility of teaching the children habits and skills that will enable them to make use of this material under conditions of elementary school life, which usually include large classes, a considerable amount of independent seatwork, and frequently teachers of a not very skillful kind.19

Deutsch Project—Institute for Developmental Studies

Martin Deutsch's project, in cooperation with the Ford Foundation and the New York City Public Schools, is reported to be "the best known of the preschool programs."20 The project is subtitled "A program to demonstrate the effectiveness of a 'therapeutic curriculum' for the socially deprived preschool child."

Deutsch utilized a basic preschool curriculum closely related to those found in previous preschool programs. In addition to the child development curriculum, Deutsch provided for a variety of special enrichment techniques.


These techniques center around the areas of cognitive functioning, memory training, language development, and motivation. 21

Four-year-olds, enrolled in a special program in selected city schools and day care centers will be followed through third grade. Four groups compose the population of the study: 60 four-year-olds divided in four nursery school classes of 15 children each, meeting two hours a day four days a week; 30 children in existing day care centers with teachers specially trained for the enrichment program; 30 children in regular day care programs serving as the control group; 30 preschool children without any nursery school experience serve as another control group. 22

Results obtained from the Columbia Mental Maturity Scale, the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, and the Stanford-Binet post test data indicate a significant difference between the experimental and control groups in post-test performance on each of the tests after one year in favor of the experimental groups. 23

Early School Admissions Project, Baltimore, Maryland

Preliminary evaluations of the Early Admissions Project of Baltimore, Maryland were reported by the Research Council of the Great Cities Project for

21 Ibid.


23 Ibid.
School Improvement. This three year experimental project, begun in 1963, undertook to determine "whether early admission to school can overcome any of the barriers to learning which environmental factors seem to impose." It is sponsored jointly by the Baltimore City Public Schools and the Ford Foundation. Beginning in February, 1963, 60 four-year-olds were enrolled in prekindergartens in two public schools with a curriculum "designed to develop cognitive skills and wholesome self-concepts."

The curriculum of the Baltimore project focuses on "individual differences, firsthand experiences, and a sensory-rich learning environment, with particular attention to language development and the development of the self-concept."

Wilkerson reports findings of the project in the Review of Educational Research as follows:

Measurement of growth among the 28 children who remained in the program in each center during the first five months of the project revealed significant development. Mean differences between initial and post-test scores on the Columbia Mental Maturity Scale show a 20-point gain in one center and a 17-point gain in the other. Correspondingly, mean differences for scores on a Verbal Maturity Scale show a 15-point gain in one center and a 9-point gain in the other. All of these mean differences were reported significant at the .001 level. No comparisons with control groups were reported.


\[\text{\textsuperscript{25}}\text{Spodek, Educational Leadership, XXI, p. 599.}\]

Perry Pre-School Project, Ypsilanti, Michigan

Weikart, Kamii, and Radin reported in 1964 on a preliminary two-year evaluation of the Perry Pre-school Project in Ypsilanti, Michigan. It is described as "an experiment with replications to assess the impact of a cognitive program upon the educability of functionally retarded, culturally deprived Negro preschool children." The program consisted of a morning pre-kindergarten, afternoon home visits to involve mothers in the educative process, and group meetings for the parents of the children in the program.27

Three experimental groups or "Waves" of children entered the program. Wave 0 consisted of 13 four-year-olds who entered in the fall of 1962, spent one year in nursery school, one year in kindergarten, and were in first grade during 1964-65. Wave 1 was 10 three-year-olds who entered in the fall of 1962, and spent two years in nursery school prior to kindergarten entrance. Wave 2 was 13 three-year-olds who entered in the fall of 1963 and were in the second year of nursery school during 1964-65. Each group was matched with a control group on the basis of Stanford-Binet I.Q. and a Cultural Deprivation Rating.28

In the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale results, there was a "dramatic spurt" in mean I.Q. scores for each experimental group in the program during the first year. This initial spurt was not maintained during the second year.


28Ibid.
of the program. Milkerson states that an unresolved question is raised by the finding that the gains were not maintained in the later stages of the experiment.29

Nurseriesboro, Tennessee Schools—Early Training Project

The Early Training Project is a research-demonstration study which has as its primary concern the planning and carrying through of a particular intervention program for young deprived children. Gray and Klaus state that the study

is intended to provide special experiences during the two preschool years and during the first year of school which might contribute to better intellectual processes and personal adjustments by the culturally underprivileged child and at the same time to provide a pattern for similar programs undertaken by other school systems.30

Two training periods of different duration were employed for the purpose of comparing the lasting effects of a shorter but still profitable period with a longer and more costly one. The shorter period was 2 ten-week summer sessions with in-between winter contact by a home visitor. The longer period had three summer sessions at school and two winters of home visits. The experimental and control groups employed had 18 to 22 children each. Gray and Klaus report the following findings:

Results of the experimentation at the time of this report found the first experimental group, at the end of the summer session with a


mean gain of 14 I.Q. points on the Stanford-Binet as compared to a 2.3 gain for the same period by the control groups. On the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, the experimentals made a gain of 6.6 months of mental age to 0.9 for the controls. Differences for both tests were significant at the .01 level.31

The experimenters suggest that these gains may be attributed in some part to the children's increased ability to relate to adults and increased task orientation and that, though these results are encouraging, the crucial tests of whether progressive retardation has been offset will come when the children have been in school for two or more years.32

University of Illinois

In Bereiter and Engelmann's academic-oriented preschool for disadvantaged children at the Institute for Research on Exceptional Children at the University of Illinois, reading, mathematics, and language skills are taught through drill methods. According to Bereiter, other experimental preschool programs lack achievement objectives and a specific program to accomplish the objectives. He defines a good preschool program as the following:

A preschool program that is capable of true development rather than haphazard change must have instructional objectives and methods that are sufficiently well defined and closely welded that it is at least possible to judge the effectiveness of individual activities and units.33

Bereiter is critical also of the use of intelligence test data to evaluate

31 Ibid.


preschool programs. He states: "If these gains disappear in later years and have no effect on school performance...it may simply indicate that the gains did not reflect any significant learning or improvement in educability."

While indicating that high quality data are not available for evaluating preschool programs, he gives the following preliminary report of achievement results of the experimental program, using available tests:

In so far as we can judge from the crude achievement measures available, our program has been quite successful in fostering academic achievement in young disadvantaged children. Our first experimental class, which was composed of typically deprived urban Negro children, obtained mean grade level scores on the Wide-Rage Achievement Test of 1.6 in reading, 2.6 in arithmetic, and 1.7 in spelling at the end of the kindergarten year, having completed two years of preschool training. By present indications the second group, which is now in the middle of its kindergarten year, should do considerably better than this in reading; and the third group, which is now in its first year of work, is progressing faster than earlier groups in all areas.

Project Head Start Follow-up Studies

Data from projects funded by Project Head Start Division of Research and Evaluating during the period from 1965 through 1968 are being analyzed. A complete report on these projects is not available at this time. However, some researchers have reported preliminary and interim findings.

In many of these studies, two measures were used to compare changes in educational achievement and mental ability of Head Start children—the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test and the Goodenough-Harris Drawing Test. In some

---

34 Ibid.
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instances the Binet, the Columbia Mental Maturity Scale, and similar measures were employed.36

The Head Start studies may be classified as studies of cognition, language and speech patterns, specific emphases in certain programs, teacher characteristics, instrument development, and follow-up studies of Project Head Start children. Some trends may be noted in progress reports on these follow-up studies.

Lawrence Township, New Jersey

As part of a longitudinal study of the effects of educational intervention of developmental factors which may be related to cultural-familial retardation, Hymen and Kliman assessed the stability of gains made during Head Start programs in the Lawrence Township, New Jersey schools.

The major purpose of this study was to investigate the academic readiness of children who had participated in Head Start programs and one year of kindergarten. The Head Start group was composed of 20 children from disadvantaged homes. The control group consisted of 20 children who met the criteria for the Head Start program but did not participate in the program.37

The basic procedure involved a post test design. The total experimental group, representing children who had either one or two summers of Head Start


and one year of kindergarten, was tested during the first two weeks of beginning
first grade. The Metropolitan Readiness test was administered to determine the
children's initial readiness to undertake first grade work.38

Results of this follow-up study indicate that the group of children who
had Head Start experience did not score statistically significantly higher on
the Metropolitan Readiness Test when they were compared with a control group
who did not participate in Head Start. The researchers conclude: "Despite
initial gains as a result of Head Start, the children described are still
disadvantaged in terms of academic readiness when they enter first grade."39

Baltimore, Maryland

The research program in Baltimore, Maryland conducted by Leon Eisenberg,
M.D. of Johns Hopkins University, had the following objectives:

To assess improvement in Head Start children and compare them in
September with children also culturally deprived but without Head
Start experience; to measure children's changes in behavior and
motivation during Head Start; to look at the effect of pupil-
teacher interaction on children's progress; to study intensively
speech patterns in a Head Start population; to investigate the
effect of a highly specific perceptual training on Head Start
children.40

Eisenberg found Head Start children gained approximately 31 to 40 points
on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test as compared to non-Head Start children.

---

38 Ibid.
39 Ibid., p. 167.
40 Leon Eisenberg, Final Report, PS 000 228, 1967.
In his summary Eisenberg states: "Our field study has provided substantial evidence on two independent measures that the children enrolled in Head Start in Baltimore in the summer of 1965 made substantial progress on attributes related to subsequent school success."\(^1\)

Texas

A state-wide follow-up and evaluation of Head Start programs was conducted by John-Pierce-Jones of the University of Texas. An abstract of the study indicates that the study is intended as a first step in explaining the variation children's educational development and extra-school environment during the first four years of elementary schools as a function of antecedent variations in teachers, children, and Head Start programs. The following immediate questions were investigated:

1. Along what meaningful parameters do Head Start programs differ?
2. To what degree can differences in (1) be predicted by data on antecedent factors of the teachers or children involved?
3. To what extent do changes in children occur with Head Start experience?
4. How accurately can Head Start changes be predicted from antecedent variations in teachers, children, and Head Start programs?
5. Is variability among Head Start children increased, decreased, or left unchanged by Head Start experience?\(^2\)

\(^1\)Osborn, *Childhood Education*, XLIV, p. 11.

Pierce-Jones found attitudinal changes toward the poor with Head Start teachers. He also reported that the first grade teachers found Head Start children more proficient in learning, more intellectually curious, and better adjusted to the classroom than non-Head Start children.\(^4\)

In the previously reported follow up-studies of preschool education, a minimum academic gain from the Head Start experience has come to be regarded as an increase of from 5 to 10 points in I.Q. and from 20 to 25 points on school readiness tests.\(^5\)

William Brazziel, a member of the National Advisory Council for Head Start Research and Evaluation, apparently favors the use of readiness tests to measure Head Start progress. He states:

Readiness for formal schools is the prime wish...The readiness test gains are perhaps more important, as readiness tests have a very high correlation with children's success in learning to read and write. They stress word meaning, matching, numbers, copying, and sentence structure. Children scoring in the 'poor risk' range usually fail to learn to read successfully in the first grade; children scoring in the average range usually do well.\(^6\)

Brazziel indicates some areas of needed follow-up research on Project Head Start as follows:

...The true test of preschool experiences is the performance of the children in learning to read, write, and do numbers in school; their understanding and appreciation of school routines; and their

\(^{4}\)Osborn, *Childhood Education*, XLIV, p. 10.


\(^{6}\)Ibid., p. 347.
achievement motivations for school work. This performance is measured by achievement tests, analyses of age-grade records, school persist-
ance and attrition, and teacher opinion. I.Q. tests are not the cor-
correct instruments here. 46

A follow-up study of a New York Head Start program included some of this needed research in its research design.

New York City

A Head Start follow-up study conducted by Max Wolff of Yeshiva University used readiness tests and teacher rankings of children's readiness for first grade work. The "Six Months Later" study, made in the fall of 1965, compared kindergarten children who had participated in the Head Start program with their classmates who had not, in order to learn whether there were any differences in readiness to enter regular first grade classes; to ascertain in what areas of readiness if any the Head Start children were advantaged and to measure such differences; to gain insights into the influence of the kindergarten experience itself and its effects on the social and educational initial head start of the children who had had pre-
schooling.47

The children involved in the study attended the kindergartens in four public elementary schools in New York City. The Head Start children in these schools attended three Head Start centers that were chosen for this study with the help of the Early Childhood Division of the Board of Education of New York City.48

46 Ibid.


48 Ibid.
Four measures of social and educational readiness for first grade work were selected for comparisons: the child's initial adjustment to classroom routines and the length of time it took to become fully adjusted to school routines; his behavior toward his peers and towards the teacher; his speech, work habits, and listening habits; and his educational attainments.49

The Caldwell Preschool Inventory was administered to all the Head Start children in the 30 classes and to a control group of all their classmates in 15 of the 30 classes. Wolff and Stein report that these tests were used to check the independent teacher rankings of the children's readiness for first grade.50

Readiness test scores showed no significant difference between the scores of Head Start children and their classmates in kindergarten who did not have Head Start, as measured by the Preschool Inventory six to eight months after the Head Start experience.51

However, Head Start children tended to be ranked highly by their kindergarten teachers, in the first to third deciles, in greater proportions than children who had not had Head Start, after six months of kindergarten. Wolff found that 91 percent of the Head Start children were ranked in a high category by their teachers as against 69 percent of the non-Head Start children. These ratings do not conform to answers from the same teachers when interviewed.52

49 Ibid.
50 Ibid.
51 Ibid., p. 350.
52 Ibid.
In interviews, 9 of the 14 teachers interviewed felt "that any initial advantage in social adjustment to school evidenced by Head Start children had disappeared after the first few months of kindergarten." Of the four teachers who thought the advantage had persisted, three had been closely associated with the Head Start program, two as directors, and one as a teacher in the program. One teacher attributed any later advantage or disadvantage "solely to the individual Head Start teacher the child had had."

Wolff concludes from the finding that Head Start did not have an impact on children's achievement in kindergarten that there is "a paucity of direct learning in the kindergarten" and "none of the children learn very much." 53

###

The follow-up study of the New York City public schools' head start program is important in several ways: The results show differences in teachers' opinions of Head Start between those kindergarten teachers who had been associated with the Head Start program and those who had not. The study also indicated the limited success of a study in the kindergarten where there is a lack of direct instruction.

A finding in this study which may be of value for future Head Start follow-up studies is that, in the interviews, those teachers who had fewer than 25 percent Head Start children in their kindergarten classes "thought

---

53Tbid.
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that Head Start had made no difference." Where Head Start children made up 50 or more percent of the class, the teachers "all thought Head Start had helped the individual child's initial adjustment."  

It seems necessary to determine whether there are measurable differences between former Head Start children and non-Head Start children when direct learning begins, in the first grade, using appropriate tests, such as readiness tests, and informal teacher evaluations of skills and attitudes that contribute to success in school.

This follow-up and evaluation study of the Head Start Child Development Program of the Chicago Board of Education will utilize several ideas suggested in this chapter for future research: the use of readiness tests rather than I.Q. tests; teacher opinion on the effects of Head Start, differentiating between teachers with and without Head Start experience; the use of teacher opinion to suggest ways in which the Head Start program may be improved.

It seems necessary to state, however, that generalizations applicable to one Head Start program will not necessarily be found in another program. The individuality of Head Start programs and the subsequent difficulty of measuring the quality of these programs has been cited by Julius Richmond, M.D., Director of Project Head Start, Office of Economic Opportunity. He states:

Within the framework of national guidelines which outline the comprehensive nature of Head Start and require that educational, medical, nutritional, parental, and social service elements be

---

55Ibid.
present, communities have been both enthusiastic and innovative. In many cases Head Start has served as a catalyst in effecting coordination of community resources...No attempt has been made to propose total rigidity in program structure. Each center has been able to maintain an individuality and flexibility unique in federal programs. This in turn has been responsible for the enthusiasm which in hard terms is an intangible but nevertheless a specific of the program's success.56

Richmond concludes that it would be "neither easy nor equitable" to use the same standards in evaluating the adequacy of different Head Start programs. He adds: "Within the total Head Start objectives, communities are encouraged to develop programs that are uniquely theirs, and reflect the most effective use of resources available to them."57

Thus a follow-up and evaluation study of the Head Start Child Development Program of the Chicago Board of Education will pertain only to the specific program outlined in the Curriculum Guidelines for the Prekindergarten Program58 as it was conducted in Head Start centers operated by the Chicago Board of Education during 1965 and 1966.

The need for this investigation to guide future planning of the Head Start Child Development Program is essential from the unique nature of each Head Start program. Investigations of other preschool programs reported in this chapter are not adequate to gain insight into the effects of the Head


57Ibid.

58Curriculum Guidelines for the PreKindergarten Program (Chicago: Board of Education, City of Chicago, 1965).
Start program of the Chicago public schools. Conversely, results found in this study preclude generalizations which would be applicable to Head Start programs other than the program in the Head Start centers operated by the Chicago Board of Education.
CHAPTER III

A HISTORY OF THE HEAD START CHILD DEVELOPMENT
PROGRAM OF THE CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Because each Head Start program in the nation has special features, it seems necessary to be aware of the development, structure, and goals of the particular Head Start program to be evaluated. The purpose of this chapter is to set forth the development of preschool education in the Chicago public schools and to describe the Head Start Child Development Program which has been in operation for three years.

Preschool education in the Chicago public schools dates back to the 1920's. While interest in preschool education continued in curriculum studies, the programs were in operation for a limited time owing to lack of funds.¹

A timetable of programs which were the forerunners of the present Head Start prekindergarten program includes the following:

1925--A nursery school was conducted for 2- and 3-year-old children at the Franklin School under the auspices of the Chicago Women's Club.

1930—A nursery school at Parker Elementary School for 3- and 4-year-old children served as a laboratory school for student teachers.

1939—An on-going program for handicapped children included 3-year-olds.

1953—The Preschool Curriculum was written as a foundation for the elementary school curriculum and as a means of assisting parents with preschool children.

1960—The experimental summer schools opened with 5-year-olds who needed an enriched preschool experience.

1964—The special summer schools included preschool classes in three centers for 150 children, ages 3 to 4 years, and another 1,000 children in prekindergarten classes, ages 4 to 5 years.

1965—Five centers opened in March, 1965 with an ongoing prekindergarten program for 4-year-old children. The ongoing prekindergarten program which opened in March, 1965, is known as the Child Development Program. In the summer of 1965, the Chicago public schools sponsored and operated a Head Start program which provided educational activities, health, and social services for 20,733 children in 132 centers.

