1987

Academic Survival Skills for the Young Child At-Risk for School Failure

Barbara Foulks
University of the Pacific

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds

Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Foulks, Barbara. (1987). *Academic Survival Skills for the Young Child At-Risk for School Failure*. University of the Pacific, Dissertation. https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds/3193

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of the Pacific Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact m gibney@pacific.edu.

Academic Survival Skills for the Young Child
At-Risk for School Failure

by

Barbara Foulks

Department of Curriculum and Instruction

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Education

University of the Pacific
School of Education

June 1987

This dissertation, written and submitted by

Barbara E. Foulks

is approved for recommendation to the Committee
on Graduate Studies, University of the Pacific

Dean of the School or Department Chairman:

Layla Hawley, Dean

Dissertation Committee:

Robert D. Mann

Chairman

Judith Van Horn

K. L. Beach

B. R. Hopkins

Dated June 22, 1987

Copyright

Barbara E. Foulks

August 1987

ACADEMIC SURVIVAL SKILLS FOR THE YOUNG CHILD
AT-RISK FOR SCHOOL FAILURE

Abstract of Dissertation

The primary purpose of this study was to identify social competence and academic survival skills necessary for success in kindergarten. The study was designed to indicate similarities and differences among early childhood educators in (a) academic survival skills considered necessary for success in kindergarten, and (b) behaviors considered inappropriate for kindergarten. A review of the literature revealed minimal research related to academic survival skills and social competence in kindergarten.

In order to ascertain which skills early childhood educators consider crucial for the child's successful survival in kindergarten, the Social Behavior Skills Inventory (Walker & Rankin, 1980) was utilized as a survey instrument to obtain the relevant information. The survey obtained data that determined the specific social competence and academic survival skills considered important for kindergarten children in Calaveras, Amador, and Tuolumne Counties in rural California.

The results of the study revealed information regarding social competence and academic survival skills needed for success in kindergarten.

There were only two academic survival skills agreed upon by kindergarten teachers, preschool professionals, and

family day care providers as being necessary for success in kindergarten. Social skills and positive interactions with peers were not as critical for academic survival as other types of skills. Kindergarten teachers considered more of the adaptive skills to be necessary for academic survival than either preschool professionals or family day care providers.

Far more maladaptive behaviors were rated as highly important than appropriate behaviors by all groups. All participant groups felt more strongly about unacceptable, maladaptive behaviors than critical, appropriate behaviors. Altogether, 16 of 51 maladaptive behaviors were rated unacceptable by all three participant groups. There was uniform agreement among all survey participants that two behaviors were not tolerated in kindergarten. The majority of behaviors rated as unacceptable in kindergarten were behaviors that challenged the teacher's control and authority. The least important maladaptive behaviors were related to peer socialization.

This study was a beginning in determining the particular adaptive precursor skills needed by the at-risk child. By identifying academic survival skills considered necessary for a successful adjustment to kindergarten, the study provided data on skills needed by the young child at-risk for school failure. A number of recommendations for further research were generated.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Robert Morrow for being the chair of my dissertation committee and for his support throughout this process. My appreciation is extended to each member of the committee for willingness to give time and guidance to this study. The members were Dr. Judith Van Hoorn, Dr. Bobby Hopkins, and Dr. Kenneth Beauchamp.

A very special thanks goes to my husband and children. Their love, support and patience made it possible for me to complete this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER I. OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY	1
Introduction	1
Problem	7
Purpose	10
Definition of Terms	12
CHAPTER II. LITERATURE REVIEW	15
Early Childhood Special Education	15
Historical Background	15
The Melding of Special Education and Child Development	21
Curricula Goals and Skills	24
Social Competence	31
The At-Risk Child	35
Traditional Skills	39
Criticisms of Traditional Skills	41
Survival Skills	43
The SBS Inventory	59
Summary	61
CHAPTER III. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	66
Description of Counties	67
Population	69
Instrumentation	69
The SBS Inventory Description	70
Revision	72
Validity	74
Data Collection	76
Assumptions and Limitations	79
CHAPTER IV. DATA ANALYSIS	80
Demographic Background of Participants	80
Scoring	84
Findings	84
Section I	85
Section II	108
Analysis	128
Discussion	151

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	156
The Study	157
Problem	158
Purpose	159
Past Research	161
Methodology	162
Conclusions	164
Significance of Study	170
Assumptions and Limitations	173
Emergent Issues	174
Recommendations	177
REFERENCES	179
APPENDICES	192
A. The SBS Inventory of Teacher Social Behavior Standards and Expectations	193
B. Cover Letters	202

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Academic Survival Skills in the Literature . . .	51
2. Factors of Sections I and II of the SBS Inventory	73
3. Survey Participation	81
4. Background of Survey Participantants	83
5. Kindergarten Teachers' Responses to Section I Factor 1 Items	87
6. Preschool Teachers' Responses to Section I Factor 1 Items	90
7. Family Day Care Providers' Responses to Section I Factor 1 Items	92
8. Kindergarten Teachers' Responses to Section I Factor 2 Items	95
9. Preschool Teachers' Responses to Section I Factor 2 Items	97
10. Family Day Care Providers' Responses to Section I Factor 2 Items	99
11. Kindergarten Teachers' Responses to Section I Factor 3 Items	102
12. Preschool Teachers' Responses to Section I Factor 3 Items	103
13. Family Day Care Providers' Responses to Section I Factor 3 Items	104
14. Kindergarten Teachers' Responses to Section I Items Not Included in Factors	105
15. Preschool Teachers' Responses to Section I Items Not Included in Factors	106
16. Family Day Care Providers' Responses to Section I Items Not Included in Factors	107

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
17. Kindergarten Teachers' Responses to Section II Factor 1 Items	111
18. Preschool Teachers' Responses to Section II Factor 1 Items	113
19. Family Day Care Providers' Responses to Section II Factor 1 Items	115
20. Kindergarten Teachers' Responses to Section II Factor 2 Items	118
21. Preschool Teachers' Responses to Section II Factor 2 Items	120
22. Family Day Care Providers' Responses to Section II Factor 2 Items	122
23. Kindergarten Teachers' Responses to Section II Items Not Included in Factors	125
24. Preschool Teachers' Responses to Section II Items Not Included in Factors	126
25. Family Day Care Providers' Responses to Section II Items Not Included in Factors	127
26. Section I Skills of High Importance (Critical) to Kindergarten Teachers	129
27. Section I Skills of High Importance (Critical) to Preschool Teachers	131
28. Section I Skills of High Importance (Critical) to Family Day Care Providers	132
29. Section I Skills of High Importance (Critical) to All Participant Groups	133
30. Similarities and Differences on Section I Skills Rated High Importance (Critical) for Kindergarten	135
31. Section I Skills that Only Kindergarten Teachers Rated High Importance (Critical) . . .	138

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
32. Section II Behaviors of High Importance (Unacceptable) to Kindergarten Teachers	139
33. Section II Behaviors of High Importance (Unacceptable) to Preschool Teachers	142
34. Section II Behaviors of High Importance (Unacceptable) to Family Day Care Providers . .	144
35. Section II Behaviors of High Importance (Unacceptable) to All Participant Groups	147
36. Similarities and Differences on Section II Behaviors Rated High Importance (Unacceptable) for Kindergarten	149

CHAPTER I

OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

Introduction

Early childhood special education is a broad field of study embracing parts of two distinct fields of education--special education and early childhood education. From birth through eight years of age, early childhood special education covers all the exceptionalities and developmental delays, including blind, deaf, epileptic, cerebral palsied, emotionally disturbed, gifted, etc. It is an emergent field that has not yet clearly defined its parameters, responsibilities, and aims. Many issues need to be addressed and resolved (Anastasiow, 1981; Beckman-Brindley & Bell, 1981; Clark, 1984; O'Shea & Gajar, 1983; Swan, 1981).

The combination and overlapping of the fields of early childhood and special education have resulted in a myriad of early childhood and early childhood special education programs. The major goal of early childhood special education is to intervene during the critical development years from birth to age 6, in order to prevent or ameliorate the effects of a handicapping condition or problems that have a high probability of manifesting themselves as developmental or school-related difficulties in later childhood. Early intervention can prevent

concomitant problems from compounding existing deviations or delays. Various other goals and curricula have been developed. The field of early childhood has also expanded and broadened to include new instructional strategies and perspectives on child development. Several major issues are raised in the melding and broadening of aspects of these two fields.

Two resultant issues are: How should the field of early childhood special education address the needs of children at-risk for school failure? What should be the specific curricular goals of early childhood special education programs? These two issues are of special concern when considering the needs of Head Start and other preschool age children who are designated at-risk for school failure.

Today, hundreds of thousands of children are enrolled in preschool settings. In 1986, Head Start alone served over 453,000 preschool children, 12% of whom were considered handicapped or requiring special education services (U.S. Dept. Health and Human Services, 1986). Many other children are attending public and private pre-kindergartens, special education programs, nursery schools, day care centers, and family day care homes.

Preschool programs attempt to prepare young children for school success. The criteria for school success,

however, are unclear (Fewell, 1983). Agreement or consensus on prerequisite skills necessary for school success is non-existent. There is little consensus on the definition of school failure and its causes during a child's early school experience (Fewell, 1983). In turn, this results in confusion regarding the identifying characteristics of the young child at-risk for school failure. Children are designated "at-risk" for school failure without a clear definition, set of criteria, or listing of skills required for school success.

What are the academic survival skills necessary for school success? Academic survival skills may be regarded as basic cognitive information, experiences, and behaviors that provide a strong foundation for academic or school related knowledge. Which particular academic survival skills are needed for success in kindergarten?

If the field of early childhood special education expects to become respected as a sound educational and scientifically rigorous undertaking, then it needs to develop systematic and effective procedures and content based on sound theoretical premises. The responsibility to foster excellence in early childhood special education programs must be accepted. The field should move forward in the development of effective early-intervention programs for at-risk children.

An ecological approach may be the most effective way for the field of early childhood special education to determine appropriate and specific curricular goals. One ecological approach developed by Thurman and Widerstrom (1985) is concerned with the child's competence in interaction with the environment.