In 1966, the Head Start Child Development Program of the Chicago Board of Education was, for the second year, the largest program operated by a single agency in the nation. In Illinois, 35,777 children were enrolled in Head Start programs, representing the largest statewide Head Start enrollment in the nation. The Chicago public schools served 75 percent of the total

---

2Ibid.
3Ibid.
number of children enrolled in Head Start programs in the state. The combined summer Head Start and Child Development programs enrolled a total of 24,531 children during 1966. Of this number, 21,620 children were enrolled in an 8-week Head Start program in 1,024 classes in 166 centers. Another 2,914 children completed the final 8 weeks of the year round preschool program in 1,374 classes at 47 of these centers.

The 1967 Head Start program of the Chicago public schools was, for the third consecutive year, the largest program operated by a single agency in the nation. The combined summer Head Start and year-round program enrolled 25,479 children. Of the total, 23,405 were enrolled in a 8-week program in 683 classes in 167 centers; 2,074 children were enrolled in 52 ongoing classes in 47 centers.

Teaching Staff

Head Start teachers held regular teaching certificates in the Chicago public schools. Priority in assignment was given to those teachers holding kindergarten-primary certificates.

Teacher aides served on temporary civil service status with the approval of the Bureau of Civil Service Personnel. Evaluation of the applications by a committee of administrators and coordinators was necessary "to determine

---


6Ibid., p. 6.
eligibility of applicants according to Federal guidelines regarding income." 

Teacher and aide orientation programs were conducted at university centers prior to the Head Start program.

Special Features of the Program

Special features of the Head Start program of the Chicago public schools are listed in the Report of the 1967 Summer Head Start program as follows:

Small class size--20 children per class--which provided for meeting individual needs and differences in an informal though structured atmosphere.

Teaching team work with a qualified teacher, assisted by a teacher aide, working to meet individual needs of each child. A third person, the volunteer, assisted both the teacher and aide by assuming routine duties, adding special skills, and making possible small group activities.

Flexible curriculum designed to develop communication skills, to improve language ability, to improve the child's self-image, and to develop positive attitudes toward school and society, and general readiness for more formal schooling later.

Extensive parent and community involvement, to reinforce the value of the preschool program in the home, and to extend these values into the community.

Medical program including survey, treatment, follow-up, and health education.

Intensive services of curriculum staff, teacher-nurses, parent education teachers, psychologists, and social service workers.

Daily in-service meetings held each morning, with the assistance of auxiliary staff working with teachers to reinforce objectives of the curriculum.

---

7 Ibid.

8 Ibid., p. 2.
Recruitment and Eligibility of Children

The recruitment of preschool age children from financially qualified families involved the use of mass media on a citywide basis. An individualized approach which was successful also in the recruitment of these children is described as follows:

The most effective recruitment technique was the door-to-door... search conducted by the Head Start center staff. Names of qualifying children are collected by the teacher and aide from Chicago Housing Authority files, Public Aid and aide from Chicago Housing Authority files, Public Aid offices, Urban Progress centers, neighborhood schools, and community action agencies. Recruitment of a single child very often leads to recruitment of his playmates. Thus, the cycle of recruitment draws children and parents--and ultimately whole communities. Recruitment becomes a vehicle for helping people to help themselves in the struggle toward a better society.9

Guidelines for eligibility for participation in the Head Start program are the following:

Children, four years old by December of the current year are eligible for the program. Children are selected on the basis of low-income families; poor housing conditions, such as lack of room for play experiences, indoors and outdoors; extenuating circumstances in the family that contribute to deprivation and which are detrimental to the well-being of the child. It is stipulated that 90 percent of the children be 'poor'; however, in order that the group of representative of a broader cross section of the community or neighborhood, it is permissible to include children--up to ten percent of the class—from homes which are more prosperous.10


10 Ibid.
Curriculum and Goals of the Program

While Federal guidelines formed the basic structure of the Head Start program, a curriculum guide devised by the staff of the Chicago public schools Guidelines for the Prekindergarten Program, was used in planning the specific Head Start program of the Chicago public schools. As an extension of the curriculum, field trips were provided.

The goals of the Head Start Child Development program are stated as follows:

- Develop a positive attitude toward self and school
- Develop the child's ability to communicate
- Stimulate his natural curiosity
- Expand the child's background with meaningful experiences
- Encourage the latent talents inherent in every child
- Develop desirable health habits
- Extend the child's ability to work and play in groups as well as independently.\(^{11}\)

Daily Program

The Head Start program operated in half-day classes. The program was the same for the children attending the afternoon session as for those attending the morning session. The suggested daily schedule for children who attended the morning session of the Head Start program is as follows:

A.M.
8:00 to 8:30  In-service with auxiliary staff and school staff and/or school staff planning and preparing materials
8:30 to 9:15  Greetings, informal health inspection, and self-selected activity period
9:15 to 9:25  Transitional activities (songs, fingerplays)
9:25 to 9:35  Snack period (juice and crackers)
9:35 to 10:15 Rotating activities:
Outdoor play (half of the group)
Small-group directed experience (half of the group)
10:15 to 10:35  Large-group activities (music, rhythms, filmstrips, story)
10:35 to 11:00 Lunch period (setting of tables and cleanup included)
11:00 to 11:15  Listening period
11:15 to 11:35  Evaluation, motivation for the next day's activities, and preparation for dismissal
11:25 to 11:30  Dismissal

Parent Participation

Parent organizations were formed at each center in recognition of the importance of the family unit in the development of the child. Parents were involved as aides, volunteers, and resource persons in the classrooms.

---

12 Ibid., p. 4.
13 Ibid., p. 8.
Volunteer Services

Volunteers were recruited from among parents, neighborhood residents, non-residents, members of the local PTA, and workers from the Volunteer Bureau of the Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago.

Parents indicate that volunteers performed a variety of tasks. Some of these tasks are listed as follows:

- In the classroom volunteers help in non-teaching activities such as: assisting children to and from dental clinics; participating with children in various classroom activities; using special abilities or talents in small group activities with children or parents. Others help to keep equipment in good repair, put toys away, clean paint brushes, make costumes for the children. The tasks outside the classroom vary from riding the bus with the Head Starters to teaching them to take turns on the swings; from taking pictures to acting as interpreters for the foreign-speaking child.\(^1\)

Other Features

The social service program, the health program, communications, and community beautification are other important parts of the Head Start program in the Chicago public schools. A description of these areas of the program is found in the Report of the 1967 Head Start Program to the Board of Education of the City of Chicago (Board Report No. 67-1155).

Evaluation

The Head Start program of the Chicago Board of Education was included in the nationwide evaluation program conducted by the Office of Economic

---

Opportunity.

The Goodenough Draw-a-Man Test has also been administered at all centers on a pretest and post-test basis for the purpose of measuring perceptual and cognitive growth.\textsuperscript{15}

There is a need for further evaluation. In the 1965 Annual Report of the Head Start Child Development Program, in a section focusing on results of the program, it is stated:

To what extent the special program met the needs of children from disadvantaged areas is yet to be statistically determined...That gains were made is apparent, but gains can be expected to be also cumulative...

Evidences of the changes in the behavior, abilities, and attitudes of the children were apparent as the program progressed each day. Observations of the changes by parents and teachers supported the belief that the program in the Chicago public schools was successful.\textsuperscript{16}

In order to determine whether the gains of the Head Start children are cumulative and to determine the success of the program, a follow-up and evaluation study of the Head Start Child Development Program of the Chicago Board of Education is needed. The design of this study, which utilizes both teacher opinion and standardized test results, is given in Chapter IV.

\textsuperscript{15}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{16}Ibid.
CHAPTER IV

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the Head Start preschool program of the Chicago Board of Education and to determine the effects of the Head Start program on children's school readiness, skill development, attitudes, habits, and other factors related to success in the first grade.

This follow-up and evaluation study utilizes the normative-survey method to obtain results by means of a questionnaire designed for this study.

Normative-survey research is directed toward ascertaining prevailing conditions. Good, Barr, and Scales state the purpose of the questionnaire as a normative-survey technique as follows:

In a questionnaire, the questions are factual, designed to secure information about conditions or practices of which the recipient is presumed to have knowledge... The questionnaire may, however, ask for opinions and it may be used to afford insight into the attitudes of a group.1

In order to determine the effects of the Head Start program and to evaluate the program, this study seeks to elicit the opinions of first grade teachers of former Head Start children.

In addition to teacher opinion, this survey compares the scores of former

Head Start pupils and other first graders without Head Start experience on the Metropolitan Readiness Test. The test results are used to check teacher judgment of children's readiness for the first grade work.

This study is limited to a survey of the opinions of the first grade teachers who are currently teaching in the schools of the Chicago Board of Education where the year round Head Start Child Development centers are in operation during the 1967-68 school year. The observations and test results of the pupil population of the study refer to the children enrolled in the first grade, or Primary I, divisions in these schools during the first six months of the school year 1967-68.

Instrument

The questionnaire designed for this follow-up and evaluation study was formulated by the writer on the basis of her study of previous research on the goals and practices of preschool and primary education and her teaching experience in the primary grades of the elementary school.

The questionnaire consists of four sections and utilizes two types of questions. To encourage teacher-freedom in expression of opinion, no personal nor school identification was required on the questionnaire.

Because a previous study found differences in the opinions of teachers with and without Head Start teaching experience, the first part of the study seeks to ascertain the background of the teachers participating in the study. The following questions are asked:

How many years have you been teaching?

Do you hold a regular teaching certificate in the Chicago Public Schools?
What grades have you taught previously?

Have you ever been a Head Start teacher in the Chicago Public Schools?

If so, when?

What college degrees do you hold?

**Pupil Data**

The pupil population for the study consists of children who have had Head Start and who are now in first grade in the same schools in which Head Start centers are being operated during the 1967-68 school year. To note differences in the pupil population, the teachers participating in the study are asked to give the following data:

- Grade you are presently teaching
- Total membership in your class
- How many members of your class were at one time enrolled in Head Start classes conducted by the Chicago Public Schools?
- When did these children attend Head Start?
- Which term did they attend? (Summer or during regular school year).

**Follow-up Study**

The follow-up section of the study is the first of two major sections of the study. The questionnaire provides for teacher opinion on the effects of the Head Start program on pupils' skills, attitudes, and habits in first grade by means of both structured and unstructured items.

Rommel states the function of the structured item as follows:

"The structured item requires only a checking or
the writing in of a scaled value judgement, and also enables one to ask several specific questions about the same list of activities."²

In this survey, the structured items call for selection type, multiple-choice answers to rate the degree to which former Head Start pupils possess skills, attitudes, and habits thought necessary for success in first grade. The respondents are asked to rate former Head Start pupils who are now in first grade, as a group, Excellent, Average, or Poor. The directions given in the questionnaire are the following:

In responding to the remainder of this survey which seeks to ascertain the effects of Head Start on first grade children, you are asked to think as a first grade teacher about the attitudes and skills needed for success in the primary grades. Compare, insofar as it is possible, the differences in attitudes and skills you have noticed between Head Start graduates, as a group, and the rest of the members of your class who did not attend Head Start.

Please place a check in the appropriate column to indicate the degree to which former Head Start pupils in your class display these skills, attitudes, and habits.

The respondents are also asked to list test results from the Metropolitan Readiness Test, administered in September, 1967, using the five categories of test results: A—Superior, B—High Normal, C—Average, D—Low Normal, and D—Low. The total number of pupils receiving these scores are listed in separate columns headed: "Former Head Start Pupils," "Other First Graders."

In order to give further information on the effects of Head Start in the

follow-up study, this survey provided an unstructured item to obtain additional knowledge. This question was the following:

Have you noted any marked differences between children in your first grade class who have attended Head Start in the Chicago Public Schools and those who have not?

The answer space provides for categorized responses: social, emotional, academic, other.

**Evaluation of the Head Start Program**

Two unstructured items make up the second major section of the questionnaire: "The Evaluation of the Head Start Child Development Program of the Chicago Board of Education." The following questions seek to obtain an evaluative opinion from the respondents:

Do you think that Project Head Start provides compensation for the culturally deprived child before he enters the elementary school?

What suggestions would you offer to strengthen Project Head Start?

**Selection of Teacher Respondents**

The teachers selected for the study population are teachers in the Chicago public schools who are teaching first grade, now labeled Primary I, during the 1967-68 school year in schools in which there is a year round Head Start center. The schools were selected with the hope that they would contain a large number of former Head Start children in the first grades. The distribution and collection of the questionnaires would also be done by the Head Start adjustment teachers who serve the Head Start centers.

The 45 schools housing these Head Start Child Development Centers are located in the north, south, and west sections of the city. In order to study
possible differences in results from these three sections of the city, the questionnaire was printed on three colors of paper to differentiate the three areas of the city: north—blue, south—yellow, west—pink. The recently reorganized plan of the Chicago Board of Education dividing the city schools into south (Area A), west (Area B), and north (Area C) sections of the city provided the categorization of the schools. (See Appendix B).

**Procedures for Conducting the Study**

Prior to distributing the questionnaires, a letter explaining the need for this study was sent from the central office staff to the district superintendents and principals involved.

Distribution and collection of the questionnaires given to the Primary I teachers were the tasks of the five Head Start adjustment teachers assigned to serve the Head Start centers in the elementary schools involved in this study. The questionnaires were distributed to the Head Start adjustment teachers at a meeting in the Head Start central office on February 13, 1968. At that time, the purpose and procedures of the study were explained. The Head Start adjustment teachers were asked to discuss the study with the district superintendents and principals in these areas and to present the study to the Primary I teachers involved.

**Results of the Study**

Results obtained from each section of the questionnaire are analyzed in several ways, differentiating the three areas of the city, teachers with and without Head Start teaching experience, and pupils who have and have not participated in the Head Start Child Development Program of the Chicago Board
of Education.

On readiness test results, differences between the scores of former Head Start pupils and other first graders without Head Start are presented.

Classification of responses of teachers on the unstructured items in both the follow-up and evaluation sections are analyzed to gain insight into the effectiveness of the program.
CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

One hundred six teachers in the Chicago public schools participated in this follow-up and evaluation study of the Head Start Child Development program of the Chicago Board of Education. This population sample represented first grade teachers in forty-five Chicago public schools. The schools selected for this study are those schools in which the year-round Head Start program is being conducted during the 1967-68 school year.

These schools, involving first grade teachers and their students, were chosen for the population sample for several reasons: the first grades, or Primary I divisions, contained a large number of children who had attended Head Start and who are now in the first grade; the distribution and collection of the questionnaire was facilitated by the Head Start adjustment teachers serving the Head Start centers in these schools; the Primary I teachers were aware of the Head Start program because of the Head Start center's proximity to their classrooms in the same schools.

The questionnaire was distributed to 110 Primary I teachers in February, 1968. Out of the total distributed, 106 teachers returned completed questionnaires, for a 76 percent return.

Because this study seeks to ascertain whether there were differences in the responses in the opinion survey according to areas of the city, the questionnaire was printed on three colors of paper to distinguish the three
areas of the city: west (pink), north (blue), and south (yellow). The recent division of the schools of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago into administrative areas was used to divide the schools used in this survey: south (Area A), west (Area B), and north (Area C). (See Appendix B for a map of the city showing these administrative divisions.)

Since there were more Head Start centers located in the west section of the city, or Area B, the majority of the questionnaires were distributed and collected in the west section schools. Seventy teachers completed the questionnaire in west section, Area B schools; 19 teachers in the north section, Area C, completed the questionnaires; 17 teachers in south section, Area A, schools, completed the questionnaires.

**Teacher Data**

In order to determine the background of the teachers who participated in this study, the first section of the questionnaire is concerned with data on their years of teaching experience, certification status, grades taught, Head Start teaching experience, and their educational backgrounds.

**Question 1.** How many years have you been teaching?

The teaching experience of the respondents ranges from 6 months to 42 years. The average teaching experience is 11 years.

**Question 2.** Do you hold a regular teaching certificate in the Chicago Public Schools?

Eighty-two, or 77 percent of the total of 106 teachers participating in the survey hold a regular teaching certificate in the Chicago public schools. Table 1 shows their certification status by areas of the city.
TABLE 1
CERTIFICATION STATUS OF TEACHER POPULATION OF STUDY BY AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you hold a regular teaching certificate?</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 3.—What grades have you taught previously?

In order to gain further knowledge about the competence of the teachers to answer questions involving an evaluation of a span of several years of preschool and primary education for the pupils involved in the study, previous teaching experience was determined. Table 2 indicates the range of previous teaching experience that was reported by the respondents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It may be noted from Table 2 that many teachers had previous teaching experience in several grades at the primary level of the elementary school. The teachers indicating experience in other grades reported teaching experience at the fourth and fifth grades. Two teachers reported seventh and eighth grade teaching experience, while one teacher reported teaching experience in an EMI division.

**Question 1.** Have you ever been a Head Start teacher in the Chicago Public Schools?

Twenty-four teachers, or 23 percent of the teachers involved in this survey, indicated that they had been teachers in the Head Start Child Development program of the Chicago Board of Education. The teachers who reported Head Start teaching experience had taught only in the summer Head Start programs of 1965, 1966, and 1967. Table 3 shows the total number of teachers from each area of the city who taught in the Head Start program of the Chicago public schools and the years when they taught.
TABLE 3
HEAD START TEACHING EXPERIENCE IN THE CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS
OF TEACHER POPULATION OF STUDY BY AREAS OF THE CITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total in Area</th>
<th>Summer, 1965</th>
<th>Summer, 1966</th>
<th>Summer, 1967</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in the table above, most of the Primary I teachers who had Head Start teaching experience taught in the summer Head Start program for more than one summer. The responses of these teachers on the opinion survey are noted to determine whether there are differences in their evaluations of former Head Start pupils and the Head Start program when compared with the Primary I teacher respondents who did not have teaching experience in the Head Start program.

In addition to the 24 first grade teachers who taught in the summer Head Start program, one respondent served as a parent coordinator. Another teacher respondent who taught in the Summer, 1965 Head Start program in the Chicago public schools served as a curriculum consultant in the Head Start program during the summers of 1966 and 1967. The parent coordinator was not included in the totals of the respondents with previous Head Start teaching experience in analyses of subsequent data.
Question 5.—What college degrees do you hold?

The educational background of the teacher population of the study is varied, ranging from a teacher with no degree to two teachers who have Masters' degrees plus 36 additional hours of graduate credit. One hundred five of the teachers hold Bachelor's degrees. In addition, 19 hold Master's degrees, and 2 teachers have 36 semester hours of credit beyond the Master's degree. Educational background is indicated by areas of the city in Table 4.