Competence, in the ecological congruence model, represents the developmental status of the individual. A child's ability to perform a certain task or behavior...is clearly a function of her developmental status. It is the interrelationship of the individual's developmental status, degree of competency, and the setting's reaction to them which are of importance within the context of the ecological congruence model." (p.89).

The ecological congruence model for educational planning (Thurman & Widerstrom, 1985) has a process that could be utilized to determine academic survival skills necessary for success in kindergarten. The steps in the process are:

1. Identify the major environmental settings that are important in the child's life.
2. Develop an inventory of critical tasks in those settings.
3. Assess the child's competence to perform those tasks.
4. Assess motivational variables and other factors that affect the child's ability to perform tasks.

5. Assess the child's tolerance of the environment.

6. Determine which of the child's behaviors and/or characteristics are outside of the level of tolerance of the system.

7. Identify objectives for each component of the ecology which, when accomplished, will lead to increased ecological congruence.

8. Identify strategies for accomplishment of the objectives.

9. Establish a means by which interventions are to be monitored and their effectiveness assessed.

One of the operational implications of this approach is that the most efficient and accurate screening measures are those which are close to the criterion or curriculum goals in both content and time. Task analysis forces one to think in terms of more immediate goals and steps to reach them. Questions of whether the preschool child will be successful in third grade, sixth grade, or high school lack operational meaning.

Validity of early identification is increased when evaluative measures tap abilities required in the immediate or subsequent educational program. Attempts to make long term predictions are inherently weak since it is not possible to sample the broad spectrum of skills needed for successful school performance years later. Emphasis in

early identification may well be changed from a future orientation to one that is more concerned with what is needed for success in the present or immediate future (Keogh & Becker, 1973).

The immediate major educational environmental setting that will be important to the young child at-risk for school failure is the regular kindergarten classroom.

The second step in developing effective early identification programs is recognition of the importance of specification of children's abilities and competencies which might be used to maximize success experiences in educational programs. The purpose of identification or evaluation is not just to document or confirm deficits but rather to provide information which might be used as the basis for prevention of later problems by developing related curricula. This second step involves specification of expected outcomes.

The third step specifically asks, does the preschool child have the skills and abilities necessary to perform successfully in the kindergarten? Does the kindergarten child have the skills necessary to master the demands of the first grade program?

Instead of labeling or catagorizing, assessment should focus on the child's capabilities, inabilities, and vital skills to be acquired/learned. As early as 1973,

Keogh and Becker emphasized pinpointing functional aspects of the child's performance which might be used as the basis for instruction. "It well may be that focus on effective educational programming per se is a more productive route than is the search for precise measures for early identification of individual children" (p. 10).

The fourth through ninth steps address assisting children in developing a repertoire of adaptive and success-producing behaviors for subsequent environments. This should be a primary goal of early childhood special education: to determine the academic survival skills necessary for success in kindergarten.

By identifying environmental demands and expectations that exist within the kindergarten setting, it will be possible to systematically prepare the young child to more effectively cope in kindergarten and thereby alleviate the child's at-risk status.

Problem

Academic survival skills are critical to a child's success in a classroom setting. The fields of early childhood special education and special education behavioral research emphasize the importance of this. Recent research (as indicated in Chapter II) clearly substantiates the crucial role of academic survival skills for success in school.

The child's progress and success depends upon his or her current repertoire and the transactions that occur with subsequent environments. By increasing the child's repertoire of appropriate responses for the classroom setting, the child's social competence and success in kindergarten will increase. Preschool may positively affect adaptive functioning in the actual school environment (Clark, 1984; Impact of Head Start, 1985). The more complex problem is to specify the academic survival skills that determine whether a child will or will not have a successful adjustment to the kindergarten classroom.

The importance of early recognition of children with potential school failure places responsibility on classroom teachers in the kindergarten and preschool, since teachers are being asked to identify problems before they are well-developed (Keogh & Becker, 1973). Specifically, what do teachers view as at-risk behaviors? Which characteristics lead teachers to suspect a given child as a potential school failure? Is there agreement among teachers as to what constitutes at-risk characteristics?

In order for the young, at-risk child to develop academic survival skills required for a successful school experience, the curricular goals and skills of early childhood special education for young children at-risk for school failure should be evaluated in terms of relevance

for school success. The particular skills needed by the at-risk child need to be determined.

To resolve this problem, the following questions will be examined:

1. Which academic survival skills do kindergarten teachers consider critical for success in kindergarten?
2. Which academic survival skills do preschool teachers consider critical for success in kindergarten?
3. Which academic survival skills do family day care providers consider critical for success in kindergarten?
4. Which behaviors do kindergarten teachers consider unacceptable in kindergarten?
5. Which behaviors do preschool teachers consider as being unacceptable in kindergarten?
6. Which behaviors do family day care providers consider as being unacceptable in kindergarten?
7. What are the similarities among kindergarten teachers, preschool teachers, and family day care providers in academic survival skills considered critical for success in kindergarten?
8. What are the differences among kindergarten teachers, preschool teachers, and family day care providers in academic survival skills considered critical for success in kindergarten?

9. What are the similarities among kindergarten teachers, preschool teachers, and family day care providers in behaviors considered unacceptable in kindergarten?

10. What are the differences among kindergarten teachers, preschool teachers, and family day care providers in behaviors considered unacceptable in kindergarten?

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to address the second step of Thurman and Widerstrom's educational planning process (i.e., develop an inventory of critical tasks) in relation to academic survival skills necessary for success in kindergarten. The first task is to review the literature to gain a theoretical background and framework of academic survival skills for the kindergarten child. The second task is to ascertain which skills early childhood educators consider crucial for the child's successful survival in kindergarten.

A thorough search of the literature was undertaken to review the paradigm of early childhood special education for young children at-risk for school failure. There exists, however, very little data on academic survival skills that are needed for success in kindergarten. A comprehensive review of the literature confirmed the fact that no systematic research clearly indicates skills needed by young children at-risk for school failure.

In order to ascertain which skills early childhood educators consider crucial for the child's successful survival in kindergarten, the Social Behavior Skills Inventory (Walker & Rankin, 1980) was utilized as a survey to obtain the relevant data. The survey obtained data that determines the specific social competence and academic survival skills needed by kindergarten children in Calaveras, Amador, and Tuolumne Counties in rural California. A further purpose of this study has been to assess preschool teachers' and family day care providers' perceptions of skills needed for success in local kindergartens.

Chapter II addresses the following topics: (a) a synopsis of early childhood special education which includes the historical background and the conceptual bases; (b) a discussion of social competence and the at-risk child; (c) an examination of appropriate goals and skills for the at-risk child; and (d) a summary, which synthesizes the literature and considers the implications.

Chapter III discusses the survey instrument used and the methodology employed in conducting the study. Included in this section is a brief description of the geographical area and survey participants, discussion of the Social Behavior Skills Inventory, and a full accounting of the methodology employed in conducting the survey.

The academic survival skills necessary for success in kindergarten in a particular geographical section of California were determined. The findings are thoroughly discussed in Chapter IV.

Chapter V summarizes these findings and address them from the the context of the literature review. Conclusions are made, and further recommendations given.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions will be employed. The definitions were derived from the literature and are consistent with previous research. These terms are central to the study and are listed in alphabetical order.

Academic survival skills: "those behaviors which enable...to take advantage of and respond to the instructional environment" (Greenwood, Hops, Delquadri, & Walker, 1974, p. 2). These skills are the "classroom behaviors that are essestial prerequisites to acquiring knowledge in an academic situation" (Cobb, 1972, p. 170). Academic survival skills may be regarded as basic cognitive information, experiences and behaviors that provide a strong foundation for academic or school related knowledge. In the literature, this concept is also referred to by the following terms: critical skills (Dettre, 1983), survival skills (Cobb, 1972), social behavior skills (Walker &

Rankin, 1980). Since the literature refers to these same skills, but different terms are used throughout the literature, this study will use the term academic survival skills.

At-risk: "children with potential school learning problems" who may later be considered "for possible placement in special education programs" (Keogh, Tchir, & Windeguth-Behn, 1974, p. 43). For the purpose of this paper, children who may later be considered for possible retention in kindergarten or grade 1 will also be deemed at-risk.

At-risk for school failure: the child does not have the skills necessary for survival in the regular classroom environment.

Social competence: "the child's everyday effectiveness in dealing with both present environment and later responsibilities in school and life" (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1984, p. 2).

Teacher expectations: standards that teachers have concerning the present and future achievement and general classroom behavior of their students.

Traditional skills: those skills that are common on standard developmental scales or checklist screening instruments, such as the Gesell developmental sequences, the Lexington Developmental Scale, and the Portage Guide

Checklist. Traditional skills are often referred to as developmental skills.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Early Childhood Special Education

Early childhood special education is a relatively new field of study. Not until the 1960s did the United States begin to focus on the education of its young. There was a big impetus for early intervention in the nation. There were social, anthropological, educational, and psychological reasons for this emphasis. The historical background should shed some light on the conceptual development and relatively recent formulation of the field of early childhood special education. The influential educational and social forces and the resulting legislation affecting handicapped young children are briefly delineated.

Historical Background

During the late 1950s and early 1960s the work of a few writers greatly influenced public awareness of the environmental influence on the development and intelligence of the child. Hunt (1961), Bloom (1964), Skeels (1966), and Gordon (1972) are among those who stressed the significance of a facilitating environment for the optimal development of children and emphasized the importance of early years' experiences. Hunt (1961) opposed the notion of fixed intelligence and abilities in favor of a new

orientation emphasizing the power of a child's environment to affect intellectual growth, and posited using preschool enrichment as an "antidote" for cultural deprivation. Bloom (1964) examined longitudinal research conducted throughout the world and reached the same conclusion. Bloom's data also indicated that intellectual growth occurred most rapidly in the first 5 years of life. Variability in an individual's performance was found to be greatest in the early years, but dwindled as the growth rate diminished. Bloom concluded that the best time to enrich the environment and affect intellectual growth was this period of rapid development, the first 5 years of life.