Table 4

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUNDS OF TEACHER POPULATION OF STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (36 hours beyond Master's)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pupil Data

The pupil population for this study is the total number of pupils enrolled in the first grades, or Primary I divisions, of the teachers involved in this study. Attention is focused throughout this study on the children who have had Head Start and who are now in first grade.

Total pupil membership in these divisions ranged from 41 to 18 children. Three additional total memberships were not given because these divisions
involved split grades 1 and 2. Only the first grade enrollments were indicated. Low class memberships were found in schools qualifying for low first grade class size under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The study involved a total of 3,050 first graders, of which 1,371, or 45 percent of the first grade pupils had attended Head Start.

A majority of the 1,371 former Head Start pupils were enrolled in the Head Start program during the summer of 1966. The teachers reported that 724 pupils were enrolled in the summer program of Head Start in either Summer, 1965, 1966, or 1967. An additional 178 of the first grade pupils attended Head Start in the year-round (ten-month) program during the 1965-66 school year. The remainder of the pupils, a total of 169, were listed by the teachers as having attended Head Start, although no dates of enrollment in Head Start were indicated on the questionnaires for these pupils. The teachers indicated that some of these 169 pupils attended Head Start in the summer program while others had attended the year-round program.

The number of former Head Start pupils in each first grade class involved in the study ranged from 26 to 1. The average number of former Head Start pupils in the 106 first grade classes was 12.9. Average class size of 101; Primary I divisions, or first grades, excluding 2 split divisions of Primary I and II, was 29.2.

Follow-up-Study

The first major section of this follow-up study contains a checklist of skills, attitudes, and habits of pupils which are needed for success in the first grade. The teachers who participated in this survey were asked to
indicate the degree to which former Head Start pupils in their classes display these skills, attitudes, and habits, when compared with the other members of the first grade classes who did not attend Head Start. Deviations from the "Average" rating are considered important in this section of the study when 25 percent or more of the teachers gave the former Head Start groups the ratings of "Excellent" or "Poor" for any of these skills, attitudes, or habits.

Table 5 contains a summary of the ratings on skills given to former Head Start pupils who are now in the first grade classes involved in this study by the total number of teachers who completed this section of the questionnaire. Ratings are given in numbers of teachers rating pupils on the item and in percentages of the total number of teachers involved.

**TABLE 5**

**SKILLS OF FORMER HEAD START PUPILS — TOTAL GROUP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills of Former Head Start Pupils</th>
<th>Excellent%</th>
<th>Average%</th>
<th>Poor%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muscular coordination</td>
<td>21 (20.0%)</td>
<td>75 (71.4%)</td>
<td>9 (8.6)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work independently</td>
<td>19 (18.1%)</td>
<td>59 (56.2%)</td>
<td>27 (25.7)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work in a group</td>
<td>27 (25.8%)</td>
<td>62 (59.0%)</td>
<td>16 (15.2)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to others</td>
<td>21 (20.0%)</td>
<td>55 (52.4%)</td>
<td>29 (27.6)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-expression</td>
<td>28 (26.7%)</td>
<td>53 (50.5%)</td>
<td>24 (22.8)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual discrimination</td>
<td>20 (18.1%)</td>
<td>74 (70.5%)</td>
<td>11 (10.4)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditory discrimination</td>
<td>15 (14.3%)</td>
<td>70 (66.7%)</td>
<td>20 (19.0)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td>9 (8.6%)</td>
<td>63 (60.0%)</td>
<td>33 (31.4)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to complete assignments</td>
<td>20 (19.0%)</td>
<td>61 (58.1%)</td>
<td>24 (22.0)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for first grade work</td>
<td>22 (20.9%)</td>
<td>51 (48.6%)</td>
<td>32 (30.5)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data on skills of former Head Start pupils gathered from the total teacher population of the study indicates that former Head Start pupils were given their highest ratings, "Excellent," in self-expression by 26.7 percent of the teachers and in ability to work in a group by 25.8 percent of the teachers. Over half of the teacher participants ranked their pupils "Average" in all skills except the item indicating readiness for first grade work (18.6%). Former Head Start pupils received their lowest rating, "Poor," as a group, in reasoning (31.4%), readiness for first grade work (30.5%), listening to others (27.6%), and the ability to work independently (25.7%).

Table 6 shows the ratings of former Head Start pupils' attitudes and habits by the total teacher population of the study. In these attitudes and habits, former Head Start pupils were ranked "Average" by more than half of the teachers completing this section of the study, with the exception of adjustment to classroom routine (18.1%) and enjoyment of books (37.6%).

This group was rated "Excellent" by more than one-fourth of the total teacher population in 7 out of the 9 items in the following order: enjoyment of books (54.1%), willingness to try new experiences (37.8%), interest in use of varied classroom materials (37.5%), adjustment to classroom routine (35.5%), respect for school personnel (32.7%), pride in accomplishments of learning (30.1%), and personal cleanliness (27.9%).

Former Head Start pupils were not rated "Poor" by 25 percent of the teachers in any of the attitudes and habits observed.
### Table 6
Attitudes and Habits of Former Head Start Pupils—Total Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes and Habits of Former Head Start Pupils</th>
<th>Excellent%</th>
<th>Average%</th>
<th>Poor%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect for school personnel</td>
<td>34 (32.7%)</td>
<td>65 (62.5)</td>
<td>5 (4.8)</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment to classroom routine</td>
<td>38 (36.5%)</td>
<td>61 (58.1)</td>
<td>15 (14.4)</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in use of varied classroom materials</td>
<td>39 (37.5%)</td>
<td>59 (56.7)</td>
<td>6 (5.8)</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal cleanliness</td>
<td>29 (27.9%)</td>
<td>72 (69.2)</td>
<td>3 (2.9)</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orderliness in taking care of materials</td>
<td>14 (13.5%)</td>
<td>76 (73.0)</td>
<td>14 (13.5)</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of personal worth</td>
<td>21 (20.1%)</td>
<td>72 (69.9)</td>
<td>10 (9.7)</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride in accomplishments of learning</td>
<td>31 (30.1%)</td>
<td>58 (56.3)</td>
<td>14 (13.6)</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment of books</td>
<td>55 (54.1%)</td>
<td>39 (37.8)</td>
<td>9 (8.7)</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to try new experiences</td>
<td>39 (37.8%)</td>
<td>54 (52.1)</td>
<td>10 (9.8)</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to note any differences in the ratings of former Head Start children who participated in the Head Start program in the various Head Start centers located in the three sections of the city—west, north, and south—the ratings of these pupils by their teachers in the three areas of the city are analyzed according to sections of the city.

**West Section Schools—Area B**

The largest number of Primary I teachers involved in this study are the respondents teaching in schools in the west section of the city, Area B, in which year-round Head Start centers are in operation.
Seventy teachers, the total number of west section teachers participating in the study, completed the ratings on skills of former Head Start pupils. These ratings are given in Table 7.

**TABLE 7**

**SKILLS OF FORMER HEAD START PUPILS—WEST SECTION, AREA B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills of Former Head Start Pupils</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muscular coordination</td>
<td>12 (17.1)</td>
<td>51 (72.9)</td>
<td>7 (10.0)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work independently</td>
<td>10 (14.3)</td>
<td>40 (57.1)</td>
<td>20 (28.6)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work in a group</td>
<td>14 (20.0)</td>
<td>55 (61.3)</td>
<td>11 (15.7)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to others</td>
<td>12 (17.1)</td>
<td>37 (52.9)</td>
<td>21 (30.0)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-expression</td>
<td>16 (22.9)</td>
<td>36 (51.4)</td>
<td>18 (25.7)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual discrimination</td>
<td>12 (17.1)</td>
<td>51 (72.9)</td>
<td>7 (10.0)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditory discrimination</td>
<td>8 (11.1)</td>
<td>45 (61.3)</td>
<td>17 (24.3)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td>5 (7.1)</td>
<td>41 (58.6)</td>
<td>21 (34.2)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to complete assignments</td>
<td>11 (15.7)</td>
<td>43 (63.1)</td>
<td>16 (22.9)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for first grade work</td>
<td>11 (15.7)</td>
<td>36 (51.4)</td>
<td>23 (32.9)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pupils were rated "Average" as a group in all skills by over one-half of the west section teachers. However, these pupils in schools in Area B were not rated "Excellent" in any trait by one-fourth of their teachers. They were rated "Poor" by more than one-fourth of the teachers in the following 5 skills: reasoning (34.2%), readiness for first grade work (32.9%), listening to others (30.0%), ability to work independently (28.6%), and self expression (25.7%).
Table 8 indicates the number and percentage of west section teachers giving each rating for the attitudes and habits of former Head Start pupils.

TABLE 8
ATTITUDES AND HABITS OF FORMER HEAD START PUPILS
WEST SECTION—AREA B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes and Habits of Former Head Start Pupils</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect for school personnel</td>
<td>21 (30.4)</td>
<td>44 (63.8)</td>
<td>4 (5.8)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment to classroom routine</td>
<td>22 (31.9)</td>
<td>36 (52.2)</td>
<td>11 (15.9)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in use of varied classroom materials</td>
<td>22 (31.9)</td>
<td>42 (60.9)</td>
<td>5 (7.2)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal cleanliness</td>
<td>15 (21.7)</td>
<td>52 (75.4)</td>
<td>2 (2.9)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orderliness in taking care of materials</td>
<td>8 (11.6)</td>
<td>51 (73.9)</td>
<td>10 (14.5)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of personal worth</td>
<td>11 (16.2)</td>
<td>48 (70.6)</td>
<td>9 (13.2)</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride in accomplishments of learning</td>
<td>15 (22.1)</td>
<td>39 (57.3)</td>
<td>14 (20.6)</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment of books</td>
<td>31 (45.6)</td>
<td>28 (41.2)</td>
<td>9 (13.2)</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to try new experiences</td>
<td>23 (33.8)</td>
<td>37 (54.4)</td>
<td>8 (11.8)</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In attitudes and habits, the Head Start groups in west area schools were rated "Average" by more than one-half of the west area teachers in all attitudes and habits except the item, enjoyment of books, where 41.2 percent of the teachers rated the former Head Start groups "average."

In contrast to the ratings for skills of former Head Start pupils in the west section schools, the pupils were not rated "Poor" on any attitude or habit by 25 percent of the participating teachers. The west section former
Head Start groups were rated "Excellent" in enjoyment of books (45.6%), willingness to try new experiences (33.8%), adjustment to classroom routine (31.9%), interest in use of varied classroom materials (31.9%), and respect for school personnel (30.4%).

North Section Schools -- Area C

Eighteen of the 19 north section teachers participating in this survey rated their pupils on skills, attitudes, and habits necessary for success in school. Table 9 shows the skill ratings of former Head Start pupils by Primary I teachers in north section schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills of Former Head Start Pupils</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muscular coordination</td>
<td>7 (38.9)</td>
<td>10 (55.6)</td>
<td>1 (5.5)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work independently</td>
<td>6 (33.3)</td>
<td>8 (44.4)</td>
<td>4 (22.2)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work in a group</td>
<td>8 (44.4)</td>
<td>8 (44.4)</td>
<td>2 (11.1)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to others</td>
<td>6 (33.3)</td>
<td>6 (33.3)</td>
<td>6 (33.3)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-expression</td>
<td>6 (33.3)</td>
<td>10 (55.6)</td>
<td>2 (11.1)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual discrimination</td>
<td>6 (33.3)</td>
<td>10 (55.6)</td>
<td>2 (11.1)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditory discrimination</td>
<td>6 (33.3)</td>
<td>10 (55.6)</td>
<td>2 (11.1)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td>2 (22.2)</td>
<td>11 (77.8)</td>
<td>2 (11.1)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to complete assignments</td>
<td>6 (33.3)</td>
<td>8 (44.4)</td>
<td>4 (22.2)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for first grade work</td>
<td>8 (44.4)</td>
<td>5 (27.8)</td>
<td>5 (27.8)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The former Head Start groups were rated "Average" by over 50 percent of the teachers in reasoning (77.8%), self expression (55.6%), visual discrimination (55.6%), auditory discrimination (55.6%), and muscular coordination (55.6%). Over one-quarter of the teachers in north section schools rated their former Head Start groups "Excellent" in all skills except reasoning. These pupils were rated "Poor" by over one-quarter of the 18 teachers in listening to others (33.3%), and readiness for first grade work (27.8%).

On attitudes and habits, over half of the 18 teachers rated their former Head Start groups "Average" in all items listed except in enjoyment of books. More than one-quarter of the teachers rated their pupils "Excellent" in all attitudes and habits except orderliness in taking care of materials (22.2%). None of the attitudes and habits of north section former Head Start groups were ranked "Poor" by 25 percent of the north section Primary I teachers. Table 10 contains the ratings of former Head Start groups by teachers in the north section schools for pupil attitudes and habits.
### TABLE 10

**ATTITUDES AND HABITS OF FORMER HEAD START PUPILS**  
**NORTH SECTION—AREA C**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes and Habits of Former Head Start Pupils</th>
<th>Excellent%</th>
<th>Average%</th>
<th>Poor%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect for school personnel</td>
<td>6 (33.3)</td>
<td>11 (61.1)</td>
<td>1 (5.5)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment to classroom routine</td>
<td>10 (55.6)</td>
<td>5 (27.7)</td>
<td>3 (16.7)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in use of varied classroom materials</td>
<td>10 (55.6)</td>
<td>7 (38.9)</td>
<td>1 (5.5)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal cleanliness</td>
<td>7 (38.9)</td>
<td>11 (61.1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orderliness in taking care of materials</td>
<td>1 (22.2)</td>
<td>14 (77.8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of personal worth</td>
<td>6 (33.3)</td>
<td>11 (61.1)</td>
<td>1 (5.5)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride in accomplishments of learning</td>
<td>9 (50.0)</td>
<td>9 (50.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment of books</td>
<td>15 (83.3)</td>
<td>3 (16.7)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to try new experiences</td>
<td>9 (50.0)</td>
<td>9 (50.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**South Section Schools — Area A**

Seventeen teachers, representing the total number of teachers participating from schools in the south section of the city, checked the degree to which former Head Start pupils indicated skills, attitudes, and habits needed for success at the Primary I level of the elementary school.

Table 11 shows the ratings for skills of former Head Start pupils in this section of the city.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills of Former Head Start Pupils</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muscular coordination</td>
<td>2 (11.8)</td>
<td>14 (82.3)</td>
<td>1 (5.9)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work independently</td>
<td>3 (17.6)</td>
<td>11 (64.7)</td>
<td>3 (17.6)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work in a group</td>
<td>5 (29.4)</td>
<td>9 (52.9)</td>
<td>3 (17.6)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to others</td>
<td>3 (17.6)</td>
<td>12 (70.6)</td>
<td>2 (11.8)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-expression</td>
<td>5 (29.4)</td>
<td>8 (47.0)</td>
<td>4 (23.5)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual discrimination</td>
<td>2 (11.8)</td>
<td>13 (76.5)</td>
<td>2 (11.8)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditory discrimination</td>
<td>1 (5.9)</td>
<td>15 (88.2)</td>
<td>1 (5.9)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td>2 (11.8)</td>
<td>8 (47.0)</td>
<td>7 (41.2)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to complete assignments</td>
<td>3 (17.6)</td>
<td>10 (58.8)</td>
<td>4 (23.5)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for first grade work</td>
<td>3 (17.6)</td>
<td>10 (58.8)</td>
<td>1 (23.5)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pupils were rated "Average" in all skills except self-expression (17.0%) and reasoning (17.0%). Using the predetermined percentage of 25 percent of the teachers participating to indicate a significant rating of "Excellent" or "Poor," it may be determined from Table 11 that over 25 percent of these south area teachers rated the former Head Start pupils "Excellent" in their ability to work in a group (29.4%) and in self expression (29.4%). The former Head Start pupils were rated "Poor" in reasoning by 41.2 percent of the Area A teacher participants.

Table 12 contains the ratings of former Head Start pupils on attitudes and habits by teachers in the south section of the city.
TABLE 12
ATTITUDES AND HABITS OF FORMER HEAD START PUPILS
SOUTH SECTION--AREA A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes and Habits of Former Head Start Pupils</th>
<th>Excellent%</th>
<th>Average%</th>
<th>Poor%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect for school personnel</td>
<td>7 (41.2)</td>
<td>10 (58.8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment to classroom routine</td>
<td>6 (35.2)</td>
<td>10 (58.8)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in use of varied classroom materials</td>
<td>8 (47.0)</td>
<td>9 (52.9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal cleanliness</td>
<td>7 (41.2)</td>
<td>9 (52.9)</td>
<td>1 (5.9)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orderliness in taking care of materials</td>
<td>2 (11.8)</td>
<td>11 (64.7)</td>
<td>4 (23.5)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of personal worth</td>
<td>4 (23.5)</td>
<td>13 (76.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride in accomplishments of learning</td>
<td>7 (41.2)</td>
<td>10 (58.8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment of books</td>
<td>9 (52.9)</td>
<td>8 (47.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to try new experiences</td>
<td>7 (41.2)</td>
<td>8 (47.0)</td>
<td>2 (11.8)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than half of the teachers rated their former Head Start groups "Average" on all of the items except enjoyment of books (47.0%) and willingness to try new experiences (41.2%). Over 25 percent of the teachers rated former Head Starters "Excellent" in enjoyment of books (52.9%), interest in use of varied classroom materials (47.0%), respect for school personnel (41.2%), personal cleanliness (41.2%), pride in accomplishments of learning (41.2%), and willingness to try new experiences (41.2%). These pupils were not rated "Poor" in any attitude or habit by a significant number of teachers participating from the south section of the city.
Ratings of Pupils by Teachers with Head Start Teaching Experience

In order to determine whether there is a difference in ratings of former Head Start pupils in Primary I classes by teachers with and without Head Start teaching experience, the former Head Start teachers' questionnaires were considered as a special group.

Twenty-four teachers, representing the three areas of the city, north, south, and west, had taught in the summer programs of the Head Start Child Development Program of the Chicago Board of Education.

Their ratings of former Head Start groups present in their Primary I classes on skills are given in Table 13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

SKILLS OF FORMER HEAD START PUPILS—RATED BY TEACHERS WITH HEAD START TEACHING EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills of Former Head Start Pupils</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muscular coordination</td>
<td>7 (29.2)</td>
<td>17 (70.8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work independently</td>
<td>6 (25.0)</td>
<td>15 (62.5)</td>
<td>3 (12.5)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work in a group</td>
<td>8 (33.3)</td>
<td>15 (62.5)</td>
<td>1 (4.2)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to others</td>
<td>9 (37.5)</td>
<td>12 (50.0)</td>
<td>3 (12.5)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-expression</td>
<td>9 (37.5)</td>
<td>10 (41.7)</td>
<td>5 (20.8)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual discrimination</td>
<td>8 (33.3)</td>
<td>14 (58.3)</td>
<td>2 (8.3)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditory discrimination</td>
<td>6 (25.0)</td>
<td>14 (58.3)</td>
<td>4 (16.7)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td>3 (12.5)</td>
<td>16 (66.7)</td>
<td>5 (20.8)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to complete assignments</td>
<td>9 (37.5)</td>
<td>12 (50.0)</td>
<td>3 (12.5)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for first grade work</td>
<td>10 (41.7)</td>
<td>12 (50.0)</td>
<td>2 (8.3)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Over one-half of the teachers with Head Start teaching experience rated former Head Start pupils present in their Primary I classes "Average" in all skills except in self-expression, in which 41.7 percent rated these children "Average." These "Average" ratings are comparable to the ratings from the total teacher population of 105 teachers participating in this section of the study, with the exception that in readiness for first grade work, 48.1 percent of the total teacher population ranked the children "Average."

In contrast to the total teacher population whose "Excellent" ratings on skills only exceeded 25 percent of the teachers responding in the items ability to work in a group and self expression, over 25 percent of the teachers with Head Start teaching experience rated former Head Start pupils "Excellent" in all skills except reasoning (12.5%). No more than 5 of the former Head Start teachers rated the pupils "Poor" in any skill.

Table 14 gives the numbers and percentages of the teachers with Head Start teaching experience who rated former Head Start groups on attitudes and habits.
It may be noted in Table 14 that, in the items on which the former Head Start pupils were not rated "Average" by 50 percent of the teachers with Head Start teaching experience, they were rated "Excellent" by over 50 percent of these teachers. The pupils were rated "Excellent" by over 25 percent of these teachers on every attitude and habit except orderliness in taking care of materials (20.8%). Only 1 former Head Start teacher rated pupils "Poor" on 6 of the items, and 3 teachers rated their groups "Poor" on another item, totaling insignificant percentages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes and Habits of Former Head Start Pupils</th>
<th>Excellent%</th>
<th>Average%</th>
<th>Poor%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect for school personnel</td>
<td>9 (37.5)</td>
<td>15 (62.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment to classroom routine</td>
<td>13 (54.1)</td>
<td>10 (41.7)</td>
<td>1 (4.2)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in use of varied classroom materials</td>
<td>14 (58.3)</td>
<td>9 (37.5)</td>
<td>1 (4.2)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal cleanliness</td>
<td>7 (29.2)</td>
<td>17 (70.8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orderliness in taking care of materials</td>
<td>5 (20.8)</td>
<td>18 (70.5)</td>
<td>1 (4.2)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of personal worth</td>
<td>7 (29.2)</td>
<td>16 (66.7)</td>
<td>1 (4.2)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride in accomplishments of learning</td>
<td>8 (33.3)</td>
<td>13 (51.2)</td>
<td>3 (12.5)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment of books</td>
<td>17 (70.8)</td>
<td>6 (25.0)</td>
<td>1 (4.2)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to try new experiences</td>
<td>16 (66.7)</td>
<td>7 (29.2)</td>
<td>1 (4.2)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Ratings

A summary of strengths and weaknesses in the skills, attitudes, and habits of former Head Start children rated as groups by the total teacher population of the study and by teachers with Head Start teaching experience is given in the two following tables. The tables contain lists of items rated "Excellent," which are considered for this study as strengths of former Head Start pupils, and lists of items rated "Poor," which are considered for this study as weaknesses. These "Excellent" and "Poor" ratings are listed in the tables when they exceeded 25 percent of the teacher group reporting.

Table 15 contains a comparison of skills rated "Excellent" and "Poor" in numbers and percentages of all participating teachers and teachers with Head Start teaching experience.
### Table 15

**Comparison of Skills of Former Head Start Pupils Rated "Excellent" or "Poor" by the Total Teacher Population of the Study and by Teachers with Head Start Teaching Experience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Excellent Rating</th>
<th>Poor Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Teachers</td>
<td>H. S. Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Expression</td>
<td>28 (26.7%)</td>
<td>9 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work in a group</td>
<td>27 (25.8%)</td>
<td>8 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10 (31.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muscular coordination</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7 (29.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work independently</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual discrimination</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditory discrimination</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to complete assignments</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several comparisons may be made from the data in Table 15. While the total teacher population ranked former Head Start pupils "Excellent" in two skills—self expression and ability to work in a group—the teachers with Head Start teaching experience rated former Head Start pupils "Excellent" in
9 out of 10 skills. On three items—readiness for first grade work, ability to work independently, and listening—former Head Start pupils were rated "Excellent" by 25 percent or more of the teachers with Head Start teaching experience. On the same items former Head Start pupils were rated "Poor" by more than 25 percent of the total teacher population of the study. Former Head Start teachers did not rate the pupils "Poor" in significant numbers in any skill.

Because less than 25 percent of the total teacher group and the teachers with Head Start teaching experience rated former Head Start pupils "Poor" in all attitudes and habits listed, Table 16 lists the "Excellent" ratings only given by the total teacher population and by the teachers with Head Start teaching experience. Only a small percentage of teachers involved in the study rated the children "Poor" on these items.
TABLE 16
COMPARISONS OF ATTITUDES AND HABITS FOR FORMER HEAD START PUPILS RATED "EXCELLENT" BY THE TOTAL TEACHER POPULATION OF THE STUDY AND BY TEACHERS WITH HEAD START TEACHING EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude or Habit</th>
<th>Excellent Rating</th>
<th>H.S. Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment of books</td>
<td>55 (54.4%)</td>
<td>17 (70.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to try new experiences</td>
<td>39 (37.8%)</td>
<td>16 (66.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in use of varied classroom materials</td>
<td>39 (37.8%)</td>
<td>11 (58.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment to classroom routine</td>
<td>38 (36.5%)</td>
<td>11 (58.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for school personnel</td>
<td>34 (32.7%)</td>
<td>9 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride in accomplishments of learning</td>
<td>31 (30.1%)</td>
<td>8 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal cleanliness</td>
<td>29 (27.9%)</td>
<td>7 (29.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of personal worth</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7 (29.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It may be noted from the data in Table 16 that former Head Start pupils excelled in attitudes and habits when they were compared with children who did not attend Head Start. In the total pupil population involved in the study, the pupils who had attended Head Start displayed a higher degree of possession of attitudes and habits than skills. While the total teacher
population had rated the former Head Start pupils "Excellent" in two skills, they rated pupils "Excellent" in 7 out of 9 attitudes and habits listed. The teachers with Head Start teaching experience rated former Head Start pupils "Excellent" in 8 out of 9 attitudes and habits. The data in Table 16 may be interpreted as indicating that there was a slight difference only in the way former Head Start pupils were rated by the two teacher groups listed. Both the total teacher population and the Head Start teacher group indicated in this section of the study that, in the formation of two skills and in the formation of many attitudes and habits which are thought necessary for success in school, pupils who have attended Head Start have a decided advantage.

Readiness Test Results

In the total pupil population of the study there are 3,050 first grade pupils of which 1,371 attended Head Start and 1,679 did not attend Head Start. Of the 3,050 pupils, 595 pupils either did not take the standardized readiness test or the test results were not available for these children, since scores for 595 pupils were not recorded by the teachers in the questionnaire.

Table 17 shows the scores from the Metropolitan Readiness Test for the pupil population of the study, divided into "Former Head Start Pupils" and "Other First Graders," indicating numbers of children receiving each score and the percentages of their group. This test was administered in September, 1967, to all Primary I pupils in the Chicago public schools as part of the regular testing program.
Table 17

Metropolitan Readiness Test Scores of Former Head Start Pupils and Other First Graders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Former Head Start Pupils</th>
<th>Other First Graders</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number of group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Superior</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B High Normal</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Average</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Low Normal</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>1084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Low</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1337</td>
<td>2455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It may be noted from the data in Table 17 that more former Head Start pupils received Average scores than the pupils without Head Start experience. There was a smaller percentage of former Head Start pupils receiving the low score, "E" (16.4%) than children without Head Start experience (26.1%).

Differences Between Former Head Start Pupils and Other First Graders

The purpose of the free response item at the conclusion of the follow-up section of the study is to allow for further evaluation of pupils and to provide for comments of teachers which were not included in any of the
categories in the checklist of skills, attitudes, and habits of former Head Start pupils. The following question is asked:

Have you noted any marked differences between children in your first grade class who have attended Head Start in the Chicago public schools and those who have not?

Responses of teachers are categorized into social, emotional, academic, and other differences. Each response given by the teachers for each of these categories is given in Appendix C.

In order to check the consistency of the teachers' evaluations of former Head Start pupils, their responses in this section of the study were checked against the same teachers' ratings of pupils on the checklist of skills, attitudes, and habits in a previous section of the study. The rating given most frequently by each teacher—"Excellent," "Average," or "Poor"—was used as a check against the positive, neutral, or negative responses to indicate the degree to which differences were observed in the open response item.

Table 18 contains the inconsistent responses of teachers from ratings and from the open response item on social differences.
### Table 18

**Inconsistencies in Teacher Responses Reporting Differences Between Former Head Start Pupils and Other First Graders on Checklist Ratings and Open Response Social Differences Item**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Checklist Rating</th>
<th>Definite Difference (++)</th>
<th>Some Difference (+)</th>
<th>No Difference (0)</th>
<th>Some Difference (-)</th>
<th>Definite Difference (--)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 25 inconsistent responses is found between the majority of a teacher's checklist ratings of "Excellent," "Average," or "Poor," indicated after each teacher's response to the social differences item in Appendix C, and the same teacher's reply to the open response item on social differences. Most of the inconsistencies may be noted between teachers' checklist ratings of "Average" for skills, attitudes, and habits, and their subsequent replies indicating positive social differences in favor of the former Head Start groups who are now attending first grade.

As indicated in Table 18, of the 19 teachers who checked a majority of "Average" ratings in the checklist and later gave a response other than "no difference" on the free response item, the inconsistencies fell into the following categories: 9 teachers indicated definitely positive social differences (++), 6 teachers indicated some positive social differences (+),
1 teacher indicated some negative difference (−), and 3 teachers indicated definite negative differences (−−) in comparing former Head Start children with those who had not attended Head Start. These teachers tended to give comments indicating a more positive opinion with respect to Head Start training than they had indicated in giving "Average" ratings in the checklist.

The three remaining parts of the open response question on differences—emotional, academic, and other—were not checked for consistency with the checklist because it is noted that most teachers who indicated positive or negative opinions for social differences tended to have similar opinions on the remaining sections of the evaluation.

Social Differences

The responses of teachers indicating the degree to which they observed differences between former Head Start pupils and other first graders who did not attend Head Start are given in Appendix C. Each response was rated on a five-point continuum, from a definitely positive difference to a definitely negative difference: definite difference (++) , some difference (+), no difference (−), some difference (−), and definite difference (−−). The responses are categorized according to sections of the city and according to teachers with and without Head Start teaching experience in each section of the city. A summary of ratings given by all teachers who completed this section of the study is given in Table 19.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Response</th>
<th>Item I a</th>
<th>Social Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Def. Diff. (++)</td>
<td>Some Diff. (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>37</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As indicated in Table 19, there is a positive opinion on the part of first grade teachers with respect to social differences of former Head Start pupils. Of the 94 teachers who completed the free response item on social differences, 26 teachers (27.6\%) indicated that there is a definite positive difference in favor of former Head Start children and 22 teachers (23.4\%) indicated that there is some positive difference. Thirty-seven teachers (39.4\%) indicated that they noted no difference socially between children who have and who have not attended Head Start. Only 3 teachers indicated some negative difference (3.2\%) and 6 teachers indicated definite negative difference (6.4\%).

Among 21 teachers with Head Start teaching experience, 13 teachers indicated a positive opinion in favor of the Head Start groups, 5 teachers indicated no difference between former Head Start pupils and other first graders, and 3 teachers with Head Start teaching experience reported negative social differences which may be associated with children who had Head Start experience.

The totals in the table show that 48 teachers, or 51 percent of all teachers completing this section of the study found social differences in their first grade classes in favor of children who had Head Start training. Thirty-seven teachers (39.4\%) found no difference in social skills or attitudes, and 9 teachers (9.6\%) found negative differences.

Over half of the teachers found that former Head Start children in their Primary I classes were able to adjust to classroom routine better, were able to share materials, take turns, get along with peers better, were more verbal in class discussions, and were more willing to participate in many group activities.
Emotional Differences

Answers to the free response item on emotional differences also show a positive opinion on the part of teachers involved in the study in favor of first-grade pupils who had attended Head Start. All responses to this item are given in Appendix C. A summary indicating the continuum of positive to negative opinions is given in Table 20.

Of the 93 teachers who completed this item, 13 teachers (14%) reported a definite positive difference, 41 teachers (45.2%) found no difference, 6 teachers (6.4%) found some negative difference.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Response</th>
<th>Item I b</th>
<th>Emotional Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Def. Diff. (++)</td>
<td>Some Diff. (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Section Head Start</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Section non-H.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Section Head Start</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Section non-H.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Section Head Start</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Section non-H.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(14.0%) (29.0%) (45.2%) (6.4%) (6.4%)
It may be interpreted from Table 20 that 40 teachers, or 43 percent, indicated a positive opinion on emotional differences favoring former Head Start groups, but not as favorable as the positive opinion reported in social differences. Forty-one teachers (45.2%) indicated no differences, and 12 teachers (12.8%) found negative differences.

Among teachers with Head Start teaching experience, 4 teachers found a definite positive difference, 8 teachers found some positive difference, 7 teachers found no difference, and 2 teachers found a definite negative difference.

The largest percentage of teachers (45.2%) saw no emotional differences between pupils who attended Head Start and those who did not, indicating a slightly less positive difference found for all pupils in the study.

Among the 43 percent of the total teacher population who noted positive differences emotionally in favor of the former Head Start pupils, the teachers commented that they seem happier in the school situation, are more stable emotionally, have less fear of failure, have a higher tolerance for unexpected or unpleasant circumstances, and are more ready to solve new problems.

**Academic Differences**

Eighty teachers completed the third part of the free response item on differences noted between former Head Start first grade children and other first graders who did not attend Head Start: academic differences.

Teacher responses on observed academic differences between former Head Start and non Head Start pupils are given in Appendix C. A summary rating the responses is given in Table 21.
## TABLE 21

AN ANALYSIS OF ACADEMIC DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FORMER HEAD START PUPILS AND OTHER FIRST GRADERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Response</th>
<th>Item I C</th>
<th>Academic Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Def. Diff. (+)</td>
<td>Some Diff. (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Section</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Start</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Section</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Start</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Section</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non H.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Totals        | 10   | 26       | 33       | 5        | 6        |                           |
|              | (12.5%) | (32.5%) | (41.2%) | (6.2%)  | (7.5%)  |                           |
Ten of the teachers (12.5%) gave responses which are considered as indicating a definite positive difference in favor of former Head Start pupils. Twenty-six teachers (32.5%) indicated some positive difference, 33 teachers (41.2%) found no difference, 5 teachers (6.2%) found some negative difference, and 6 teachers (7.5%) found a negative difference academically.

Ten of the 11 negative opinions came from teachers in west section schools. One teacher in the south section gave the other negative opinion.

Five teachers with Head Start teaching experience indicated that there was a definite positive difference. Six teachers indicated some positive difference, 7 teachers with Head Start experience found no difference, and 2 former Head Start teachers found a definite negative difference.

Notable among positive differences which favored former Head Start children are comments from teachers that the former Head Start children in Primary I classes are able to follow directions, have more readiness skills, learn to read faster, are more interested in learning, and have more confidence in their ability to learn.

**Other Differences**

Twenty-two teachers made additional comments listed under "other" differences. Three teachers with Head Start teaching experience and 6 teachers without Head Start teaching experience found no other differences between children in their Primary I divisions who had and who had not attended Head Start.

Responses classified as indicating a positive opinion were given by 12 teachers indicating that former Head Start children: adjust to formal education better, seem more curious, display better discipline in the classroom.
are good leaders, have better coordination, have an appreciation of and interest in music, games, and art activities, are more highly motivated, and are neater in personal appearance.

Head Start Program Evaluation

The second major section of this study is concerned with an evaluation of the Head Start Child Development Program of the Chicago Board of Education. Two questions comprise the evaluation section. One question concerns the compensation that Project Head Start has provided for the culturally deprived child. The second question is concerned with ascertaining whether any improvements are needed in the program.

Question 1.—Do you think that Project Head Start provides compensation for the culturally deprived child before he enters the elementary school?

A total of 89 teachers out of 106 responded to this question. While many teachers indicated that the program provides compensation by stating "Yes," many other teachers made additional comments. These comments are listed in Appendix D.

The comments and responses from each teacher are given the following valuation: Yes—provides much compensation (++) , Provides some compensation (+), and No, does not provide compensation (-). A summary of the responses is given in Table 22.
TABLE 22
AN EVALUATION OF THE HEAD START CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM IN PROVIDING COMPENSATION FOR THE CULTURALLY DEPRIVED PRESCHOOL CHILD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Yes Provides much compensation (++)</th>
<th>Provides some compensation (+)</th>
<th>No Does not provide compensation (-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Section H.S.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Section Non H.S.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Section H.S.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Section Non H.S.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Section H.S.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Section Non H.S.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(62.9%) (27.0%) (10.1%)

Fifty-six teachers (62.9%) indicated that the Head Start Child Development Program provided much compensation to the culturally deprived child. The most frequent comments indicate that Head Start provides compensation by providing a variety of experiences and learning that contribute toward readiness, by providing children with general knowledge about their surroundings.
and the communities in which they live, by providing planned activities and listening experiences, by helping children adjust to routine more quickly, and by developing verbal capacity.