The studies by Skeels (1966) on the positive, lasting effects that early stimulation could have on young "mentally retarded" children had a significant impact on the fields of early childhood education and that of special education. The results of his studies and those of Kirk (1958) demonstrated the importance of early stimulation on intellectual development. The findings and statements by these scholars greatly influenced educational policy for young handicapped children after the middle of the 20th century. Educators began to point out that it was short-sighted and wasteful to have so-called compensatory education in elementary and secondary schools when early

intervention (pre-kindergarten programs) might prove more efficient. This concept concomittantly carried over to include early intervention in special education.

The early educational intervention of Operation Head Start was both a result of the recognition of the importance of children's early experience and a cause of the current awareness of the importance of these early years. In 1964 Head Start was implemented as part of the Economic Opportunity Act and the War on Poverty. Recent research and follow-up studies have indicated that Head Start positively affects the school success of its former enrollees. Children who attended Head Start were less likely to be assigned to special education classes or to fail in school (Impact of Head Start, 1985). A few years after Head Start began, federal commitment to provide experimental early intervention for young handicapped children and infants was initiated by Congressional passage of the Handicapped Children Early Education Assistance Act (HCEEAA) of 1968. Support for this legislation was based on Head Start's focus on early intervention and education for "disadvantaged" young children, research, past studies, and strong grass root support from parents (Swan, 1981).

The intent of this act (HCEEAA), Public Law 90-538, was to experiment with the process of educating young handicapped children from birth to 8 years and to develop

models that could be replicated in other settings. Further, HCEEAA was directed toward planning, experimentation, and innovation. The first group of projects, called First Chance Projects, were funded in 1969 by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped. The program was designed to be catalytic. Projects were supported that demonstrated high quality comprehensive services utilizing a variety of approaches in a wide range of settings and situations (Martin, 1971). This focus on utilizing a variety of approaches precipitated the development of new and innovative curricula designs.

In the 1970's "very early childhood education was deemed to deserve particular attention because of the facility with which young children profit from certain kinds of educational experiences" (Doll, 1982, p. 15). In 1972 the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments (P.L. 92-424) established a mandate that required 10% or more of the total number of Head Start placements to be reserved for handicapped children. Some Title I Preschool and Title XX Day Care funds were applied to providing services for handicapped preschool children and their families. This additional funding was supported by provisions in Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Amendments of 1973 (P.L. 93-112), relating to basic civil rights and discrimination against handicapped individuals (Cohen, Semmes & Guralnick, 1979).

In 1975 P.L. 94-142 was passed, requiring that all handicapped children in educational programs have an individualized education program designed specifically to meet their educational needs, and that they have a right to be educated in the least restrictive environment that is appropriate to their needs. This law effectively mainstreams many handicapped children into the regular education classes and requires parent involvement as an integral part of special education (and early childhood special education) policies. In addition, funding from the federal government on HCEEAA has continued into the present decade. In 1980 there were 177 early childhood special education programs operating under HCEEAA funding demonstrating service delivery models to handicapped preschoolers and their parents (Mori & Olive, 1980).

The large number of laws in the area of special education for young children indicates a very substantial federal role. However, this movement has only emerged in the past 25 years. The burgeoning special education programs of the late 1950s and 1960s were preponderantly based on categorical handicaps and conducted apart from regular education classes, applying the philosophy of compensatory education to special education (LaVor, 1977). "The concept of a deliberate, planned intervention is, for

practical purposes, a phenomenon of the sixties" (Glick, 1971, p. 5).

In considering future directions in 1976, Reynolds and Rosen discussed three points that were relevant to the field of early childhood special education. First, schools should place less emphasis on the kind of handicap a child has and more on the child's learning problems. Children should receive special help on the basis of their problems, not their handicapping condition. Second, they foresaw the federal government intervening to upgrade schools, teacher training, and educational programs in those areas of the country where educational opportunities did not meet the educational standard. Third, since schools are social institutions, the future direction of early childhood special education was "inexorably related to the future of the nation and to the directions it takes politically, economically, socially, ecologically, and industrially" (p. 8).

The early 1980s, however, reflected a concern for quality in programs for young children. The National Association for the Education of Young Children (1982), the Council for Exceptional Children (1983), and the California State Department of Education (Office of Program Evaluation, 1982) published standards for quality programs and education for young children. This coincided with the

national general educational movement towards accountability (Doll, 1982; O'Connell, 1983). As this suggests, the prevailing focus has been on culture-fair developmental assessment linked with a prescriptive curricula. In early childhood special education there has been a need for linkage and coordination of assessment and curriculum programming (Bagnato & Neisworth, 1981).

A recent push for significant expansion of services to young children with special needs has been the federal legislation passed and signed into law in 1986. Public Law 99-457 amends current law by increasing incentive grants to states to educate handicapped children 3 to 5 years of age. The law also mandates states to serve all handicapped children 3 to 5 years of age by 1990 or forfeit their incentive grant funding. This denotes strong, current federal pressure to promote services for young children with special needs.

The Melding of Special Education and Child Development

In the past, special education has been based on a medical model of biological and physical deficiency (Kauffman & Hallahan, 1974). This deficiency concept assumes that children who lack certain skills or abilities cannot function appropriately. The adherents to this model posit that some physical or emotional trauma(s) occurred to

the child which has interfered with the child's ability to perform some educational tasks. Following the medical profession, this model suggests that after identification of specific disabilities and/or causative factors, educational remediation, or correctional procedures can be instituted. This is the same concept behind the compensatory programs for the educationally disadvantaged (Bender & Bender, 1979).

Special education focuses on how the teacher should deal with the individual child, drawing from the field of learning theory to provide a technology for arranging the instructional environment to enhance the child's skill learning (Vincent, Salisbury, Walter, Brown, & Gruenwald, 1980). Operant conditioning, shaping, cueing, chaining, behavior modification and task analysis are all an integral part of special education instructional strategies.

Early childhood education has traditionally been based on a "child development" model. The child development model emphasizes the importance of normalization based on established norms for acceptable, age-appropriate behaviors and skills. A holistic view of the child is stressed. Each child is regarded as a unique combination of abilities--cognitive, physical, social, emotional, and psycho-motor. The child functions as a member of a group; the educator works with a group of

children (Almy, 1975; Cryan & Surbeck, 1979; Frost & Kissinger, 1976; Gordon, 1972; Weikert, 1972).

In early childhood special education, child development contributed developmental milestones utilized by special educators as guidelines for age appropriate behavioral objectives. Special education has contributed the specific techniques of applying behavioral objectives, operant conditioning, and task analysis to methods of teaching the young child normal developmental skills. The mainstreaming movement of the 1970s and early 1980s can be seen as a reversal of the medical deficiency model to a special educational model to remediate or cope with the handicapping conditions. Early childhood special education has emerged from recent legal and governmental push toward services and programming for young children and the transition of the medical model of handicappism to the special education mode. This concern for young children with exceptional needs, and the shift in emphasis from the medical to an educational perspective, has helped to cause the rapid development of the field of early childhood special education.

Early childhood special education derives much from past research and present knowledge in child development and special education, but is also a rapidly expanding field in its own right. The marriage of child development

and special education has yielded modified theories, innovative models and techniques, and impressive research. The growing field of early childhood special education demands programs and curricula that reflect and deliver relevant content and skills for young children. Current emphasis on cost effectiveness and accountability of educational programs will have great import on future social and political directions for early childhood special education.

A focus on appropriate goals may also provide early childhood special education with a more efficient means to document cost effectiveness and program accountability, which are demanded by today's society. Perhaps if early childhood special education professionals and researchers were able to better measure what they were teaching, they might come up with substantial findings in differences in the efficacy of early childhood special education programs.

Curricula Goals and Skills

Curriculum has been defined as programmatic goals or targets (skills) for instruction, as the content of education, or as a planned arrangement of learning experiences (Mori & Neisworth, 1983). Each of these definitions makes clear that curriculum should be thought of as synonymous with program content.

Early childhood special education's curricula and programs are often classified as: developmental, behavioral, Piagetian (cognitive-developmental), Montessori, or diagnostic-prescriptive (Anastasiow, 1978; Cook & Armbruster, 1983). These groupings follow a theoretical framework based on learning theory and child development theory. The groupings differ markedly in the way the child is perceived as the learner--from an active discoverer and inventor of knowledge (Piagetian, Montessori), to a passive receiver of knowledge (behavioral).

Another way that early childhood special education curricula and programs have been classified is along the matrix of: teacher-child interaction, child-material interaction, and child-child interaction (Almy, 1975). Sometimes early childhood special education curricula and programs are classified by the handicapping condition of the children they serve; other times by the physical set-up of program services--in-home, center, or combination home-center (Bricker, 1986). All of these early childhood special education program groupings reflect categorization by methods or teaching strategies, with the exception of the classification by handicapping condition. None of these groupings is based on curricula goals or skills.

Various studies dealing with the effectiveness of specific early intervention approaches have begun to appear in the literature (Reynolds, Egan, & Lerner, 1983). Researchers are currently addressing the effectiveness issue and looking to the future to provide answers to questions as: "Is one form/model of intervention more effective than another in selected areas under specified conditions?" (Swan, 1981, p.2) "In established programs, which individual strategies can be manipulated to give the most positive results?" (Reynolds, Egan, & Lerner, 1983, p. 54) But there has been little or no focus on goals. Questions of the appropriateness of certain goals and skills have been addressed by relatively few researchers (Simner, 1983).

Classification of the goals and skills would help to define the scope and purpose of early childhood special education, and to set guidelines for resolving some of the questions previously mentioned. In early childhood special education the goals and skills have been confused with the methods throughout the literature. The goal "becomes of huge importance the moment we take it as defining a present direction of movement" (Dewey, 1902, p.18). Visualized in this way, the goal and skills are the end result and the instructional strategies are the methods used in achieving the goal and skills. A curriculum is basically a set or

pattern of educational goals and the skills which are related to the goals. The curriculum is the "what to teach" of the early childhood special education program (Bagnato & Neisworth, 1981, p. 109). The particular curriculum utilized should be a primary consideration, both for the program and for the child's needs. Curriculum goals and skills should lead directly to remediating and effacing the handicapping or at-risk category of the children in the program.

The critical test of early intervention efforts is whether they lead to effective services that benefit young children and alleviate the need for special services in later years. The "types" of services have been addressed (strategies, categories), but not the goals and skills of the services.