Twenty-four teachers, or 27 percent of the teachers answering the question, gave opinions which indicated that, while Head Start provides some compensation to the culturally deprived child, these teachers were not entirely certain that Project Head Start is helping to overcome the effects of cultural deprivation before the child enters the elementary school. Three teachers gave comments similar to one given by a teacher with Head Start teaching experience who stated: "We do not ask the Head Start children to do as much as they are capable of doing." Three teachers felt that the program is too short. Two teachers saw the greatest outcome of the program that parents of former Head Start children participate more actively in school activities. Two teachers stated that they felt that not every child is equally benefited.

Nine teachers (10.1%) stated that the Head Start program does not provide the compensation that the culturally deprived child needs. Three of these teachers indicated that differences lie mainly in the home. One teacher stated that she felt that the majority culture will never become part of the lives of these children.

Among the teachers with Head Start teaching experience, 13 stated that the Head Start program provided much compensation, 7 teachers stated that the program provided some compensation, and 1 teacher indicated that the program does not provide compensation.

Thus the data presented in Table 22 may be interpreted as a very positive consensus that the Head Start Child Development Program of the Chicago Board of
Education is providing compensation for the culturally deprived child before he enters the elementary school. While the responses of 56 teachers out of the 89 teachers completing the item were interpreted to indicate a very positive opinion, an additional 27 percent of the teachers thought that the Head Start program provides some compensation. The 2 categories of positive answers total 80 teachers (89.9%) out of the 89 teachers who answered the question, indicating that first grade teachers believe that the Head Start program in the Chicago public schools is apparently meeting its goals.

The second question on the Head Start program evaluation section of the study sought to elicit suggestions for strengthening the Head Start Child Development Program. The question is stated as follows:

**Question 2.** What suggestions would you offer to strengthen Project Head Start?

Sixty-six teachers gave suggestions in response to this question which they indicate would strengthen Project Head Start. Each suggestion for improvement is listed in Appendix D, and is categorized in Table 23.
## TABLE 23

AN ANALYSIS OF SUGGESTIONS FOR STRENGTHENING
THE HEAD START PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>West H.S.</th>
<th>West Non H.S.</th>
<th>Teachers North H.S.</th>
<th>North Non H.S.</th>
<th>South H.S.</th>
<th>South Non H.S.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Emphasis on communication skills</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. More structured program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Readiness skills</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Emphasis on academic skills--less play activity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Emphasis on development of independence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. More field trips</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Emphasis on development of motor coordination</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Emphasis on self control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. More use of books</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas</td>
<td>West H.S.</td>
<td>West Non H.S.</td>
<td>North H.S.</td>
<td>North Non H.S.</td>
<td>South H.S.</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Intensified program in listening skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Raise income level allowed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lower entrance age of children</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Expand program on a city-wide ten-month basis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Areas of Head Start Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. A strong parent involvement and parent education program</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A more expanded communications program to recruit pupils</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A communications program between Head Start and Primary Teachers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. An expanded record keeping system from Head Start Program to school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 23--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Problems of Head Start Teachers</th>
<th>West H.S. Non H.S.</th>
<th>West North H.S. Non H.S.</th>
<th>North South H.S. Non H.S.</th>
<th>South H.S. Non H.S.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Less clerical work</td>
<td>1 0 3 0 1 0 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. More supplies for every classroom</td>
<td>0 0 3 0 0 0 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data presented in Table 23 shows the following categories: curriculum of the Head Start program, organization, improvements in other areas of the Head Start program.

Of the 66 teachers who responded to Question 2, on program evaluation, 3 teachers; 2 former Head Start teachers and 1 teacher without Head Start teaching experience, indicated that they had no suggestions to offer in order to strengthen the program.

The most frequently stated suggestions for improvement of the curriculum of Head Start are given as follows:

1. More emphasis on communication skills, language development and structure, and the ability to express oneself in sentences.

2. A more structured program, lessening the permissiveness of the Head Start program.

3. More reading and mathematics readiness work.

Most of the suggestions for modification of the Head Start curriculum came from west section schools, the area which contained the largest number of teacher participants. Of the 5 suggestions most frequently given in the area of curriculum, most were given by teachers without Head Start teaching experience. Three teachers with Head Start experience suggested more emphasis on communication skills and more emphasis on the development of independence.

Suggestions for revising requirements for Head Start participation are listed in Table 23 under Organization. The most frequently mentioned suggestion is to raise the level of income a family may have to be included in the program. This expansion of the program would require a revision of Federal guidelines.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This follow-up and evaluation study of the Head Start Child Development Program of the Chicago Board of Education was undertaken in the light that there is a need to determine whether there are cumulative effects of Head Start noticeable at the first grade level.

The Head Start program began in March, 1965. It is now the largest Head Start program operated by a single agency in the nation. After three years of operation, there was a need to evaluate the effectiveness of the program in meeting the needs of the culturally deprived preschool child.

A questionnaire was designed by the writer to assess cumulative gains made by former Head Start pupils now in first grade, to determine the status of the program, and to determine any area of the Head Start program which may need to be strengthened. The questionnaire utilized standardized test results and elicited teacher opinion through a multiple-answer checklist and free response items.

One hundred six first grade, or Primary I, teachers in 45 Chicago public schools, located in north, south, and west sections of the city, participated in the study. The schools selected for this study are those in which the year-round Head Start program is being conducted during the 1967-68 school year.

The study involved 70 teachers from west section (Area B) schools, 19
teachers from north schools (Area C), and 17 teachers from south schools (Area A). Twenty-four teachers, or 23 percent of the total teacher population, had been Head Start teachers in the Head Start program operated by the Chicago Board of Education during the summers of 1965, 1966, or 1967. Eighty-two, or 77 percent of the teachers hold regular teaching certificates in the Chicago public schools. All except one teacher hold Bachelor's degrees, while 19 teachers have Master's degrees, and two teachers have completed 36 hours of graduate credit beyond the Master's degree. The average number of years of teaching is 11 years.

The pupils enrolled in the first grade classes of the 106 teachers who completed the questionnaires comprise the pupil population of the study. Of the total pupil population of 3,050 first graders, 1,371 pupils, or 45 percent, had attended the Head Start Child Development Program of the Chicago Board of Education. Average class size of these Primary I divisions was 29.2, with the average number of former Head Start pupils in these classes being 12.9.

The follow-up section of the study contained a checklist of skills, attitudes, and habits which are considered important in the primary levels of the elementary school. Teachers were asked to rate former Head Start pupils in their classes Excellent, Average, or Poor, in comparison to other members of their Primary I divisions who did not attend Head Start. Differences in ability between former Head Start pupils and others who did not attend Head Start were narrowed in each class by the Continuous Development Program of organization in operation in the primary grades of the Chicago public schools which provides for homogeneous grouping.

A criterion was determined at the beginning of the gathering of data that
a deviation in percentage of teachers reporting 25 percent or more Excellent or Poor ratings would be noted. Over one-half of the teachers in each teacher group--total teacher population, west area teachers, north area teachers, south area teachers, and teachers with Head Start teaching experience--tended to rate pupils Average in all skills, attitudes, and habits.

The total teacher population ranked former Head Start pupils Average in all skills except readiness for first grade work, by over 50 percent of the teachers responding. The pupils were ranked Excellent in self expression and ability to work in a group by over 25 percent of the teachers. They were rated Poor in reasoning, readiness for first grade work, listening, and the ability to work independently.

In attitudes and habits, the former Head Start pupils excelled when compared with other first graders, for more than one-fourth of the teachers rated pupils Excellent in 7 out of the 9 attitudes and habits listed. These teachers did not rate the pupils Poor on any attitude or habit in a significant percentage.

When compared with ratings given pupils by the total teacher population of the study, teachers with Head Start teaching experience rated pupils higher in skills. While 25 percent or more of the total number of teachers involved rated pupils Excellent in 2 skills, similar percentages of the Head Start teacher group rated pupils Excellent in 8 skills. Teachers with Head Start experience did not rate pupils Poor in any skill in significant numbers.

In the total pupil population involved in the study the pupils who had attended Head Start reportedly displayed a higher degree of possession of positive attitudes and habits than skills when compared to non-Head Start
groups of first graders.

Data from the Metropolitan Readiness Test, a standardized readiness test, was used as a further means of determining differences between former Head Start pupils and other first graders without Head Start experience. A total of 1,116 former Head Start pupils and 1,337 without Head Start experience were listed as having taken this test given as part of the regular testing program in the Chicago public schools in September, 1967. While the absence of prior test data for the former Head Start pupils precludes generalizations which may be attributable to the presence or absence of Head Start training, it may be noted that a higher percentage of former Head Start pupils (32.6%) received average scores compared with other first graders (20.2%). There was a smaller percentage of former Head Start pupils receiving the lowest score, Low (16.1%), than other first graders (26.4%).

An open response item in the follow-up section of the study sought to elicit the opinions of first grade teachers to determine whether there were differences--social, emotional, academic, other--between the children in their classes who had attended Head Start in the Chicago public schools and those who had not. Forty-eight teachers, or 51 percent of all teachers completing this section of the study, found positive social differences in favor of children who had head Start experience. On emotional differences, teachers reported less positive difference (43%) than on social differences. A majority of teachers (45.2%) found no difference emotionally between the two groups. Academic differences showed a greater positive difference with 45 percent of the teachers reporting differences in favor of Head Start groups. Very few items were listed under other differences.
Head Start Program Evaluation

Two open response items sought to determine the status of and any improvements needed in the Head Start program. A total of 89 teachers out of 106 responded to the first question:

Do you think Project Head Start provides compensation for the culturally deprived child before he enters the elementary school?

Fifty-six teachers (62.9%) indicated that the Head Start Child Development Program provided much compensation to the culturally deprived child. Twenty-four teachers (27%) gave opinions which indicated that Project Head Start provides some compensation. Nine teachers (10.1%) stated that the Head Start program does not provide the compensation that the culturally deprived child needs.

The second question on program evaluation was stated:

What suggestions would you offer to strengthen Project Head Start?

Areas of needed improvement suggested by the Primary I teachers may be categorized as follows: curriculum, organization, other areas of the Head Start program, and professional problems of Head Start teachers. Only those teachers with Head Start teaching experience gave suggestions in the last category, professional problems.

Conclusions

In the follow-up section of the study effects of the Head Start Child Development Program were noted in homogeneous groups of pupils several years after completion of the program.

While the cause of the positive results favoring pupils with Head Start experience cannot be determined from this study, the teacher survey indicates
that former Head Start pupils in first grade excel in the skills of self expression and ability to work in a group. They also excel in the attitudes and habits of enjoyment of books, willingness to try new experiences, interest in use of varied classroom materials, adjustment to classroom routine, respect for school personnel, and pride in the accomplishments of learning. In these skills, attitudes, and habits, it may be concluded that former Head Start pupils have a decided advantage.

On readiness tests, more former Head Start pupils received average scores and a smaller percentage received the lowest score when compared with pupils who had not attended Head Start. Owing to the absence of previous test results, it cannot be concluded that Head Start children's higher scores were a result of Head Start experience.

The opinions of teachers on social, emotional, and academic differences between former Head Start and non-Head Start first graders supports the conclusion that Head Start experience has had a positive cumulative effect. A majority of teachers reporting indicated that they observed positive social and academic differences in favor of former Head Start children. Teachers also tended to state a more positive degree of difference favoring Head Start pupils than they had indicated in the checklist of skills, attitudes, and habits.

In the section of the study focusing on evaluation of the Head Start program, a significant percentage of teachers involved gave very positive opinions indicating that:

The Head Start Program of the Chicago Board of Education provides much compensation to the culturally deprived child before he enters the elementary school.

That this compensation has focused on social learnings is evidenced by the
high ratings given former Head Start pupils in social attitudes and habits in contrast to lower ratings given to academic skills in the follow-up section of the study. It is further evidenced by the fact that the highest percentage of positive difference, 51 percent, had been given by the teachers to former Head Start pupils on social differences in the free response item in the follow-up section of the study.

Suggestions for strengthening the program bear out the fact that, while social learnings are important in overcoming the effects of a deprived environment, there is a need for expanding the curriculum to include other skills.

It may be concluded that the majority of teachers involved in the Head Start program evaluation proposed an expansion of the program to include a stronger parent involvement and a parent education program, and a more structured curriculum emphasizing communication skills and readiness skills. Some teachers were not aware of the goals of the program.

**Recommendations**

The following recommendations are made as a result of this follow-up and evaluation study of the Head Start Child Development Program of the Chicago Board of Education:

1. The addition of activities to the curriculum of the program which will further contribute to the development of readiness skills.

2. An expansion of the communications program of the Head Start Child Development Program to inform the community and the staff of the Chicago Public Schools of the goals and accomplishments of the Head Start program.

3. An expanded parent involvement program at Head Start centers which would foster interest that would carry over to the elementary school.
4. A broadened program of language development in the Head Start program, emphasizing oral communication skills.

5. An expansion, on a permanent basis, of the Head Start Child Development Program to assure greater numbers of children an opportunity to acquire the skills, attitudes, and habits, observed at the Primary I level of the elementary school, which have accrued to the population sample of former Head Start pupils involved in this study.
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TEACHER DATA

Experience:

How many years have you been teaching? _____

Do you hold a regular teaching certificate in the Chicago Public Schools?

____ Yes ______ No

What grades have you taught previously?

____ Kindergarten
____ First ______ Second ______ Third ______ Other

Have you ever been a Head Start Teacher in the Chicago Public Schools?

____ Yes ______ No

If so, When?

Education:

What college degrees do you hold?

____ None ______ Bachelor's ______ Master's ______ Other

PUPIL DATA

Grade you are presently teaching __________

Total membership in your class __________

How many members of your class were at one time enrolled in Head Start classes conducted by the Chicago Public Schools? __________

When did these children attend Head Start?

____ 1965 ______ 1966 ______ 1967

Which term did they attend?

____ Summer ______ During regular school year
In responding to the remainder of this survey which seeks to ascertain the effects of Head Start on first grade children, you are asked to think as a first grade teacher about the attitudes and skills needed for success in the primary grades. Compare, insofar as it is possible, the differences in attitudes and skills you have noticed between Head Start graduates, as a group, and the rest of the members of your class who did not attend Head Start.

**EVALUATION OF FORMER HEAD START PUPILS**

Please place a check (V) in the appropriate column to indicate the degree to which former Head Start pupils in your class display these skills, attitudes, and habits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills of Former Head Start Pupils</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muscular coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work independently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work in a group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-expression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditory discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to complete assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for first grade work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes and Habits of Former Head Start Pupils</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect for school personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment to classroom routine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in use of varied classroom materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal cleanliness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orderliness in taking care of materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to determine whether there are differences in scores on the Metropolitan Readiness Test between those first graders who attended Head Start and those who did not, please list the number of former Head Start pupils in the first column and other class members in the second column who received the scores given below for "Total Readiness" on the Metropolitan Readiness Test given in September, 1967.

**Former Head Start Pupils**

- A -- Superior
- B -- High Normal
- C -- Average
- D -- Low Normal
- E -- Low

**Other First Graders**

- A -- Superior
- B -- High Normal
- C -- Average
- D -- Low Normal
- E -- Low

Have you noted any marked differences between children in your first grade class who have attended Head Start in the Chicago Public Schools and those who have not?

**Social:**

**Emotional:**
Do you think that Project Head Start provides compensation for the culturally deprived child before he enters the elementary school?

What suggestions would you offer to strengthen Project Head Start?

(1) 

(2) 

(3) 

(4)
TEACHER DATA

Experience:

How many years have you been teaching?

Do you hold a regular teaching certificate in the Chicago Public Schools?

Yes  No

What grades have you taught previously?

Kindergarten  First  Second  Third  Other

Have you ever been a Head Start Teacher in the Chicago Public Schools?

Yes  No

If so, When?

Education:

What college degrees do you hold?

None  Bachelor's  Master's  Other

PUPIL DATA

Grade you are presently teaching

Total membership in your class

How many members of your class were at one time enrolled in Head Start classes conducted by the Chicago Public Schools?

When did these children attend Head Start?

1965  1966  1967

Which term did they attend?

Summer  During regular school year
HEAD START PROGRAM -- EVALUATION

Do you think that Project Head Start provides compensation for the culturally deprived child before he enters the elementary school?

What suggestions would you offer to strengthen Project Head Start?

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)
In responding to the remainder of this survey which seeks to ascertain the effects of Head Start on first grade children, you are asked to think as a first grade teacher about the attitudes and skills needed for success in the primary grades. Compare, insofar as it is possible, the differences in attitudes and skills you have noticed between Head Start graduates, as a group, and the rest of the members of your class who did not attend Head Start.

EVALUATION OF FORMER HEAD START PUPILS

Please place a check (✓) in the appropriate column to indicate the degree to which former Head Start pupils in your class display these skills, attitudes, and habits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills of Former Head Start Pupils</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muscular coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work independently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work in a group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-expression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditory discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to complete assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for first grade work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes and Habits of Former Head Start Pupils</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect for school personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment to classroom routine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in use of varied classroom materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal cleanliness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orderliness in taking care of materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of personal worth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride in accomplishments of learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment of books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to try new experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to determine whether there are differences in scores on the Metropolitan Readiness Test between those first graders who attended Head Start and those who did not, please list the number of former Head Start pupils in the first column and other class members in the second column who received the scores given below for "Total Readiness" on the Metropolitan Readiness Test given in September, 1967.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Former Head Start Pupils</th>
<th>Other First Graders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>___ A -- Superior</td>
<td>___ A -- Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ B -- High Normal</td>
<td>___ B -- High Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ C -- Average</td>
<td>___ C -- Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ D -- Low Normal</td>
<td>___ D -- Low Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ E -- Low</td>
<td>___ E -- Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have you noted any marked differences between children in your first grade class who have attended Head Start in the Chicago Public Schools and those who have not?

Social:

Emotional:
Do you think that Project Head Start provides compensation for the culturally deprived child before he enters the elementary school?

What suggestions would you offer to strengthen Project Head Start?

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)
TEACHER DATA

Experience:

How many years have you been teaching? _____

Do you hold a regular teaching certificate in the Chicago Public Schools? 
____ Yes _____ No

What grades have you taught previously? _____ Kindergarten

_____ First _____ Second _____ Third _____ Other

Have you ever been a Head Start Teacher in the Chicago Public Schools? 
____ Yes _____ No

If so, When? 

Education:

What college degrees do you hold? 

_____ None _____ Bachelor's _____ Master's _____ Other

PUPIL DATA

Grade you are presently teaching ________

Total membership in your class ________

How many members of your class were at one time enrolled in Head Start 
classes conducted by the Chicago Public Schools? ________

When did these children attend Head Start? 

____ 1965 _____ 1966 _____ 1967

Which term did they attend? 

_____ Summer _____ During regular school year
In responding to the remainder of this survey which seeks to ascertain the effects of Head Start on first grade children, you are asked to think as a first grade teacher about the attitudes and skills needed for success in the primary grades. Compare, insofar as it is possible, the differences in attitudes and skills you have noticed between Head Start graduates, as a group, and the rest of the members of your class who did not attend Head Start.

**EVALUATION OF FORMER HEAD START PUPILS**

Please place a check (✓) in the appropriate column to indicate the degree to which former Head Start pupils in your class display these skills, attitudes, and habits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills of Former Head Start Pupils</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muscular coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work independently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work in a group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-expression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditory discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to complete assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for first grade work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes and Habits of Former Head Start Pupils</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect for school personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment to classroom routine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in use of varied classroom materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal cleanliness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orderliness in taking care of materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of personal worth</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pride in accomplishments of learning</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enjoyment of books</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Willingness to try new experiences</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**In order to determine whether there are differences in scores on the Metropolitan Readiness Test between those first graders who attended Head Start and those who did not, please list the number of former Head Start pupils in the first column and other class members in the second column who received the scores given below for "Total Readiness" on the Metropolitan Readiness Test given in September, 1967.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Former Head Start Pupils</th>
<th>Other First Graders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>______ A -- Superior</td>
<td>______ A -- Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______ B -- High Normal</td>
<td>______ B -- High Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______ C -- Average</td>
<td>______ C -- Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______ D -- Low Normal</td>
<td>______ D -- Low Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______ E -- Low</td>
<td>______ E -- Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have you noted any marked differences between children in your first grade class who have attended Head Start in the Chicago Public Schools and those who have not?

**Social:**

**Emotional:**
HEAD START PROGRAM -- EVALUATION

Do you think that Project Head Start provides compensation for the culturally deprived child before he enters the elementary school?

What suggestions would you offer to strengthen Project Head Start?

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)
APPENDIX B

ADMINISTRATIVE AREAS A, B, AND C

CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS
APPENDIX C

FOLLOW-UP STUDY DATA
Item I-a-- Social Differences

West Schools
Area B

Have you noted any marked differences between children in your class who have attended Head Start in the Chicago Public Schools and those who have not?

Teacher:

0 1. No, not a marked difference. (Average)

- 2. Head Start children are less inclined to work or play independently of each other. They tend to look for a leader and then mimic the latter in deed and action. They would rather play than work. (Poor)

+ 3. More outgoing. (Average)

0 4. No. (Average)

5. ----

-- 6. These children are immature and still need more experiences. (Average)

+ 7. Children get along with peers better. (Excellent)

+ 8. They get along well together. (Excellent)

++ 9. Head Start pupils seem to enjoy being sociable in all activities more so than other first graders. (Excellent)

--- 10. There are only two children--one is withdrawn and the other is very immature. (Average-Poor)

0 11. Children need normal or average intelligence to profit from the opportunities of Head Start. The extremely slow and the immature child might be adversely affected by experiences for which he is not ready. (Average)

++ 12. Pupils seem to adjust to new and varying situations more easily. They show greater excitement in belonging and being accepted by the group members. (Average-Excellent)

-- 13. These Head Start children are not ready for a typical Chicago public school classroom situation. The class loads are large and these children have been accustomed to a small class with three or more teachers. The average class of first grade has one teacher and many children. Head Start has created an artificial situation. (Poor)
11. Generally speaking, Head Start children adjust to first grade routine quicker and better than those who have not attended. Head Starters get along better in a group. (Av.-Ex.)

15. No (Average)

16. Seem to function well with each other. (Av.-Excellent)

17. They are more talkative than the rest of the children. (Av.)

18. --- (Average)


20. No comparison in present class, but with previous children I noted better adjustment socially to school, friends, and routine. (Average)

21. No, I have not noticed any significant difference. (Average)

22. No. (Average)

23. They tend to get along with each other better and share with each other. (Excellent)

24. --- (Average)

25. These Head Start children are very verbal. They are very friendly with other children and adults. (Average-Poor)

26. --- (Average)

27. --- (Average)

28. --- (Average)

29. No. (Poor)

30. No marked difference. (Poor)

31. --- (Average-Excellent)

32. They are more cooperative. They have learned to share and take turns. Are better adjusted socially. (Average)

33. They are very good listeners and they get along well with their peers. (Average)
They get along well with other children. They share more and work together better. (Average)

Pupils who attended Head Start tend to be aggressive in their behavior and they are very difficult to discipline. (Average)

No. (Poor)

No. (Excellent)

Some of the children who were in Head Start are outgoing and active youngsters. Whereas, the other children are shy and introverted toward their teacher and classmates. (Average)

Yes, the Head Start children are more sociable and responsive in group activities. (Average)

Those who attended Head Start make friends more readily. (Excellent)

Those who attended Head Start seem more aware of their surroundings and are able to adjust to social situations more easily. (Average)

--- (Poor)

No marked differences. (Average)

I think that Head Start is a great help to the child's social aspect of learning. (Average)

Out of study.---

Out of study.---

The children who have attended Head Start are more verbal but not necessarily in a constructive way. (Average)

Out of study.---

They seem to be more adjusted. (Average)

No. (Average)

Seems to be no difference. All my P-1's are immature. It may be those without Head Start would be many years behind. Perhaps they are now only 1 year. (Average-Poor)
--- 53. Since I have been asked to compare the two groups as groups I would far rather have the group who had not attended Head Start. With 2 exceptions they are quieter, kinder to their associates and have far better work habits. They are more mature and have shown the greatest amount of improvement since September. (Average)

0 51. No. (Average)

0 55. None (marked). Almost all children in our school have had 1 year of kindergarten. (Poor)

+ 56. Two of the three pupils are well adjusted and function very well in all phases of first grade work. (Average-Excellent)

0 57. Not too noticeable. (Average)

55. 58. --- (Average)

0 59. A difference exists especially if the family has a higher cultural level. I have two, the worst in the room as far as conduct is concerned, but after making inquiries, and talking to the parents, I find the children simply reflect the philosophy of their homes. After working in Head Start, and with children from Head Start, I find too often that no matter what one tries, if the philosophy of the home is negative the child too often falls into the same pattern. (Average)

0 60. I cannot say that I notice any differences. However, how do we know how some children might have been without Head Start? (Average)

0 61. No. (Average)

0 62. None (Average)

0 63. No marked differences.

+ 64. He is easier to understand. He can adjust to the class and he can work well with others. (Average-Excellent)

+ 65. Yes, there is a difference between children who have not. Socially they are shy, and are slow to work in groups. (Excellent)

+ 66. There is some difference in maturity. (Excellent)

+ 67. Yes, some of those who have not attended are less inclined to be sociable with classmates. They are less attentive and do not work independently. (Excellent)
The above scores indicate Other First Graders have succeeded as well as Head Start pupils. However I have had experience with a first grade class in 1966 with Head Start experience that indicates readiness for first grade far above the present group. The teacher was able to enter into first grade experiences without any readiness. They seemingly were socially adjusted to first grade. (Average)

--- (Poor)

The most aggressive children in this room were in Head Start.
(Average)

Yes. Head Start children are not as inhibited as other classmates. Very talkative children. (Average-Excellent)

Most of the Head Start pupils seem to be on the average better adjusted socially. (Average)

Head Starters are more mature. Head Starters don't "sit still" as well. (Excellent)
Teacher

74. None. (Average)

++ 75. They work and play well with other children. (Average-Excellent)
++ 76. Children who attended Head Start get along better with other peers. There is less restlessness among them. They listen better. They respond better verbally. (Excellent)
++ 77. The children who have attended Head Start are more willing to participate in activities. They are able to talk and express themselves better. (Excellent)
++ 78. It seems that the Head Start children are better able to get along with other children and they certainly are more aggressive (sometimes too much so). (Excellent)
+ 79. The former Head Start children do seem more outgoing on the whole. They in general show more of a willingness to try new things. (Excellent)
++ 80. The children who attended Head Start are more organized and experienced than the rest of my low-grouped class. (Average)
0 81. The group of children who attended Head Start are socially equal with the others who did not attend. (Average)

82. ---

++ 83. Some are more mature, able to get along well with others easily, complete work and are more verbal in class discussions. (Average)
0 84. No comment. (Average)
0 85. No. (Average)
++ 86. Children who attended Head Start seem to show more cooperativeness, gentleness, and aggressiveness. (Excellent)
0 87. I have not noticed any difference in the social habits of Head Start children as compared to the social habits of those children who have not attended Head Start. (Excellent)
++ 88. More aggressive, less hesitant about making friends, or adjusting to new situations. (Excellent)
### Teacher Item I-a--Social Differences

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>Aside from personality and maturity factors, the children who attended Head Start exhibit more social stability than those children who did not have Head Start experience. These Head Start children seem to interact very comfortably and freely with adults and children. (Excellent)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.</td>
<td>They are most aggressive (Head Start children), and sometimes have difficulty adjusting to a more structured program. (Poor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td>No noticeable difference. (Excellent)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.</td>
<td>Head Start children function individually rather than in a group and demand much attention. (Average)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher

++ 93. Yes, the children who have had Head Start seem to adapt better to social situations. They are more outgoing and show a willingness toward team work. (Excellent)

++ 94. Yes, as far as social adjustment. They have learned to accept others, to listen, and accept opinions. They usually have a good opinion of themselves. (Excellent)

+ 95. I have not been able to see a definite difference in the social behavior of the Head Start children within my present class. However, there is a difference between the class I had last year. The children were able to adjust more readily to the classroom situation. There is a sharing that I wasn't able to effect among the other first grade children. (Average-Excellent)

0 96. No. (Average)

++ 97. As a group, all the children are outgoing and socially adjusted—but in a few individual cases it is evident that Head Start had a positive effect. (Excellent)

0 98. No. (Average)

0 99. None. (Average)

100. --- (Average)

++ 101. All Head Start children are gregarious. All except one play very well with others. One is excellent leader material.

102. --- (Excellent)

+ 103. I cannot say that I have noticed a great deal of difference but the children who have been in Head Start do little if any fighting with other children. (Average-Excellent)

0 104. No—not in this particular class which is a special grouping of children who were quite slow progressing in kindergarten and were classified as not ready for first grade. (Average)

++ 105. Yes, they seem to appear happier and ready to solve new problems. (Average)

0 106. No. (Average)

0 107. No. (Average)
Item I-a--Social Differences--Continued

Teacher

0 106. No. (Average)

0 109. None. (Average)
Item I-b--Emotional Differences

Teacher

0 1. No.

-- 2. They are constantly seeking more than their share of the teacher's time and help. They demand a lot of attention. They become easily upset when under the slightest pressure.

++ 3. Readily accept school rules.

4. No.

5. ---

-- 6. These children are all emotionally immature.

++ 7. Adjustments made much faster.

8. ---

+ 9. Not much difference emotionally but perhaps, on the whole, it would seem to hold true that the Head Start pupils are ahead.

-- 10. There are only two children--one is withdrawn and the other is very immature.

0 11. The extremely emotionally immature child might be adversely affected by experiences for which he is not ready. This is especially true of the child with deep-seated emotional problems in connection with limited mental ability.

+ 12. Most former Head Starters have adjusted to being away from the home environment whereas a great deal of anxiety and apprehension was noticed in those who had not received this experience.

-- 13. These children are not emotionally ready for a typical Chicago public school classroom situation. They have been accustomed to a small class with three or more teachers.

+ 14. Head Start children are not "loners" as often as are those who have not had as much group experience. I have noticed children that have not gone to Head Start and sometimes kindergarten--are more likely to either withdraw or cry.

0 15. No.

0 16. Not really.
Item I-b--Emotional Differences

Teacher

17. Average, I would say.
18. ---
19. More readily adjusted.
20. No, not with this class, but with previous children, I found fewer emotional problems among the children who had had Head Start classes.
21. No.
22. No.
23. They do not seem to be shy and withdrawn. They seem more curious.
24. ---
25. Head Start children seem very happy in the school situation and are not overly aggressive toward one another.
26. ---
27. ---
28. ---
29. ---
30. No marked differences.
31. ---
32. Former Head Start children are not prone to emotional outbursts.
33. They are more stable emotionally than the other first graders and they tend to be more aggressive.
34. There was no crying from these children. There was no wanting to return home with the parents, or temper tantrums to go home.
35. No.
36. Most of the pupils who have attended Head Start crave lots of attention.
**Item I-b—Emotional Differences**

**West Schools Area B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37. No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 39. A few of the children cry very easily. They are still babies. For example, one day when it was snowing a girl who attended Head Start started crying for her mother. Another boy once cried when he misplaced his paste when we were doing artwork.

- 40. I would say they are emotionally more stable.

- 41. The students who did not attend Head Start are somewhat afraid of new experiences.

- 42. They are emotionally more stable.

- 43. ---

- 44. No marked differences.

- 45. I have noticed nothing unusual.

- 46. Out of study.

- 47. Out of study.

- 48. None.

- 49. Out of study.

- 50. About the same

- 51. No.

- 52. Seems to be no difference. All are easily excited. All have poor work habits. Discipline problem very difficult. Much time is spent with discipline problems which seem to be deeply impressed. Lack any knowledge of teacher presence.

- 53. Children who have not had Head Start are more emotionally mature. I would rather have the group who had not attended Head Start.

- 54. The former Head Start children seem less ready to work.
Item I-b- Emotional Differences

Teacher

0 55. None.

0 56. One of the three former Head Start children is subject to emotional outbursts and has difficulty adjusting to ordered exercises.

0 57. Not too noticeable.

0 58. ---

0 59. A difference exists especially if the family has a higher cultural level. The children simply reflect the philosophy of their homes.

0 60. No noticeable difference. If I had known child as a four-year-old I would be better able to judge.

0 61. No.

0 62. None.

0 63. No marked differences.

+ 64. Former Head Start children are not problem children.

+ 65. ---

+ 66. I think they are more able to cope with situations in school.

+ 67. Three of the children who did not attend Head Start are withdrawn into their little world. They seem to be difficult to reach and just sit looking all day. They never talk or respond when they are asked to answer questions. They don't learn as well as Head Starters.

++ 68. The Head Start children are more ready and more emotionally adjusted to first grade.

0 69. Not a good sampling of children because all were specially selected for the class because of emotional instability and poor school adjustment.

0 70. No marked difference.

71. ---
Teacher:

+ 72. The Head Start children are better adjusted emotionally.

++ 73. Head Starters are more emotionally well balanced than other first graders.
Teacher

74. None.

75. They seem to be more stable than the children who did not attend Head Start.

76. Unless there was a neurological problem found in Head Starters, their emotions are more stable. I find no crying among the first graders as was prevalent before Head Start.

77. The children who did not attend Head Start in my classroom did not wish to participate in activities because of fear of failure. Art activities frightened them because they thought they couldn't "draw" or "make" anything. Those who had been in Head Start will try to participate and have already had these activities.

78. Those attending Head Start seem better able to cope with situations or surprises that may come up.

79. There seems to be less fear of failure in the children who have attended Head Start. They contribute eagerly believing what they think to be of value.

80. ---

81. The emotional stability of former Head Start pupils and regular first graders is comparable.

82. ---

83. Some of the Head Start children cry easily, are temperamental and physically active constantly.

84. No comment.

85. No.

86. Children who attended Head Start have a higher tolerance of disagreeable circumstances. Their behavior is more rational.

87. I find of the six children who attended Head Start, three are emotionally immature. They are upset easily and become frustrated quickly and cry. I have several non-attenders of Head Start of which this is also the case. However, their outbursts are less frequent.
Item I - b

North Schools
Emotional Differences

Teacher

++ 88. None.

++ 89. Those children with Head Start experience, again aside from personality and maturity differences, seem more capable of adjusting to new, varied, and even frustrating classroom situations.

90. ---

91. Those who have had Head Start are very strong willed -- will try to do what they want to do -- when they want to do it.

++ 92. Spontaneous and well adjusted.

South Schools

++ 93. Yes. Head Start children seem to be more well adjusted and ready for school and the many challenges which school brings.

++ 94. Very good emotional adjustment for Head Starters. Some -- a few -- have not learned to accept criticism. If they do not achieve at first a few give up easily (tears etc.)

++ 95. The Head Start children are able to adjust more readily to the classroom situation.

0 96. No.

++ 97. The children who have not had Head Start are a bit less emotionally mature. Here again I have noted that some few children who have had Head Start react quite positively.

0 98. I do not think so.

0 99. None.

100. ---

0 101. No differences except one, who is extremely immature, but this is accounted for by a very bad experience.

102. ---

++ 103. They seem fairly stable emotionally with only one exception.
Teacher

0 104. No -- but unfair to evaluate in this class which is a special grouping of children who were classified as not ready for first grade.

+ 105. Yes, they appear happier, and more ready to solve new problems.

0 106. No.

0 107. No.

0 108. No.

0 109. None.
West Schools

Item I-c ACADEMIC differences

Teacher:

0 1. No.

-- 2. Head Start children are slow learners because they are used to working in groups and have a difficult time learning to work independently of each other.

3. ---

0 4. No.

5. ---

6. ---

+ 7. Children are able to work in groups better. Some concepts need less preparation to teach.

8. ---

++ 9. Head Starters are definitely more academically prepared.

- 10. One is at the lowest level in the class; the other is average.

11. ---

+ 12. Greater academic achievements are noticed in former Head Start pupils.

-- 13. Children from Head Start seem to think school is merely a playground and the one classroom teacher is there for his personal wants, needs, etc.

++ 14. With one exception, all those not attending Head Start are the slowest reading group. Head Starters follow directions better and achieve closer to grade level.

15. ---

+ 16. Head Starters are more interested in communication and are better at it.

+ 17. On the whole the Head Start children are somewhat better than others.
Teacher:

+ 18. Yes, the Head Starters are better academically.

19. ---

20. No.

21. No.

22. ---

23. The children who have attended Head Start in the Chicago Public Schools are better able to adjust to classroom routine.

24. The children who attended Head Start are doing much better than most of those children who did not attend Head Start -- in math, and reading.

25. The few children scoring B and C on the Metropolitan Readiness Test who attended Head Start have good skills. They are very independent and proceed with their tasks. D--scoring children who attended Head Start are very immature and require almost a one-to-one relationship.

26. ---

27. ---

28. ---

29. ---

30. No marked differences.

31. ---

32. Academic abilities seem to be on a level with those who did not attend Head Start.

33. With this particular group, the Head Start children have not been superior academically.
Item I - c ACADEMIC differences

Teacher:

0 34. At first these children were not ready to read but with many kinds of readiness work they are progressing, but rather slowly.