Closely related to a consideration of appropriate goals is the question of the validity of tests used as early predictors. Simply stated, what tests used in the preschool years may be relied upon as valid indicators of future school success or failure? Readiness screening at school entrance or during the kindergarten year has become almost routine in many school districts. A variety of screening and readiness tests have been developed to assess facets of children's development assumed to be related to later school success. Reliability and validity of many

items for prediction of school success is as yet uncertain, however (Keogh & Becker, 1973).

The reason for this is that educational goals are not always precise. Are goals defined in terms of IQ, standardized achievement test norms, achievement comparable to mental age expectancies, consistency of performance with parental expectancy, or mastery of subject matter? Are social and affective goals as well as academic ones taken into account? Is the concern with immediate or long term goals? Lack of clarity of appropriate goals complicates prediction (Keogh & Becker, 1973).

When studies focus on younger children, the educational goals represent a more heterogeneous view of the child than do studies of older children. This situation may reflect a discrepancy between those who study schools and those who study children. Educators have concentrated little of their energies in looking at the range of children's characteristics that specialists in child development typically consider (Weiss, 1980). Similarly, little attention has been paid by social psychologists to the inclusion of the educational setting in the study of socialization and social competence.

This discrepancy may be accounted for. First, the major theories of child development stress an holistic view of the child in early years, utilizing an ecological

perspective. Second, what we test for influences our notions of schooling. Testing instruments are limited in what they measure, not just from a technical standpoint but from a curricula perspective. This trend is illustrated in the comparison of the Head Start Study with those of National Evaluation of Follow Through (Cohen, Solnit, & Wohlford, 1979). The latter program was initiated as a follow up on how well Head Start youngsters fared in school after their preschool experience. The Coleman Report is another good example of this (Weiss, 1980). Follow-up testing and procedures that have more curricula validity need to be used.

Early intervention activities need to be directed by established goals and objectives. In order to ensure a systematic, cohesive approach, intervention and early childhood special education efforts should be organized around a set of program goals. These goals should dictate the program's target population, focus, content, instructional strategies, and evaluation efforts. Goals should serve as a functional set of organizational guidelines. Without appropriate and relevant goals, interventionists may be using instructional activities that are irrelevant and nonproductive for children.

One of the first questions to be asked in examining the applicability of a curriculum is, "Do skill sequences

in the curriculum include the skills needed by the children?" (Wolery, 1983, p. 152) Another question that should be considered in selecting curricula for young at-risk children is, "Does the curriculum focus of the skill domain that is most critical for the target population?" (DuBose & Kelly, 1981, p. 6) In educational areas, the advantage lies in the consideration of contextual features. This enables a researcher to adopt a curriculum to situational features, to determine consistency of responses, and to determine appropriateness of goals.

An important curriculum issue to be considered is the usefulness of selected skills for the at-risk child. The skills should be functional in that they lead to greater independence and adaptability. "The functionality of responses should be a major criterion in determining the content of the intervention program" (Bricker, 1986, p. 302). Children should master behavior and information that offers means for greater control over their environment (social competence). The ultimate goal for children is to become independent, self-sufficient, and socially competent. The aims and goals for the young, at-risk child should directly efface the child's at-risk status.

There are various goals among the myriad of early childhood special education programs and curricula. The

appropriateness of curricula goals is vital to the future of early childhood special education. There is a need to establish clear goals for the paradigm of early childhood special education for children at-risk for school failure. A discussion of social competence and at-risk may elucidate appropriate goals and skills for the young child at-risk for school failure. Goals for young at-risk children will be discussed in terms of their validity for school success.

Social Competence

The study of social competence has been stimulated by a growing disenchantment with the use of IQ as the major criterion of the success of educational intervention programs like Head Start. It has been proposed that an index of social competence be employed as the major goal for evaluating the effectiveness of early educational programs (Mott, Fewell, Lewis, Meisels, Shonkoff, & Simeonsson, 1986; Strain & Cordisco, 1983). Putallaz and Gottman (1982) cited several studies that indicate that variables associated with social competence may improve the predictability of academic success beyond the information provided solely by cognitive variables. In addition, the studies pointed out that both teachers and parents have rated certain behaviors associated with social competence, such as social skills, goal directedness, and emotional

stability, as more likely to lead to school and life success, than variables such as IQ and aptitude. Social competence is perceived as being useful as a replacement for IQ as a criterion evaluating educational intervention programs (Putallaz & Gottman, 1982). Gresham (1983) claims that the recent emphasis upon the development of social competence has been one of the most influential developments in the area of educational programming with both disadvantaged and handicapped children.

Few professionals in the field of early childhood special education would dispute the importance of social competence for young children, yet there is much disagreement over an appropriate definition. The need for an adoption of a universal definition of social competence was so great that, in 1973, the federal Office of Child Development commissioned a panel of 12 experts to jointly agree on one definition of the term. The committee arrived at a total of 29 statements as important facets of social competence. The committee believed that these could additionally serve as goals of early intervention programs. The 29 components of social competence included such factors as habits of personal maintenance and care, sensitivity and understanding in social relationships, morality and prosocial tendencies, fine motor dexterity, gross motor skills, language skills, general knowledge, and

positive attitudes toward learning and school experiences. The committee concluded their report by drawing attention to the need to operationalize the components of each of the 29 statements into appropriate measurement terms (Putallaz & Gottman, 1982).

Rather than advocate that social competence is a general trait, a profile of a child's social competence consisting of behavioral and cognitive skills that are associated with high risk criteria has been proposed (Putallaz & Gottman (1982). Social competence is viewed in terms of situationally specific abilities of a number of trainable components that include elements of motivation, perception, response patterns, self-confidence, and self-preservation.

The position that social competence is situation-specific has been advocated by other researchers (Odom & McConnell, 1985). This stand concurs with the definition of social competence proposed by Foster and Ritchey (1979), "responses which, within a given situation, prove effective or, in other words, maximize the probability of producing, maintaining, or enhancing positive effects for the interactor" (p. 626). Social competence relates directly to the child's actions within a social context.

A functional model of social competence offered this similar definition:

Social competence is thus defined as the infant or preschooler's ability to engage with adults or peers in interactions that (a) either elicit nurturing environmental responses or achieve desired goals, (b) are mutually satisfying to both the child and the person with whom he or she is interacting, and (c) are consistent with the adult or peer's expectations for socially competent behavior (Bailey & Simeonsson, 1985, pp. 21-22).

The definition is based on the assumption that social competence is relative to the context of both the demands of the situation and expectations for performance. The ecological perspective is taken into account.

These definitions of social competence force a consideration of context. Social competence has been defined as a capacity to respond or initiate behavior so as to obtain a desired goal. Also considered is that success at goal attainment can be judged differently depending on the evaluator, the task, the setting, the time frame, and the cultural and age norms. A child who lacks social competence skills for the kindergarten classroom is at-risk for school failure.

It is clear from the varied and numerous definitions that social competence has acquired in the literature that a great deal of confusion prevails as to precisely what is meant by the concept. Despite the wide usage of the term "social competence" and the vast amount of research the concept has generated, a consensus still has not been reached. Among the problems are (a) establishing a

universally agreed upon definition of the construct, (b) developing measures to assess social competence skills, and (c) using those measures effectively for planning curriculum for the young child at-risk for school failure (Bailey & Simeonsson, 1985; Hops, 1983).

The At-Risk Child

Early childhood special education is also designated for children who are at-risk for school failure. Few studies on the effects of early intervention have related to the at-risk group. The findings of several recent projects indicate that early intervention programs can significantly lessen the effects of at-risk factors. Hence, the services for the the at-risk group of children in early childhood special education may be cost effective (Efficacy and cost effectiveness, 1982; Garland, 1981; Smith, 1982).

The importance of early recognition of and intervention for children at-risk for school failure places responsibility on classroom teachers in the kindergarten and preschool, since teachers are being asked to identify problems before they are well-developed (Keogh & Becker, 1973). The young child at-risk for school failure displays a potential handicap rather than an actual one. Many young children are in high risk situations or are found to be at-risk of developing a handicapping condition.

Children can be assigned to the at-risk category for either biological or environmental factors. The concept of at-risk as applied to the classification of children indicates that presently the child is expected to catch up, is likely to recover, or is functioning normally. At-risk situations range from prenatal physiological and/or environmental factors, such as age and health of mother, genetic history, availability of adequate nutritional and medical resources, to postnatal factors, which include the previous factors as well as the health of the child and the ability of the mother and family to provide adequate care and protection (Smith, 1982). The at-risk concept indicates that factors or conditions place the child in greater jeopardy for failing to attain or maintain a subsequent normal rate or pattern of development than other children. Infants and children suffering some biological or medical insult have a higher percentage of neurological and developmental problems than other children (Bricker, 1986). Environmentally at-risk children are those for whom a factor or condition in the social or physical environment has a high probability of interfering with the child's normal developmental pattern. This terminology and classification is found throughout the literature.

The at-risk child is the mildly handicapped child, the one who is often overlooked in diagnosis and

programming, the child who can easily fall between the cracks of educational intervention. Mildly handicapped students seldom display characteristics that are obvious to the casual observer. The at-risk or handicapping condition becomes apparent through the interaction of the teaching/learning process in the classroom. The mildly handicapped or at-risk child may not be identified until the problem increases in severity and becomes obvious (Meyen & Moran, 1979). This is the child who will not do well enough in kindergarten to succeed, but will not perform poorly enough for special placement or for an individual educational plan to be developed. The identification and enrollment in early special education programs for at-risk children received the highest priority in O'Shea and Gajar's (1983) study of future trends for the field of special education.

Attempting to establish the number of children who are at-risk or handicapped is a difficult endeavor. For school-age children, the estimate of children requiring some special service generally ranges from 12% to 15%. For younger children, such percentages are more difficult to determine because of variations in definitions, eligibility guidelines, and services available across states (Smith, 1982). Even more elusive are data on children classified as at-risk because of variations in definitions, services,

and follow-up procedures not only across but within states (Bricker, 1986). Further, a paradox exists which should be acknowledged. If early identification and diagnosis were valid and early intervention successful, the preschool or kindergarten at-risk child would receive the kind of educational programming which resulted in school success (Mercer, Algozzine, & Trifiletti, 1980). In essence, the child would no longer be at-risk and would instead be socially competent. "Predictive validity of the identification instruments would, therefore, be low" (Keogh & Becker, 1973, p.7).