0 35. No.

0 36. There is very little difference in the classroom performance of pupils who have attended Head Start and those who have not.

0 37. No.

0 38. No.

39. The children in my room who attended Head Start are not able to work independently. They are not able to finish any work that I give them, no matter if it is coloring or printing work. I don't feel head start prepared them for kindergarten.

40. The Head Start children are more eager to participate in learning activities. The Head Start children make more rapid progress in reading readiness activities and can communicate better with staff members and peer group.

41. Non-Head Start students needed more readiness-type of activities.

42. ---

43. I have not noticed any differences on a large scale. All of my 25 students enrolled as 0.0. students. Out of the 14 that attended Project Head Start, I can see a marked difference in 4 students.

44. ---

45. Academically this is a slow first grade with most of them at the readiness stage.

46. Out of study.

47. Out of study.

48. None.

49. Out of study.
Teacher:

50. ---

51. None.

52. All have poor work habits, so I see no difference.

53. The non-Head Start children have far better work habits and have made the greatest amount of improvement since September in learning.

54. There seems to be very little difference between these two groups. However, we did not see these children before they attended Head Start.

55. At this level, none.

56. Two of the three former Head Start pupils are above average in school work.

57. No marked difference.

58. ---

59. Poor to average in academic progress (Head Start children)

60. No difference.

61. No.

62. None.

63. None.

64. He achieves better than those who did not attend Head Start.

65. ---

66. The children who have attended Head Start program do good work in school.

67. The children who attended Head Start do good work even though their readiness scores are low. Their attention span is longer and they learn to read at a faster rate. The children who have not attended Head Start require more readiness.
Teacher:

++ 68. Children who attended Head Start were able to enter into first grade experiences without any readiness work. They are achieving better than those who did not attend Head Start.

69. ---

70. This is an average room— all children are reading. But of the five closest— four had Head Start training.

++ 71. Head Start children will listen better than others. They will try to do their work.

++ 72. Head Starters are well adjusted to classroom routine.

++ 73. Head Starters have a wider and more varied interest.

North Schools

74. ---

++ 75. They are able to follow directions better than the other children.

++ 76. These children excel over those who have not attended Head Start or kindergarten. There is a better readiness skill among these children. They grasp learning faster and more eagerly.

++ 77. The Head Starters seem to begin to read sooner. They have more experiences to bring to the class after having Head Start training.

0 78. Using my room for comparison, I cannot find much difference in academic work.

++ 79. The confidence of the Head Start children is not so easily shaken when they find something difficult. They are in general more likely to say "I don't know" or "I forgot that"— thus making it easier to locate and work on learning problems.

80. ---

0 81. Both groups— former Head Start pupils and regular first graders achieve at an equal pace.

82. ---
Item I - c ACADEMIC differences

**North Schools**

Teacher:

+ 83. Some of the Head Start are ahead of the rest. The fast group has had Head Start and are able to write legibly and pick up reading faster than others.

84. ---

85. ---

+ 86. Children who attended Head Start seem to catch on to new concepts more easily. They are more advanced than those who did not attend.

+ 87. Of the six who attended Head Start, I find that three have greatly benefited from the activities of Head Start. They are bright and alert and take on new experiences readily. This is true of other students, who did not attend--but not quite to the same degree.

0 88. None.

+ 89. More than a majority of the children who attended Head Start are excellent pupils academically. However, I contend that they have progressed so well because of the combination of Head Start experience and excellent kindergarten experience. I would say it is this necessary combination which makes the Head Start program a success.

+ 90. Children from Head Start are very verbal, can follow directions, and for the most part can distinguish between likenesses and differences.

0 91. A bell curve distribution from E -- U.

+ 92. Head Starters are not too organized but are eager to learn.

**South Schools**

+ 93. Yes. These Head Start children seem to understand and absorb learning more readily.

++ 94. The Head Start children are a very good group academically.

0 95. Academically, the children this year who were and were not in Head Start seem to be doing from low average to average work.

0 96. No.
97. There is a definite and large academic growth in the Head Start children. They seem to have a better understanding of concepts.

98. I don't think there is a difference academically.

99. It was difficult to reteach manuscript and the writing of numbers.

100. ---

101. No, however, all except three (out of the 11) try hard for neatness in their work.

102. ---

103. They seem ready and able to listen to directions and interested in class discussion. In academic accomplishment they range from very slow (3) to quick to learn (3), from preprimer to first reader. However, they all take their school work seriously and really try.

104. ---

105. The academic achievements of former Head Start children seem to be above average.

106. No.

107. No.

108. No.

109. None.
**Item I - d OTHER differences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Head Starters adjust to group living better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item I - d, OTHER differences

23. Head Starters seem more curious.

24. ---

25. ---

26. ---

27. ---

28. ---

29. ---

30. ---

31. ---

32. Classroom discipline is superior to those who did not attend Head Start.

33. They are very good leaders.

34. The Head Start children like singing and can learn songs easily. They like to play games, march, jump, skip. Their coordination seems ready for learning.

35. ---

36. ---

37. No.

38. ---

39. ---

40. This former Head Start group exhibits a greater curiosity in things around them (toys, books, puzzles, etc.).

41. ---

42. ---

43. ---
Teacher

44. ---

45. ---

46. Out of study

47. Out of study

48. ---

49. Out of study

50. ---

51. None

52. Head Start children have absolutely no control over their actions.

53. ---

54. ---

55. ---

56. ---

57. ---

58. ---

59. Four of the Head Starters have adjusted to formal education fairly well; two no difference.

60. No difference.

61. ---

62. None.

63. None.

64. ---
West Schools

Item I - d OTHER differences

Teacher:
65. ---
66. ---
67. The Headstarters show a love for music, games, and art activities while the children who did not attend are reluctant to participate.
68. ---
69. ---
70. ---
71. ---
72. Well adjusted to classroom routine.
73. ---

North Schools

Item I - d OTHER differences

74. ---
75. ---
76. ---
77. The Head Starters are generally more mature and well adjusted to school.
78. ---
79. ---
80. ---
81. ---
82. ---
83. ---
### Item I - d OTHER differences

**North Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>84.</th>
<th>85.</th>
<th>86.</th>
<th>87.</th>
<th>88.</th>
<th>89.</th>
<th>90.</th>
<th>91.</th>
<th>92.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**South Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>93.</th>
<th>94.</th>
<th>95.</th>
<th>96.</th>
<th>97.</th>
<th>98.</th>
<th>99.</th>
<th>100.</th>
<th>101.</th>
<th>102.</th>
<th>103.</th>
<th>104.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

97. Except for one or two the Head Start children are highly motivated.

101. All except three are very clean, well-kept.
Item I - d OTHER differences

Teacher:

105. ---
106. ---
107. No.
108. No.
109. None.
APPENDIX D

PROGRAM EVALUATION DATA
Item II - a

Do you think Project Head Start provides compensation for the culturally deprived child before he enters the elementary school?

Teacher:

++ 1. Yes, indeed providing situations and experiences of value to the deprived child.
+ 2. Yes, mainly because of the planned trips.
++ 3. Yes.
+ 4. Yes, but it does not show very much in my particular class because these children are the slower ones.
++ 5. Yes.
++ 6. Project Head Start, I feel, is very valuable for the deprived child. He needs as much experience as can be provided.
++ 7. Yes.
8. ---
10. Yes.
+ 11. Definitely yes—provided child is ready for the program—mentally and emotionally.
++ 12. I think this Project is a very worthwhile experience for the culturally deprived child. The variety of experiences and learnings that are achieved are very important towards pupil readiness.
++ 14. Yes. All Head Starters have had more experiences, adjust to new routine quicker and show a greater interest in learning.
15. ---
+ 16. I think it provides a small degree of what the deprived child needs. Much more needs to be done.
+ 17. Yes, I think it helps.
Teachers:
++
18. Yes.
++
19. Yes -- mentally, socially, and emotionally.
++
20. ---
++
21. Yes, in the light that it gives them an opportunity to meet other children, get used to being around large numbers of people, and used to routine procedures.
++
22. ---
++
23. Yes.
++
24. Yes.
++
25. Yes, it gives children a chance to express themselves verbally and creatively. It gives them personal relationships with adults, which they may have little of at home. It helps the child develop his "self-concept" and "self esteem." It helps the child begin developing a verbal capacity which is lacking in many children from such environments. School to them is a friendly place.
++
26. ---
++
27. Yes, I do.
++
28. ---
- 29. No. I think the difference lies in the home with the parents taking time with their children -- talking and playing with them; reading to them, teaching them their names and addresses. Head Start cannot do it all.
++
30. Yes, in that it enriches the child's first experience of learning.
- 31. No.
++
32. Yes.
++
33. Yes. However, I feel the program should be broader and more intense.
++
34. I think Head Start provides compensation for those who go; but, I think all culturally deprived children should be required to
Item II - a

Teachers:

attend Head Start.

++ 35. Yes.

0 36. I really do not have enough pertinent information to give a valid evaluation.

++ 37. I am sure that it does. I do not wish to give the impression that the Head Start program is of little value. It is of immense value. There are eight first grade rooms at my school. I have the fifth group out of eight. So you see these children would be achieving less if they had not had Head Start experience. Also, the attendance is poor for quite a few of these children. Their attendance was poor in kindergarten, as it has been in first grade.

++ 38. Yes, by providing worthwhile planned activities for the children, which some of them would not otherwise receive and which will further help the child in beginning school work.

++ 39. I do feel that Head Start provides compensation for the culturally deprived child but the children in my room did not benefit from it. They are not children who are capable of learning. I suppose it makes a great deal of difference if they come from the proper home environment.

++ 40. I can honestly say, I think Project Head Start provides compensation for the culturally deprived child in many areas.

++ 41. Yes, it is a wonderful program, but all students should attend on a year round basis. The summer program helped but it is too short.

++ 42. It provides slight compensation but it does not provide all of the enrichments one needs.

++ 43. I do -- because Project Head Start provides the child with experiences that he would not have knowledge of if it were not for Head Start.

++ 44. I would say yes. The children have been exposed to experiences that should aid in giving them the background needed for school.

++ 45. I feel that Head Start will reach many children from culturally deprived areas, and give them the background needed to begin
Item II - a

Teachers:

kindergarten. There are others who are not yet mature enough to profit from this and as a result, they lag behind. They are slow learners.

46. Out of study.
47. Out of study.
48. ----
49. Out of study.
++ 50. Socially, yes, very much so.
++ 51. Yes.
52. The problem, culturally deprived, is moot. What we think is culturally deprived is not, because what we as a majority consider culture is furthest from the values of many others, and that culture would never have a part in their lives.
++ 53. Yes. Anything is better than nothing when it comes to enriching the lives of these children.
54. We do not see these children before so it is hard to judge. However, I feel they are too at ease or relaxed. You can not get across the importance of finishing work. Getting a star, bringing back flash cards, etc. Everything should be fun and games for them.
++ 55. To some degree.
56. ----
++ 57. For the very low, yes.
58. ----
++ 59. Yes, if the family and child think positively, that is if they try to cooperate. To others the service was merely high priced babysitting. The parents themselves do not want to change either their own way of thinking or that of their children.
Item II - a

Teachers:

++ 60. I am sure that he would profit by Head Start experience especially in families where background is limited.

61. ---

62. Consider first my observations are limited to those children from one center. With the present curriculum set up, Head Start does not provide adequate compensation.

63. ---

++ 64. Yes.

65. ---

++ 66. I think it is a wonderful program.

++ 67. Yes, I think that children who attend Head Start definitely show more interest and eagerness to learn. They are so much better than those who have not attended. They have more general knowledge about surroundings and are eager to participate in activities. They are more sociable and adjusted.

++ 68. Yes.

69. ---

++ 70. To a degree, but could do much more- This child does not lack for companionship as does the child who is sent to a middle class nursery school. So his program should have less play and more activities that would prepare him for the formal work of regular school -- vocabulary building, story listening, etc.

++ 71. Very much so.

++ 72. Definitely, the program provides much in the way of new experiences and training for the deprived child. Low academic achievement does not mean that the children have not gained in many other ways.

++ 73. Head Start is the greatest hope the culturally deprived can experience before entering school.
Teacher:

74. ---

75. They are able to follow directions better than the other children.

76. These children excel over those who have not attended Head Start or kindergarten. There is a better readiness skill among these children. They grasp learning faster and more eagerly.

77. The Head Starters seem to begin to read sooner. They have more experiences to bring to the class after having Head Start training.

78. Using my room for comparison, I cannot find much difference in academic work.

79. The confidence of the Head Start children is not so easily shaken when they find something difficult. They are in general more likely to say "I don't know" or "I forgot that" -- thus making it easier to locate and work on learning problems.

80. ---

81. Both groups -- former Head Start pupils and regular first graders achieve at an equal pace.

82. ---

83. Some of the Head Start are ahead of the rest. The fast group has had Head Start and are able to write legibly and pick up reading faster than others.

84. ---

85. ---

86. Children who attended Head Start seem to catch on to new concepts more easily. They are more advanced than those who did not attend.

87. Of the six who attended Head Start, I find that three have greatly benefited from the activities of Head Start. They are bright and alert and take on new experiences readily. This is true of other students, who did not attend--but not quite to the same degree.
Item I - a ACADEMIC differences

Teacher:

0 88. None.

+ 89. More than a majority of the children who attended Head Start are excellent pupils academically. However, I contend that they have progressed so well because of the combination of Head Start experience and excellent kindergarten experience. I would say it is this necessary combination which makes the Head Start program a success.

+ 90. Children from Head Start are very verbal, can follow directions, and for the most part can distinguish between likenesses and differences.

0 91. A bell curve distribution from E - U.

+ 92. Head Starters are not too organized but are eager to learn.

South Schools

+ 93. Yes. These Head Start children seem to understand and absorb learning more readily.

++ 94. The Head Start children are a very good group academically.

0 95. Academically, the children this year who were and were not in Head Start seem to be doing from low average to average work.

0 96. No.

++ 97. There is a definite and large academic growth in the Head Start children. They seem to have a better understanding of concepts.

0 98. I don't think there is a difference academically.

99. It was difficult to reteach manuscript and the writing of numbers.

100. ---

0 101. No, however, all except three (out of the 11) try hard for neatness in their work.
Item I - c -- ACADEMIC differences

102. ---

+ 103. They seem ready and able to listen to directions and interested in class discussion. In academic accomplishment they range from very slow (3) to quick to learn (3), from preprimer to first reader. However, they all take their school work seriously and really try.

104. ---

+ 105. The academic achievements of former Head Start children seem to be above average.

0 106. No.

0 107. No.

0 108. No.

0 109. None.
West Schools

Item I - d OTHER differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Head Starters adjust to group living better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. ---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item I - d OTHER differences

23. Head Starters seem more curious.

24. ---

25. ---

26. ---

27. ---

28. ---

29. ---

30. ---

31. ---

32. Classroom discipline is superior to those who did not attend Head Start.

33. They are very good leaders.

34. The Head Start children like singing and can learn songs easily. They like to play games, march, jump, skip. Their coordination seems ready for learning.

35. ---

36. ---

37. No.

38. ---

39. ---

40. This former Head Start group exhibits a greater curiosity in things around them (toys, books, puzzles, etc.).

41. ---

42. ---

43. ---
Item I - d, OTHER differences

Teacher:

44. ---

45. ---

46. Out of study

47. Out of study

48. ---

49. Out of study

50. ---

51. None

52. Head Start children have absolutely no control over their actions.

53. ---

54. ---

55. ---

56. ---

57. ---

58. ---

59. Four of the Head Starters have adjusted to formal education fairly well; two no difference.

60. No difference.

61. ---

62. None.

63. None.

64. ---
Teacher:

65. ---

66. ---

67. The Headstarters show a love for music, games, and art activities while the children who did not attend are reluctant to participate.

68. ---

69. ---

70. ---

71. ---

72. Well adjusted to classroom routine.

73. ---

74. ---

75. ---

76. ---

77. The Head Starters are generally more mature and well adjusted to school.

78. ---

79. ---

80. ---

81. ---

82. ---

83. ---

84. ---

85. ---
West Schools

Item I - d OTHER differences

Teacher:
86. ---
87. ---
88. ---
89. ---
90. ---
91. ---
92. ---

South Schools

93. ---
94. ---
95. ---
96. ---
97. ---
98. Except for one or two the Head Start children are highly motivated.
99. ---
100. ---
101. All except three are very clean, well-kept.
102. ---
103. ---
104. ---
South Schools

Item I - d OTHER differences

105. ---
106. ---
107. No
108. No
109. None.
APPENDIX D

PROGRAM EVALUATION DATA
Do you think Project Head Start provides compensation for the culturally deprived child before he enters the elementary school?

Teacher:

++ 1. Yes indeed, providing situations and experiences of value to the deprived child.
++ 2. Yes, mainly because of the planned trips.
++ 3. Yes.
++ 4. Yes, but it does not show very much in my particular class because these children are the slower ones.
++ 5. Yes.
++ 6. Project Head Start, I feel, is very valuable for the deprived child. He needs as much experience as can be provided.
++ 7. Yes.
++ 8. ---
++ 10. Yes.
++ 11. Definitely yes--provided child is ready for the program mentally and emotionally.
++ 12. I think this Project is a very worthwhile experience for the culturally deprived child. The variety of experiences and learnings that are achieved are very important towards pupil readiness.
++ 14. Yes. All Head Starters have had more experiences, adjust to new routine quicker and show a greater interest in learning.
15. ---
++ 16. I think it provides a small degree of what the deprived child needs. Much more needs to be done.
Item II - a

Teacher:

17. Yes, I think it helps.
18. Yes.
19. Yes—mentally, socially, and emotionally.
20. ---
21. Yes, in the light that it gives them an opportunity to meet other children, get used to being around large numbers of people, and used to routine procedures.
22. ---
23. Yes.
24. Yes.
25. Yes, it gives children a chance to express themselves verbally and creatively. It gives them personal relationships with adults, which they may have little of at home. It helps the child develop his "self-concept" and "self esteem." It helps the child begin developing a verbal capacity which is lacking in many children from such environments. School to them is a friendly place.
26. ---
27. Yes, I do.
28. ---
29. No. I think the difference lies in the home with the parents taking time with their children -- talking and playing with them; reading to them, teaching them their names and addresses. Head Start cannot do it all.
30. No.
31. Yes, in that it enriches the child's first experience of learning.
32. Yes.
Item II - a

Teacher:

33. Yes. However, I feel the program should be broader and more intense.

34. I think Head Start provides compensation for those who go; but, I think all culturally deprived children should be required to attend Head Start.