Children who lack essential preacademic knowledge and skills are considered at-risk for school failure. A child may also be at-risk for school failure, even though the factors relating to success or failure are social or affective. A number of school learning problems may be attributed to the interaction of child and learning situation (Keogh & Becker, 1973). These factors are behaviors that affect a child's success or failure in the school environment. Examples of these behaviors or academic survival skills are: following directions, standing in line, waiting for a turn, sharing, etc. (Dettre, 1983).

Relevant and functional activities need to be focused on, such as generic problem-solving skills, communication

with the social environment, and behaviors that will make the child more acceptable to the larger social community (Bricker, 1986). Developing the child's social competence may overcome possible effects of at-risk conditions (Keogh & Becker, 1973).

Although many curricula and programs are supposedly designed or adapted to accommodate the at-risk child, there has been little research conducted in this area. Full-scale prevention programs have been slow to develop because the definition of at-risk is frequently uncertain and because early identification techniques are often imprecise (Keogh & Daley, 1983).

What abilities, skills, or knowledge does the child need that will be required for success in the kindergarten classroom? Examining what is available in the literature on traditional and critical skills may provide possible answers to this question.

Traditional Skills

Most skills for at-risk children focus on the "traditional developmental milestones" of early childhood education. These are the skills normally required for success in traditional or regular preschool activities--stringing beads, naming colors, gross and fine motor development, language development, emotional development, and social skills. Cook and Armbruster (1983), Frost and

Kissinger (1976), and Hendrick (1980) are among the educators with this perspective. These educators usually come from a background in child development or early childhood education. Meisels (1979), with his Piagetian based development applied to young children with special needs, would also be in this category. These skills focus on "normalization" of the child toward the traditional developmental milestones.

Traditional skills are exclusively child focused and assume continuous, linear patterns of development (Keogh & Daley, 1983). They are based on the developmental tasks characteristic of most regular preschools and child development centers.

Various behavior inventories listing the traditional warning signs of school failure have been available for some time to help preschool and kindergarten teachers to recognize children who are likely to require special assistance in order to succeed (Denver Developmental Screening, The Development Profile, Portage Guide to Early Education Checklist, etc.). These inventories typically advise teachers to note, for example, whether children know the names of the body parts and their positions, know left from right, are able to identify colors and shapes by name, can cooperate, participate in group activities, and can walk a balance beam.

In addition, teachers are often advised to look for problems in such fine motor coordination activities as cutting, pasting, pencil use, and shoe tying. Teachers are also requested to notice which children are tense, cry easily, reverse letters and numbers when printing, and have trouble with copying tasks. Presumably, those preschool and kindergarten children who are experiencing difficulties in such areas are likely to have problems experiencing success in the elementary grades. However, it now appears that much of this advice might not be correct.

Criticisms of Traditional Skills

Traditional approaches to readiness assessment have been increasingly challenged in recent years. Originally derived from the Gesell Scales, their validity in terms of school success is currently being questioned. Hammill and Leigh (1983) state:

A major limitation of many standardized readiness tests involves the questionable relevance of many of the tasks contained within the tests. Frequently the tasks that the child is asked to perform bear little resemblance to those required in the classroom. For example, discriminating among geometric figures, stringing beads, repeating digits, using a pegboard, and coloring within lines are viewed by many diagnosticians and teachers as indicators of a child's "readiness" for school. Yet, none of these activities have been found to consistently predict a child's present or future school achievement in reading, writing, math, and so on. While such activities probably do provide useful information about some aspects of children's development, they certainly do not

provide information about the kind of development that is directly involved in school achievement. (p. 4)

Specialized early intervention for children identified as at-risk for school failure should encompass provision of the abilities, skills, and knowledge required for success in kindergarten and the early primary grades. McCormick and Kawate (1982) demand that "preschool special education programs which concentrate exclusively on identifying and ameliorating developmental deficits should have to empirically document the relevancy of these deficits to the children's functioning in future environments" (p. 250).

Simner is the only writer in the early childhood special education literature who examined research studies to look specifically for warning signs of school failure. His findings (1983) indicate that the overwhelming majority of ineffective signs are considered the traditional objectives and skills of early childhood education.

The profile of the at-risk preschool and kindergarten age child differs considerably from the profile conveyed by the lists of traditional warning signs found today on so many behavior and skill inventories. These children are not necessarily lacking in many basic motor, language, drawing, and copying skills when compared to the average child. Nor are these children necessarily shy, lonely,

withdrawn, or uncooperative. Instead, these children are far more likely to display other types of characteristic behaviors and remedial needs such as not following directions, or attending to the task at hand (Simner, 1983).

Survival Skills

A recently posited conceptualization of at-risk children emphasizes the use of survival skills required for successful functioning in the school environment. This perspective is brought clearly into focus when academic survival skills are considered as behaviors and skills necessary and appropriate for the regular and mainstreamed child. Survival skills supporters claim that beyond certain prerequisites for school success such as adequate intellectual capability, intact sensory functioning, and appropriate background of experience, there are other prerequisites beyond these traditional requirements for school success. School readiness must be defined and measured in relation to the specific content and skills involved in the academic, linguistic, and behavioral areas directly associated with school performance (Leigh, 1983).

Academic survival skills are a group of overt classroom behaviors that are essential prerequisites for acquiring knowledge in an academic situation. They are not academic behaviors per se, but provide the conditions

conducive to academic responding. Academic survival skills are behavioral skills required for the acquisition of academics in school. In order for children to make correct academic responses, they must be able to perform those behaviors which enable them to take advantage of and respond to the instructional environment. Such behaviors, as being in the correct area of the classroom, looking at the teacher and materials at the right time, following teacher's directions and commands, volunteering answers to teacher's questions, and asking questions when materials or directions are unclear, are seen as necessary for correct academic responses.

Children who have deficits in these skills are thought to be unable to participate constructively in the school learning environment. Students can maximize their learning experiences only when academic survival skills are utilized.

Academic survival skills are often developed by the interaction of the child's prior learning before entering the school environment and the present stimulus conditions in the classroom. For some children the past environment has been one in which situations that have much in common with the school environment occur frequently; adults or older children provide many learning experiences in which the child acquires academic survival skills. The child

learns to attend while stories are being read, to follow instructions in structured play activities, and to work independently for long periods of time. Other children have not yet developed academic survival skills before they enter kindergarten, and may not have had these early experiences. Thus, they enter the classroom situation lacking those skills. "It seems essential that such children receive, as part of the curriculum, training in such skills in order to enable them to profit from the learning environment" (Cobb, 1972, p.171).

When children enter the school setting into the kindergarten classroom, they are required to make a major social-behavioral adjustment. That is, they must meet the teacher's behavioral and academic expectations (H. Walker, 1984). Children's ability to make this adjustment is heavily dependent upon their academic survival skills and social competence. When children are placed in a classroom in which they cannot meet the teacher's minimal behavioral standards, the consequences for the children are likely that they will experience failure.

The functional model is based on the premise that development should be viewed as the acquisition of those skills that will immediately or in the future improve a child's ability to interact with the environment and to become more self-sufficient, independent, and socially

competent. The content of such a curriculum consists of those goals and skills that are or will be functional for the child. This is one approach that links goals or curriculum development with their educational functions.

The essential aspect of a functional curriculum approach is establishing relevant goals. The goals are then be analyzed in terms of their observable behaviors and the environmental conditions necessary to teach these behaviors. Thus, the primary role of early intervention is to assess the child's current behavioral repertoire, to operationalize the target responses, and to assist the child in acquiring these responses (LeBlanc, Etzel, & Domash, 1978).

The survival skills functional model encourages acquisition of the knowledge, abilities, and skills that clearly are prerequisites for successful school performance. It does not advocate pushing young children to learn to read, write or do mathematics before they are developmentally capable of mastering such a task (Leigh, 1983). Pre-reading, -writing, and -math skills can be taught in preschool to prepare academically at-risk children, and give them the confidence and ability to competently deal with kindergarten and first grades tasks. Various researchers have examined skills specific to a certain academic area. For example, Clay (1979) and Johns

(1980) have expressly looked at pre-reading skills in children's understanding of the "concepts of print." They have researched whether the child realizes what books are for, the right to left progression, recognition of a word or a letter, and the relationship of pictures to words.

Basic readiness concepts considered by some survival skills supporters to be highly-related to academic performance include skills and abilities of: attention span, distractibility, and memory span; following directions; verbal fluency; interest and participation in group activities; form errors in printing; and concepts of print and books. Many of these skills and abilities are lacking in children at-risk for school success (Clay, 1979; Hammell & Leigh, 1983; Leigh, 1983; Simner 1983).

Other academic survival skills are related to coping with classroom rules, routines, and school. These are behavioral skills which include: getting into a line; waiting to take turns and sharing; knowing their way around school; finding needed materials; attending to task; and working independently (Fewell, 1983). McKinney (1979) found that "high-risk children show less appropriate classroom behavior than their...classmates" (p. 14). Many skills, not traditionally considered readiness skills, are important for young children to develop before entering the mainstream of kindergarten or first grade.

"Teachers are accustomed to a certain level of appropriate behaviors in pupils before dispensing instruction, especially direct instruction, which is critical to many handicapped children if they are to acquire academic skills." (Hersh & Walker, 1983, p. 160)

Similarities and differences in teacher's perceptions of child behaviors indicative of educational at-risk were researched (Keogh, Tchir, & Windeguth-Behn, 1974). The highest ranked descriptors at that time were: hyperactive, aggressive, short attention span, disruptive, talking, noisemaking, lack of responsibility, and withdrawn. Learning-related behavior should be considered as an important item in education. "Learning-related behavior refers to attendance, time devoted to learning or problem solving, self-discipline, initiative, cooperativeness, and performance (not in a paper-and-pencil setting)" (Weiss, 1980, p. 430).