35. Yes.

36. I really do not have enough pertinent information to give a valid evaluation.

37. I am sure that it does. I do not wish to give the impression that the Head Start program is of little value. It is of immense value. There are eight first grade rooms at my school. I have the fifth group out of eight. So you see these children would be achieving less if they had not had Head Start experience. Also, the attendance is poor for quite a few of these children. Their attendance was poor in kindergarten, as it has been in first grade.

38. Yes, by providing worthwhile planned activities for the children, which some of them would not otherwise receive and which will further help the child in beginning school work.

39. I do feel that Head Start provides compensation for the culturally deprived child but the children in my room did not benefit from it. They are not children who are capable of learning. I suppose it makes a great deal of difference if they come from the proper home environment.

40. I can honestly say, I think Project Head Start provides compensation for the culturally deprived child in many areas.

41. Yes, it is a wonderful program, but all students should attend on a year-round basis. The summer program helped but it is too short.

42. It provides slight compensation but it does not provide all of the enrichments one needs.

43. I do -- because Project Head Start provides the child with experiences that he would not have knowledge of if it were not for Head Start.
Item II - a

Teachers:

+ 44. I would say yes. The children have been exposed to experiences that should aid in giving them the background needed for school.

+ 45. I feel that Head Start will reach many children from culturally deprived areas, and give them the background needed to begin kindergarten. There are others who are not yet mature enough to profit from this and as a result, they lag behind. They are slow learners.

46. Out of study.

47. Out of study.

48. ---

49. Out of study.

+ 50. Socially, yes, very much so.

+ 51. Yes.

- 52. The problem, culturally deprived, is moot. What we think is culturally deprived is not, because what we as a majority consider culture is furthest from the values of many others, and that culture would never have a part in their lives.

+ 53. Yes. Anything is better than nothing when it comes to enriching the lives of these children.

- 54. We do not see these children before so it is hard to judge. However, I feel they are too at ease or relaxed. You can not get across the importance of finishing work. Getting a star, bringing back flash cards, etc. --everything should be fun and games for them.

+ 55. To some degree.

56. ---

+ 57. For the very low, yes.

58. ---
Teacher:

+ 59. Yes, if the family and child think positively, that is if they try to cooperate. To others the service was merely high priced babysitting. The parents themselves do not want to change either their own way of thinking or that of their children.

++ 60. I am sure that he would profit by Head Start experience especially in families where background is limited.

61. ---

- 62. Consider first my observations are limited to those children from one center. With the present curriculum set up, Head Start does not provide adequate compensation.

63. ---

++ 64. Yes.

65. ---

++ 66. I think it is a wonderful program.

++ 67. Yes, I think that children who attend Head Start definitely show more interest and eagerness to learn. They are so much better than those who have not attended. They have more general knowledge about surroundings and are eager to participate in activities. They are more sociable and adjusted.

++ 68. Yes.

69. ---

+ 70. To a degree, but could do much more--This child does not lack for companionship as does the child who is sent to a middle class nursery school -- So his program should have less play and more activities that would prepare him for the formal work of regular school -- vocabulary building, story listening, etc.

++ 71. Very much so.
West Schools

Teacher:

72. Definitely, the program provides much in the way of new experiences and training for the deprived child. Low academic achievement does not mean that the children have not gained in many other ways.

73. Head Start is the greatest hope the culturally deprived can experience before entering school.

North Schools

74. ---

75. Definitely, otherwise, some of the children would not leave home until they were ready for kindergarten.

76. Yes, Project Head Start does provide compensation for the culturally deprived child before he enters the elementary school. I would not say that every child is equally benefited. However, I think more than one half of the children are thoroughly benefited by the program.

77. Yes. The children are exposed to group participation. They are trained to care for themselves and the things they use in school and at home. They learn about the city in which they live through field trips. They are exposed to books, stories, and listening experiences they wouldn't get otherwise. They are instructed in good health practices for future life.

78. I think it helps, but two months or ten months certainly cannot altogether compensate for five years.

79. Yes, to a limited degree. They are exposed to many new experiences and to books. It does a great deal for the child in helping him to care for himself and to mix with other children in a happy and constructive way. The health program is very good. But somehow I feel we do not ask them to do as much as they are capable of doing.

80. Very definitely. There are many enrichment projects that people take for granted a child has experience at home.

81. Yes, it provides a great experience for the pre-school child.

82. Yes, I do. But the children must have at least a year or more.
Item II - a

Teacher:

++ 83. I think anything that takes the child out of a deprived environment and gives him a chance to excel is worth the effort.

++ 84. Yes, because all preschool youngsters need to learn concepts related to measurement of all kinds but the culturally deprived children are very apt to need somewhat more help than children whose families may have provided them with more teaching of this kind.

85. ---

++ 86. Yes. When these children enter the elementary school it is noticeable that they can develop some of the same kind of creative originality as the non-culturally deprived children. They also seem to have a better awareness of the community in which they live.

++ 87. Yes. The program definitely acquaints the children with the school community and other necessary experiences which because of various reasons the parents are unable to provide.

++ 88. Yes, in that it acquaints the child with the school program, his community, and his world, establishing a background he might otherwise lack.

++ 89. Yes!!!

++ 90. Yes, Head Start does provide compensation for the culturally deprived child before he enters the elementary school.

+ 91. I do, although there is no trace of it in the six children in my class who have had Head Start.

++ 92. Yes.

South Schools

++ 93. Yes, yes, yes---These children need the advantages that are given in a Head Start program. Many will not receive these advantages at home. At least with a Head Start background these children might be able to begin their formal education on an equal footing with other average American children.
Item II - a

Teachers:

++ 94. Yes. I think some who attended Head Start would have been several years behind their class had they not attended. Their horizons have been broadened considerably.

++ 95. I think the Head Start program has done much to upgrade the backgrounds of the children in this area. There is not anything more I could suggest that is not already being done. Except to say, I wish we had the program sooner.

- 96. My first grade class does not show any evidence of compensation that Project Head Start provided. However, I am not in a position to compare this class with some Head Start experience and former classes without Head Start experience as my former first grade class was six years ago.

++ 97. Definitely! Whatever means we can find to encourage the natural inclination to learn and explore is worthwhile. There is no limit to the amount of readiness that a child can benefit from.

+ 98. Probably; the biggest difference I notice is that former Head Start pupils' parents participate more actively in school activities.

++ 99. Yes.

++ 100. Yes.

++ 101. Yes.

102. ---

+ 103. I would say that the children I have - have good attitudes toward school. They are serious about it, accept limits, are used to it are able to get along socially in the group. However, I cannot say that it definitely helps them academically as I have a wide academic range in my class.

++ 104. Yes.

++ 105. Yes, it helps the child to understand and to adjust to school life.

- 106. No.
Teacher:

+ 107. Yes, but how can one determine progress without knowledge of each child before Head Start experience? Readiness scores indicate equal degree of readiness. Children with high ability scores were not culturally deprived before Head Start experience.

++ 108. Yes.

- 109. No.
Item II - b

What suggestions would you offer to strengthen Project Head Start?

Teacher:

   b. More class room activities and fewer trips.

2. a. More emphasis on academic work -- less playing activities.
   b. Stress ability to express themselves orally.
   c. Learn to work independently.
   d. Learn self-control.

3. ---

4. ---

5. Please teach the children to use books. These children seem to be very used to being read to but do not know how to handle books.

6. More time is needed for the teacher to spend or use with the children in the Head Start daily schedule.
   b. Lessen the paper work for the Head Start teacher.
   c. A more concentrated effort to include parents is needed.

7. ---

8. ---

9. ---

10. a. More specific records of what has been done with each child to be passed on to the succeeding teachers.
    b. The Head Start program should have a resource person to advise the Head Start teacher of agencies that would help children with physical or mental problems.

11. ---

12. ---

13. a. Trained teachers--those who have specific training in early childhood education.
West Schools

What suggestions would you offer to strengthen Project Head Start?

Item II - b

Teacher:

b. A definite pre-school program that is more realistic and constructive.
   c. More learning and less play for play's sake.

14. Smaller groups per teacher.

15. a. I would like to suggest a more structured approach to pre-school learning.
   b. Give priority to development of academic skills, rather than social skills. Successful students usually adjust well to the school environment.
   c. Develop an objective method of measuring academic growth at the end of the preschool year.

   b. More reading readiness.
   c. More mathematical concept work.

17. ---

18. ---

19. a. Start at an even earlier age.
   b. Physical space enlargement of Head Start classroom.

20. ---

21. The purpose of Head Start serves its purpose but it is from that point on that we see results.

22. ---

23. None at present. The program seems to be functioning well.

24. ---

25. ---

26. ---

27. ---
What suggestions would you offer to strengthen Project Head Start?

Teacher:

28. ----

29. More parent education is necessary not only for those who have children enrolled in Head Start classes, but for all our parents.

30. a. Take it out of the school building as such. Head Start gives children an unrealistic view of school.
    b. Give more attention to readiness skills such as attention, following directions.

31. ----

32. a. More exploratory trips to develop awareness.
    b. Formal readiness workbooks.
    c. Regular visits to first grade rooms.

33. The program should be broadened and be made more intense.

34. a. All culturally deprived children should go to Head Start like kindergarten.
    b. Reading should be started in Head Start and also kindergarten. Although all children are not ready to read at 4 years, some are ready at 4 years.

35. More experiences for developing motor coordination.

36. In order to strengthen Project Head Start's effect:
    a. Provide the kindergarten with the same pupil-teacher ratio.
    b. Provide the first grade with at least one teacher-aid.
    c. The above suggestions will tend to make the pupil's transition from Head Start less frustrating, and the pupils will no longer feel lost for lack of attention.

37. a. More verbalization
    b. Simple classification tasks
       1. Things we eat
       2. Things we wear
       3. Things that grow
       4. Kinds of animals
    c. Recite and chant poetry
    d. Identification of colors
    e. Visual discrimination
    f. Counting games
Item II - b

What suggestions would you offer to strengthen Project Head Start?

Teacher:

1. Forming associations
2. Size discrimination
3. Fewer trips -- and more discussions about the trips they do take. Also more story telling (creative story telling) Discuss pictures. Trips to the grocery store, fire station, police station are very valuable.
4. Less time spent playing with cars, tricycles, wagons etc., in independent play, and more time in games spent in counting, naming things, etc.
5. An emphasis on a parent orientation program.
6. Expand the program on a city wide basis.
7. More emphasis on the communication skills.
8. Lower the entrance age to include children of 3½ to 4 years of age.
9. Help the child who is not capable of much learning -- the slow learner.
10. Take them on trips to other places outside of the neighborhood.
11. I suggest a more extensive program to develop motor skills as these skills appear to be less advanced than verbal skills.
12. I also think more activities associated with thinking, generalizing, and inquiring will help toward total readiness growth.
13. At least six months to a year's experience in Head Start for all children.
14. I think acceptance of those in the upper lower class would be beneficial.
15. More classes and trips.
16. More exposure to a wider range of experience.
17. - - -
18. - - -
19. Have the children recognize their ABC's so that it might be easier to teach phonics on the first grade level.
20. Counting from 1 to 10 and being able to recognize these numbers would help in problem solving on the first grade level.
21. Out of study. xxx
What suggestions would you offer to strengthen Project Head Start?

Teacher:

47. Out of study. xxx
48. ---
49. Out of study. xxx
50. ---
51. ---

52. a. Have basic essentials taught that lead to transfer of learning at the first grade level.
   b. Controlled free play. Children have absolutely no control over their actions.
   c. Teach parents the basic concepts to teach children.
   d. Have parents know what is expected of children at each age.
   e. Lessen the permissiveness in the Head Start program.

53. a. A far more expanded program of parent education. The parents are the ones who really enrich the lives of the children.
   b. Far more qualified teachers.

54. a. There should be a more formal atmosphere. School is a place for the work first and play later.
   b. Mothers should be brought into the learning part not just the social.

55. a. A more structured program with some planning leading up to a normal school situation (not a permissive atmosphere).
   b. Development of habits of self-responsibility especially in area of care of materials and equipment.
   c. Planning for parents meeting near the end of the Head Start program at which the mothers would be made aware of the change in situation the children would meet in kindergarten--or differences--such as larger group, less individual attention, more work than play, and need for instilling in child desire to work.

56. ---
57. ---
58. ---
What suggestions would you offer to strengthen Project Head Start?

Teacher:

59. Have a strong parent involvement program. Insist that the parents attend, or keep the child out of the program.

60. a. Emphasis on proper attitudes toward school work.
    b. Making child feel at home at school so his mind is ready to accept work, instead of being fearful.

61. ---

62. a. A curriculum designed for more intense development in independence.
    b. Units of work built around field trips to develop oral expression, and understandings in the areas of science and social studies.
    c. Intensified program in listening.

63. ---

64. Not any.

65. ---

66. ---

67. Something should be done to interest all parents in sending their children to Head Start.

68. a. More informal teaching—recognition of colors, objects, shapes, etc., by games, conversations, puzzles.
    b. Development of good listening habits.
    c. Development of an appreciation of music.
    d. Encourage conversations.
    e. More socializations.

69. ---

70. a. Disciplined freedom rather than freedom alone.
    b. Periods of formal training in expression—developing the ability of the child to express himself in sentences.
    c. Developing habits of orderliness—always put away one thing before taking another.
    d. Since the same rooms must be used for Head Start and the regular kindergarten, the child even at age four must be made to realize that school is a place for work for himself and others.
What suggestions would you offer to strengthen Project Head Start?

Teacher:

71. ---

72. ---

73. Include children regardless of age (up to 7) in the Head Start program if they have not had this experience.

74. ---

75. Try to work out some program that would be a carryover from school to the home.

76. Provision wherein teachers could do more actual teaching and less clerical work.

77. a. Have complete new supplies at each school when the program begins. Allow the teacher a day or two to prepare the room without the children present at the start.

b. Raise the income level for those allowed to participate. Have "poverty areas" outlined where all children are immediately enrolled.

c. Pre-register the children using all available community organizations possible and have a uniform registration program. Use social workers, community representatives etc. to register and not teachers who could be setting up classrooms for the children.

d. Limit the number of excessive duplicate forms by planning the whole program at the start as to CCUO forms, attendance records, emergency information, health services, and daily activities and lunches.

e. Plan the health services and field trips so they do not conflict.

78. a. Needed supplies for every room.
Item II - b
North Schools

b. Income base is ridiculous--Just because a child's parents earn $500-$1000 more than the base does not mean the child needs Head Start any less. More than probably, every child in this area needs nursery school or training of some kind.

c. Head Start teachers cannot effectively teach a classroom with all the extra work she must do.

79. a. Have complete and delivered supplies for each school. Allow the teacher a day or so free to decorate her room. Recruitment could begin earlier to help provide this time.

b. Raise the income level for those allowed to participate.

c. Arrange for better scheduling of trips and health programs to avoid conflicts.

d. Some of the high school helpers seem to feel they can not be dismissed for any reason--This must be clarified.

80. ---

81. a. Stressing the process of self-expression.

b. Strengthen the ability to work alone.

82. a. Have more books with simple pictures and one word under the picture.

b. Stress motor coordination in painting and other Head Start art activities.

83. ---

84. a. Getting the family involved so that an enduring pattern of reading to the child may have some opportunity of being established.

b. Increase the amount of book and story experience available to the child through his family's participation.

85. ---

86. a. More field trips.

b. More parental involvement.

87. a. A classroom which is a little less liberal.

b. Many manipulative materials for counting and self-expression (clay, paint, etc.)

c. Many trips concerned with the children's immediate area (neighborhood stores, streets, buildings, other schools) before
Item II - b

North Schools

Trips branch out to the larger part of society. In other words, a knowledge and understanding of their own immediate community.

88. More readiness activities that could be enriched and strengthened in the kindergarten.

89. As a first grade teacher I would desperately like to know more about Project Head Start. Its goals, procedures, and content areas are very vague to me. More communication and explanation is needed between the Project and primary teachers so that a continuum of learning can be established.

90. If the program were less permissive, the children could settle down to work quicker and gain more.

91. ---

92. More total group activity.

South Schools

93. a. Federal funds allotted for Head Start programs on a permanent basis--so that the program is a continuous one and there is no fear of financial cut-backs.
   b. Head Start should be a permanent part of the educational system, just as kindergarten.

94. a. Raise the financial limit so that more people may send their children.
   b. Allow the Head Start teacher to have a full time clerk so that she may teach her class or release her from teaching a class.
   c. Lower age level so that child may enter at four.
   d. Have classes divided as to age levels.

95. I cannot suggest anything more than is already being done in the program.

96. Extend reasoning situations.
   Develop listening abilities.
   Extend general knowledge--that is, to know and recognize things around him involved in everyday experiences, and to be found in average classroom.
   More readiness skills. Follow simple directions.

97. a. Involve parents! Have them talk more with their children. Help them think things through.
   b. Have enough manipulative materials available.
   c. Use music as a means to their learning to distinguish difficult sounds.
   d. Let them have books to take home and bring back.
Item II - b Program evaluation South Schools

Teacher:

98. a. Extend the services and small groupings to kindergarten and primary grades.
   b. Integrate Head Start into the schools where they are located. They are kept too much a separate unit. Let them be in school assemblies, for instance.

99. a. To refrain from using first grade work materials such as workbooks and ditto materials.

100. ---

101. a. Any activities that strengthen the ability to communicate verbally.
   b. Any work with (potentially) emotionally disturbed children. These can and do disrupt any normal classroom procedure.
   c. Anything that will bring mothers of these children into a closer and warmer association with the school.

102. ---

103. I have only taught two years. I really do not know enough about the program to evaluate it.

104. a. The program should be compulsory or a September through June basis.
   b. There should be something in the child's records which readily indicates that he has attended Head Start and whether it was only for the summer session or for the ten-month session.

105. ---

106. a. Provide listening experiences that will develop an attention span of some sort. The experiences observed are such that they seem to deviate the child's attention to many different things during certain periods.
   b. Parent education to pass on to other uninterested parents.

107. Intensive program of parent education.

108. a. Adult education.
   b. Better low rent housing.

109. a. A more disciplined approach in the classroom.
   b. Teaching respect for the rights of others.
   c. Learning the basics of dressing oneself--tying shoes, zipping jackets, putting on and taking off boots.
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