From the academic survival skills model, suggestions arise that most screening instruments for the young child may overlook behaviors and skills that are needed for the child's survival and success in kindergarten (Dettre, 1983). By identifying criteria of the future school environment, advocates of this approach prefer criterion-referenced skills rather than developmentally normalized milestones (Dettre, 1983; Fewell, 1983).

Many children fail to achieve not because of low ability, but because they are unable to sustain themselves in a classroom setting. The interpersonal dynamics of instruction are often overlooked in early intervention curricula models. Cobb (1972) has identified behaviors which, if acquired, will enhance a child's survival in the classroom. These academic survival skills are: attending to the teacher, volunteering, following instructions, and looking at appropriate material. Attending to the teacher emerged as the most significant indicator of school failure.

The behavior and interaction of mildly handicapped and typical kindergarten students with their teachers was investigated (Walter & Vincent, 1982). Characteristics distinguishing successful and unsuccessful students were identified. The researchers found that task behavior and independent task performance were correlated with success. Also important for success were appropriate classroom and rule following behaviors as follows: (a) looking at, watching, or viewing teacher-presented tasks, teacher presentations, teacher-approved tasks, and children answering teacher questions; (b) working (writing, reading, drawing, painting) on teacher-assigned or approved tasks; (c) volunteering information related to academic or management matters either verbally or by raising the hand,

according to teacher's rules; (d) answering teacher questions on either academic or management matters; (e) following teacher directions, instructions, or commands; and (f) talking to peers about academic matters (depending on teacher's rules) (Walter & Vincent, 1982).

Whereas, inappropriate behaviors which actively compete or are incompatible with survival skills consist of the following behaviors: (a) looking around or away from the appropriate task or materials at hand; (b) out-of-seat without teacher permission (depending on teacher's rules); (c) verbal and/or behavioral non-compliance with teacher requests, commands, or instructions; and (d) hitting, threatening, or aggressing other children (Greenwood, Hops, Delquadri, & Walker, 1974; Hersh & Walker, 1983; Hops & Cobb, 1972).

A review of the literature on survival skills needed for school success was recently conducted by McCormick and Kawate (1982). Their research revealed that many skills needed for academic survival are different from those assessed by school readiness screenings. Their findings are listed in Table 1.

TABLE 1
Academic Survival Skills in the Literature
(McCormick and Kawate, 1982)

Responds to and follows directions
Participates in classroom activities and groups
Initiates a new activity without assistance
Completes assignments on time
Asks for help when needed
Tries before giving up
Attends to the task at hand
Volunteers for various tasks
Follows classroom rules and procedures
Stands in line
Takes turns and shares materials
Sits quietly in a group
Raises hand to speak
Asks and answers questions
Controls impulses

Children spend a considerable amount of their time in school. Since a significant measure of students' competencies is the extent to which they cope with the school's environment, the curriculum should include the development of skills that facilitate adjustment in school (Stephens, 1977).

Based on this assumption, Stephens (1977) developed a social skills curriculum contained in his Directive Teaching Instructional Management System (DTIMS). It covers four categories of behavior: environmental, interpersonal, self-related, and task-related behaviors. Although not specifically developed for preschool or

kindergarten age children, many of the skills in the curriculum are relevant for young children.

Numerous behaviors may be related to the school's environment including: care for environment, dealing with emergencies, lunchroom behaviors, and movement around the environment. Interpersonal behaviors cover 10 areas: accepting authority, coping with conflict, gaining attention, greeting others, helping others, making conversation, organized play, positive attitude toward others, informal play, and care of property. These represent routine, but important, interpersonal behaviors. Self-related behaviors includes: accepting consequences for one's actions, ethical behavior, expressing feelings, positive attitude toward self, responsible behavior, and self-care. Task-related behaviors cover 10 areas of: asking and answering questions, attending behavior, classroom discussion, completing tasks, following directions, group activities, independent work, on-task behaviors, performing before others, and quality of work.

The Directive Teaching Instructional Management System (DTIMS) Social Skills curriculum does not attempt to include every social competence skill needed for school. However, it assists teachers to consciously instruct students in many skills necessary for school success. Often these behaviors are acquired by children indirectly

through various life experiences. Learning-disabled and at-risk students are often so labeled because they lack these behaviors (Stephens, 1977).

Few teacher rating scales have been designed specifically for assessing children's academic survival skills or social competence skills. The development of the Social Behavior Assessment (SBA) instrument by Stephens (1978) is an important contribution to the field. Stephens developed the scale in conjunction with his social skills curriculum. By collecting items from 12 behavior rating scales, conducting classroom observations of behaviors, and reviewing relevant literature, a final list of skills was selected for inclusion in the instrument. The list was standardized by having 200 regular education and 200 special education teachers randomly selected to rate the skills. For each skill, the teachers responded on a six-point scale to the statement: This behavior is important for success in my class. The scale ranged from strong agreement to strong disagreement. The resulting scale consists of 136 skills grouped into four categories: (a) behaviors related to the environment, (b) interpersonal behaviors, (c) self-related behaviors, and (d) task-related behaviors. The Social Behavior Assessment was designed to assist multidisciplinary teams in assessing the social competence skills of handicapped children and providing

information to make informed judgments regarding a child's readiness for mainstreaming.

Extensive studies of survival skill training for first grade students were done by Hops and Cobb (1973). Their findings indicated that training in academic survival skills not only increased survival skills but achievement in reading also significantly increased compared to control groups. A causal relationship between survival skills and academic achievement in first grade was demonstrated. The researchers claimed that the results of their study clearly indicated that teachers can increase the level of the student's survival skills so that academic achievement can be improved.

Increase of academic survival skills should also decrease inappropriate or maladaptive behaviors related to the child's behavior in the school setting. Inappropriate behaviors presenting extensive instructional difficulties have been identified in the following areas: (a) attention levels that demand close supervision and intensive monitoring by teachers; (b) persistent rule-breaking and non-compliant behavior; and (c) failure to generalize the use of skills learned in one setting or context to another (Strain & Cordisco, 1983).

One curriculum program, Project PREP (Preparation for Regular Education Placement), teaches students the

necessary behaviors for interacting with teachers in academic settings. Instruction and programming to increase the levels of social competence and adaptive behavior of handicapped preschool children is provided (Odom & McConnell, 1985).

The literature reviewed so far has revealed academic survival skills and social competence as being behavioral skills. Upon further investigation, however, similar concepts and skills can be found in another area of research.

Rating the Affective Domain (RAD) is a 70 item, 5 point Likert-type rating scale designed to assess a student's current observable behavior and attitude (Hughes & Frommer, 1982). Many of the items or tasks on the Rating the Affective Domain scale are similar to the behavior skills research and inventories. Take, for example, the following item numbers:

- #1. Establish and maintain eye contact with teacher
- #2. Accept task assigned by teacher
- #3. Select appropriate materials
- #4. Ask for assistance in beginning task when needed
- #5. Begin task promptly
- #6. Follow through assigned task
- #7. Accept offers of help from teacher (p. 521).

This is a fairly systematic approach that may be used to identify and prescribe desirable behaviors and attitudes for students. A criterion-referenced social competence curriculum has also been developed to complement

the Rating the Affective Domain scale (Hughes & Frommer, 1982). The curriculum is divided into four major behavioral skill areas, each of which is further divided into sub-areas of clusters of skills:

1. Task-Individual includes sub-areas of initiating a task, working independently on a task, completing a task.

2. Social Interaction includes peer relationships of one or two peers, small groups, and larger groups.

3. Relationship to Teacher relates to a positive working relationship between student and teacher.

4. Emotional Responses relates to establishing positive responses and accepting emotional responses (behaviors) towards others, and behavioral responses in relation to environment when the student is under stress.

Skills needed for success in school are not strictly cognitive. Affective behaviors and positive attitudes are also critical to social competence and academic survival.

Many studies contain evidence that teachers are surprisingly accurate predictors of future successes and problems (Keogh, Tchir, & Windeguth-Behn, 1974). On this basis, it is reasonable to conclude that teachers can recognize behaviors indicative of risk in the early school grades; teachers can recognize children who are not adjusting to the academic or social environment of school.

Particular emphasis on teacher standards, expectations, and tolerance levels in relation to students' behavior, as opposed to their academic achievement is the focus of recent research (Hersh & Walker, 1983).

For most classroom teachers children's successful adjustment would be evidenced by a behavioral repertoire that (a) facilitates academic performance (listening to the teacher, following instructions and directions, working on assigned tasks, complying with teacher requests, etc.) and (b) is marked by the absence of disruptive and/or unusual behaviors that challenge the teacher's authority and disrupt classroom atmosphere or are objectionable to the teacher and difficult for her or him to cope with. Most teachers demand this kind of behavioral repertoire from all children assigned to their classrooms (p. 151).

Those children who cannot or will not meet these standards and expectations are at-risk for school failure.

Research on success in school stresses the crucial role played by teacher expectations. "At present, we do not know what an optimal profile of teachers' standards and expectations for either academic or social behavior should look like" (Hersh & Walker, 1983). Research has shown, however, that teachers do appear to have minimal standards and expectations for children in their classrooms (Doyle, 1982).

Teachers of mainstreamed kindergartens maintain that classroom and rule-following behaviors are important for the child's success in school (Walter & Vincent, 1982).

Studies have also indicated academic survival skills have a high positive correlation with achievement in kindergarten and subsequent elementary school grades (Hops & Cobb, 1973). The investigation and research done by Walter and Vincent (1982) provide support that certain behavioral skills are needed for success in the kindergarten classroom.

From the academic survival skills model, suggestions arise that most screening instruments for the young child may overlook behaviors and skills that are crucial for the child's survival and success in kindergarten (Dettre, 1983; McCormick & Kawate, 1982). By identifying criteria of the future school environment, advocates of this approach prefer criterion-referenced skills rather than developmentally normalized milestones (Dettre, 1983; Fewell, 1983).

Advocates of academic survival skills recommend identifying the criteria of the future school environment. The importance of determining academic survival skills based on criteria of appropriate kindergarten and first grade behavior is addressed by Dettre (1983), Fowler (1978), and McCormick and Kawate (1982). "A preliminary step in teaching should include identification and analysis of future environments" (Fowler, 1978, p. 1). The necessity of assessing and providing kindergarten and first

grade survival skills has also been strongly supported by others (Keogh & Becker, 1973; Keogh & Daley, 1983).

Education of children in preschool compensatory, special education, or regular programs should emphasize those skills most crucial to prepare them for success in the next environment. The educational environment that is targeted for these children usually is the normal or mainstreamed kindergarten classroom. Academic survival skills are those that (a) distinguish between school success and failure; (b) teachers believe to be important; and (c) are necessary for participation in school learning activities. Academic survival skills appear relevant and crucial to success in the primary grades. Therefore, the acquisition of these skills in early childhood special education programs should be emphasized.

The SBS Inventory

One way to determine needed academic survival skills is to measure teachers' expectations and standards for the classroom. The Social Behavior Skills Inventory of Teacher Social Behavior Standards and Expectations (SBS Inventory) was developed by Walker and Rankin (1980). This is a survey instrument which identifies teacher expectations of the child's behavior in an elementary classroom setting. Academic survival skills critical to the child's success in

the classroom are listed. Also listed are behaviors considered inappropriate to the classroom setting.

The Social Behavior Skills Inventory consists of the specific standards and expectations that teachers hold for child behavior in the classroom as measured by self-report inventory. As used in this instrument, teacher social behavior standards and expectations refer to (a) the degree of importance that teachers place upon academic survival skills in the classroom (e.g., complying with teacher requests, making assistance needs known, following established classroom rules), and (b) the degree to which the teacher is not accepting of inappropriate child behaviors in the classroom (e.g., disturbing others, refusing to share, stealing, defying the teacher).

Hersh and Walker (1983) found that individual teachers differ dramatically in their tolerance levels and standards of expectations regarding academic survival skills and child behavior in the classroom. In comparisons of regular and special education groups of teachers, however, there was not much difference between regular education teachers and special education teachers.

Teachers' social behavior standards and expectations appear to be very stable among both regular classroom and special education teachers. Both groups are very similar in the level and degree of importance they assign to adaptive classroom behavior and the degree of tolerance they show for maladaptive, inappropriate behavior. Regular

and special education teachers also are very similar in the actual adaptive behaviors they rate as most and least important and in the maladaptive behaviors they rate as least and most acceptable. (p. 165)

Doyle (1982) had similar findings in his research with the SBS Inventory.

The SBS Inventory was used to look at preschool teachers' expectations of appropriate behavior in early childhood education classrooms (J. Walker, 1984). The level of formal education among Head Start teachers to their standards and expectations for handicapped children in their classes was examined. The findings indicated that there was no correlation. In summarizing the study, Walker noted that other factors which were not considered might have influenced the data.

Summary

The combining of early childhood education with special education is a relatively recent phenomena in the history of education. A new field of early childhood special education has emerged which has not yet formed a cohesive domain of theory and practice. One of the problems within the field is the confusion of goals and skills with instructional methods.

This review of the literature has examined the issue of appropriate goals and skills for young children at-risk for school failure. The goals and skills of early

childhood special education programs are crucial for the future success of at-risk children in the kindergarten and primary grades. There is no consensus in the field of early childhood special education on the prerequisites for success in kindergarten. This section questioned the assumed validity that the mastery of traditional early childhood education skills provides the necessary background and training for success in the early school years.

The review of the literature has shown that many preschool and kindergarten traditional readiness skills are not necessarily associated with the child's success in school. Educators need to recognize that other skills and behaviors, such as those noted by Simner (1983), McCormick and Kawate (1982), and Walker and Rankin (1980), may be crucial to school success for the young at-risk child. Academic survival skills should be considered in early childhood special education curricula for the at-risk child. These pre-requisite academic and behavior skills may be needed to effectively survive in the regular kindergarten classroom. In the literature reviewed however, few references to critical skills for young children at-risk for school success were found. There were few theories and little research regarding this area of curricular concerns.

From the academic survival skills model, suggestions arise that most screening instruments for the child at-risk for school failure may be overlooking behaviors and skills that are crucial for the child's survival and success in kindergarten and first grade. From the traditional developmental approach, the academic survival skills model reduces the emphasis on screening for and teaching various developmental skills, which are also important for later school success. This argument leads to the issue of which skills are crucial and/or important to success in kindergarten and the primary grades. In ideological disputes like this one, researchers and educators tend to take sides, when the actual problem is how to synthesize the opposing points of view and develop a strong cohesiveness within the field. Even if this ideological problem was resolved, the current emphasis on holistic education requires that early childhood special education programs attempt to graduate socially competent children, who will be successful in kindergarten.

Within the last 10 years, early childhood special education has grown into a legitimate field that combines information and expertise from special education and early childhood education. Professionals in this field have come to realize that early-intervention programs must specifically address the needs of the target population.

An era of professionalism has been entered. To maintain professional standards, programs should be carefully developed using sound conceptual foundations and goals that permit the young child to develop the specific skills needed for social competence and academic survival.

Too little time and effort have been directed at clearly defining the at-risk child and establishing appropriate and effective goals and skills for early intervention programs. Until the field of early childhood special education is able to generate more definite findings on social competence and its relation to school success, it seems wise to assume that quality early intervention is necessary to assist these children in the acquisition of adaptive responses that lead to social competence. On this basis, academic survival skills need to be developed until the child provides clear evidence of being able to cope successfully with environmental demands in kindergarten.

The implications of these findings are clear. All children, regardless of ability level, must first be taught the prerequisite skills that will enable them to take advantage of educational opportunities offered in the classroom. Children must learn to look at the book before they can learn to read from it, whether it be a basal reader or library book. Intervention procedures are,

therefore, required which will facilitate the teaching of necessary survival skills prior to teaching the academic task itself (Hops & Cobb, 1972).

Curricular strategies for at-risk preschool and kindergarten children can build bridges between current functioning and the next educational environment. The first task in operationalizing this intent becomes a consideration of that environment--kindergarten--in terms of needed academic survival skills.

The chapters of this study that follow describe research that was designed specifically to provide empirical data on academic survival skills needed for success in kindergarten. The SBS Inventory was utilized to gather this information. By surveying family day care providers, preschool teachers, and kindergarten teachers, various perceptions of academic survival skills needed by the young child at-risk for school failure were obtained.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This study utilized the The Social Behavior Skills Inventory of Teacher Social Behavior Standards and Expectations (SBS Inventory), Sections I and II to determine the academic survival skills considered important for preschool children at-risk for school failure. The Social Behavior Skills Inventory is an ecological assessment instrument that focuses on measuring the behavioral demands or expectations that exist in the educational setting. This survey instrument, when completed, provided information on the minimum behavioral requirements considered necessary for success in the kindergarten setting. The study was designed to indicate similarities and differences among early childhood educators in (a) academic survival skills considered necessary for success in kindergarten, and (b) behaviors considered inappropriate for kindergarten.

The study comprehensively covered a three county area in northern California. Data were collected on the populations throughout the rural counties of Calaveras, Amador, and Tuolumne. These three counties were chosen for the study because they border one another and have common characteristics. Amador, Calaveras, and Tuolumne Counties share similar geography, population size and distribution,

economic bases, and have united in forming a consortium for special education.

Surveyed were teachers in Head Start and licensed preschools, licensed family day care providers, and private and public kindergarten teachers. Data were collected from individuals in each group to determine local academic survival skills considered necessary for success in kindergarten and to determine behaviors considered inappropriate for kindergarten.

Description of Counties

Amador, Calaveras, and Tuolumne Counties extend from the foothills into the Sierra Nevada Mountains in north-central California. These counties had a total population of approximately 100,000 in the fall of 1986, when this study was conducted. The population had grown by 45% since 1980. This growth rate is expected to continue at least through 1990. Ethnically, the counties are 93% white. Blacks, Native Americans, Asians, and Hispanics make up the remaining 7%. Over 10% of the population was below poverty level. The median income in 1986 stood at \$18,500. The unemployment rates averaged at 15%. (Census Data Center, 1986) Most jobs are with the county government. Tourism and private services are the other main employers. Residents are also employed out of area in San Joaquin Valley cities. (Mother Lode Job Training, 1986)

There are many factors creating tensions in the communities. The overall low income level is a major factor, as is geographical isolation. Most of the population resides in small communities, connected by one- or two-lane winding and hilly roads. Education and recreation are limited. One county has no colleges, movie theaters, bowling alleys, or record stores, yet has a population over 30,000. Many social functions center on churches or bars. Drug and alcohol abuse is a major concern. It is estimated that 15% of the population relies heavily on alcohol and drugs. For the Native American population, this increases to 50% of all those over the age of 10 (Alcohol and Drug Abuse Program, 1986). A lack of public transportation exacerbates all these factors into emotional as well as geographical isolation.

The school drop-out rate could not be determined. Statistics were not centrally kept, and were not kept at all prior to the 1985-86 year. No figures exist for the elementary schools. No attempt is made to track children from one school to the other, or from one grade to the next, so that children who drop out over the summer are not counted in any statistics. Only those students who actually drop out in the middle of a high school year are included in the definition of drop-out. Special education students are not counted in these statistics. Neither the

County Offices of Education nor the Superintendents of all the school districts were able to provide statistics on drop-out students. Therefore it was not possible to obtain reliable information regarding the school drop-out rate.

Until recently, there were no federal or state funded preschools in the counties. Federal support first arrived in 1984 and 1985 with Head Start programs beginning to get underway. In 1986 one county was able to initiate a State Preschool program.

Population

The populations surveyed included the following early childhood educators in the tri-county area: (a) all private and public school kindergarten teachers, (b) all Head Start and preschool teachers, and (c) all family day care providers. There were a total of 163 of these early childhood educators surveyed. Each group consisted of approximately one-third of the total participants. The study comprehensively covered these populations throughout the three county area.

Instrumentation

The SBS Inventory consists of 107 items descriptive of child behavior in the classroom setting. The items are grouped into appropriate and inappropriate behavior competencies and skills. Kindergarten teachers, preschool

teachers, and family day care providers were asked to make one of three rating judgments about each item.

The SBS Inventory Description

There are three sections in the SBS Inventory. Section I contains descriptions of 56 adaptive or appropriate child behaviors. Section II contains descriptions of 51 maladaptive or inappropriate child behaviors. Section III of the survey asks respondents to identify technical assistance needs in teaching and managing children who display critical or unacceptable behaviors in Sections I and II. Section III of the SBS Inventory was not utilized in this study, as it is not relevant to the specific problem being herewith addressed.

Section I lists socially competent behaviors that are appropriate for the classroom setting. Survey participants are asked to rate the 56 behaviors as critical, desirable, or unimportant. The instructions explain that critical means that the behavior is essential to successful adjustment in kindergarten, desirable means that the behavior is encouraged, and unimportant means that the behavior is not necessary for a successful adjustment in kindergarten.

Section II lists behaviors that are inappropriate for the classroom setting. Survey participants are asked to rate the 51 behaviors as unacceptable, tolerated, or

acceptable. The instructions explain that unacceptable means that the behavior would not be tolerated in the kindergarten classroom, tolerated means that the behavior would be tolerated temporarily until it reduced in frequency and replaced by a more appropriate behavior, and acceptable means that the behavior presented no problems for successful kindergarten adjustment.

At the conclusion of each section, additional space was provided for any additional behaviors that the participants regarded as being either critical or unacceptable for a successful kindergarten adjustment. The SBS Inventory is presented in Appendix A.

Research on a factor structure for Sections I and II of the SBS Inventory yielded three-factor and two-factor solutions for Sections I and II respectively. These factors account for 45% of the variance in Section I and 30% of the variance in Section II (Walker & Rankin, 1983). The three factors for Section I describe a student:

Factor 1--with excellent work habits, organized, and efficient;

Factor 2--who exhibits self-control, is responsive to the teacher, and serves as a behavioral model for others; and

Factor 3--who is socially skilled and positive with peers.

The two factors for Section II describe maladaptive behavior:

Factor 1--specific to the child (that does not challenge the teacher's authority) or that is inappropriate for social interactions with peers; and Factor 2--disruptive of classroom atmosphere or the instructional process, and challenges the teacher's authority and control.

The specific item numbers that load on these factors are identified in Table 2.

Revision

The instructions on the instrument were slightly altered in order to provide data on preschool teachers' and family day care providers' expectations of appropriate kindergarten behaviors. Dr. Hill Walker of the University of Oregon was contacted to obtain permission to use the SBS Inventory and to revise the wording on the instructions so that the instrument could be used in this study. Permission was granted in writing.

The wording revision was made in the instructions to the rater. The instructions for Section I and II were revised so that in the phrase "in your classroom" was changed to "in a kindergarten classroom."

TABLE 2

Factors of Sections I and II of the SBS Inventory (Walker 1980)

<u>Factors</u>	<u>Item Numbers</u>
Section I, Factor 1	
Describes pupil with excellent work habits, who is organized and efficient	2, 10, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 22, 24, 27, 28, 33, 35, 38, 50, 54
Section I, Factor 2	
Describes a pupil who exhibits self-control, is responsive to the teachers, and serves as a behavioral model for others	1, 5, 7, 9, 12, 13, 23, 25, 26, 29, 30, 31, 40, 41, 42, 44, 49, 52, 53, 56
Section I, Factor 3	
Describes a pupil who is socially skilled and positive with peers	11, 20, 39, 43, 45, 47, 55
<hr/>	
Section II, Factor 1	
Describes maladaptive behavior specific to the pupil, that does not challenge the teacher's authority, or that describe maladaptive social interaction with peers	1, 3, 5, 7, 8, 15, 19, 20, 21, 23, 27, 28, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 45, 46, 48, 50, 51
Section II, Factor 2	
Describes pupil behavior that challenge the teacher's control and authority	2, 4, 6, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 22, 24, 49

None of the survey questions were altered. This minor change in the instructions allowed preschool teachers and family day care providers to complete the survey. Data on expectations of appropriate kindergarten behaviors could be obtained from these varied populations without affecting the validity of the instrument.

Validity

The Social Behavior Skills Inventory of Teacher Social Behavior Standards and Expectations (SBS Inventory) has been validated as an appropriate instrument for conducting ecological assessments of teacher expectations. The initial validation studies indicated a high level of reliability and validity (Herh & Walker, 1983). Internal consistency reliability (N-196) is reported as .96 for Section I and .94 for Section II (Herh & Walker, 1981). Test-retest correlations over a 6 week period were .82 for regular elementary teachers and .86 for special education teachers (H. Walker, 1984).

Normative data on over 2,000 elementary regular and special education teachers on the SBS Inventory are available. This research has established four types of validity on the SBS Inventory. These are concurrent, item, criterion, and factorial validity (H. Walker, 1984). Validity specific for kindergarten, however, has not been addressed.

Similarity among different teacher groups in their responses to this instrument is considerable in the normative research data. Both the scoring pattern and the content of items consistently rated high versus low reflected this similarity (H. Walker, 1984). High-rated SBS Inventory items are those most frequently rated critical or unacceptable; low-rated items are those least often rated critical or unacceptable. The content of the highest rated Section I items (i.e., most critical) dealt almost exclusively with classroom control, general discipline, and compliance with teacher instructions and commands. In contrast, the highest rated Section II items (i.e., most unacceptable) dealt with child behaviors that are of high intensity and occur seldom in most classroom. A child exhibiting one of these behaviors, even once, would be labeled problematic or deviant by a majority of teachers (H. Walker, 1984).

Past research has indicated that teachers show considerable individual variability, however, in their responses to the SBS Inventory. On the average, teachers mark about 25% of the items in Section I as critical and about 54% of Section II items as unacceptable (Hersh & Walker, 1983).

The SBS Inventory has been identified as a survey instrument that recognizes and delineates academic social

behaviors and skills necessary for survival in school (Walker & Rankin, 1983). In this study it has been used to determine the expectations of the next environment--to determine the pre-requisite academic survival skills considered necessary for success in kindergarten.

Data Collection

All public and private schools (registered with their County Office of Education) that have kindergartens in Calaveras, Amador, and Tuolumne Counties were contacted. A brief, introductory phone call was made to each superintendent. This was followed by a cover letter (See Appendix B) briefly describing the project and requesting participation in the study, and a copy of the SBS Inventory. Each principal also received a cover letter and a copy of the SBS Inventory. Follow-up was conducted on schools that were not indicated on returned surveys. Teachers were telephoned at their school site and encouraged to participate in the survey.

Every kindergarten teacher, preschool and Head Start teacher, and family day care provider were mailed a packet at their school address. The packet contained:

1. A cover letter explaining the purpose of the study, guaranteeing confidentiality of information, and encouraging participation.

2. A brief survey of demographic information.

3. Instructions on how to complete the SBS Inventory.
4. The SBS Inventory.
5. A stamped, self-addressed, confidential mailer.

The packets were identical.

For Section I each survey respondent was asked to indicate whether that specific behavior is critical, desirable, or unimportant to a successful or satisfactory adjustment to a kindergarten classroom. For Section II each survey respondent was asked to indicate whether that specific behavior is unacceptable, tolerated, or acceptable in a kindergarten classroom.

Individuals in each group surveyed received the SBS Inventory, Sections I and II. Section I provides data on needed academic survival skills. Public and private school kindergarten teachers identified which academic survival skills are necessary for successful adjustment in their classrooms. Preschool and Head Start teachers identified which academic survival skills they considered as being necessary for successful adjustment in kindergarten. Family day care providers identified which academic survival skills they considered as being necessary for successful adjustment in kindergarten.

Section II provides data on counter-survival or maladaptive behavior. Public and private school kindergarten teachers identified which behaviors are

unacceptable in their classrooms. Preschool and Head Start teachers identified which behaviors they considered as being unacceptable in kindergarten. Family day care providers identified which behaviors they considered as being unacceptable in kindergarten.

After completing the survey, participants stapled or taped the self-addressed, stamped mailer closed. The confidential, completed surveys were returned by mail.

The data were collected and analyzed by frequency count and item scores. The frequency count for each category for all items listed in Sections I and II was obtained. The number of adaptive behaviors in Section I marked as critical, desirable, or unimportant were totaled. The number of maladaptive behaviors in Section II marked as unacceptable, tolerated, or acceptable were totaled. Item scores are weighted scores. In Section I three points were assigned to each item marked by the participant as critical, two points to items marked as desirable, and one point to items marked as unimportant. In Section II three points were assigned to each item marked by the participant as unacceptable, two points to items marked tolerated, and one point to items marked acceptable. The item points were then averaged to obtain an item score. The collected data are analyzed and discussed in Chapter IV.

Assumptions and Limitations

This study was limited to the rural counties of Amador, Calaveras, and Tuolumne. Only those participants who responded to the survey have data included in the findings and results. The findings reflect the academic survival skills for the population participating and the geographical area included in the study.

The research in the literature did not reflect consideration that school success or failure is culturally based and reflects society's contemporary values. Due to the variances in school and individual philosophies, goals, and practices, the resultant findings may not be valid for any other population. Therefore the findings of this study are assumed to be valid only for the geographical regions and school districts participating in the survey.

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS

The data were collected in the fall of 1986. All surveys were sent and returned in October. It was considered strategic to ask kindergarten teachers to respond in the beginning of the school year, while they were working with a new group of children. Preschool professionals would be planning the program for the year, to get older children "ready for kindergarten." Thus, two groups of participants would be focusing on the young child just entering or getting ready to enter kindergarten. Success in kindergarten would be the focus of both groups. By distributing the surveys at the same time to all participants, it was anticipated that the results would be reliable.

Demographic Background of Participants

The population surveyed included the following groups of early childhood educators working in Amador, Calaveras, and Tuolumne Counties: (a) all private and public school kindergarten teachers, (b) all Head Start and preschool teachers, and (c) all family day care providers. A total of 163 of these early childhood educators were working in the tri-county area. Each participant group consisted of approximately one-third of the total population surveyed. Table 3 displays the number in each group and percentages

TABLE 3

Survey Participation

<u>Group</u>	<u>County</u>			<u>Total</u>
	<u>Amador</u>	<u>Calaveras</u>	<u>Tuolumne</u>	
Kindergarten				
Mailed	15	20	18	53
Completed	11	15	17	43
Total Kindergarten teacher participation				81%
Preschool				
Mailed	9	19	15	43
Completed	6	14	11	31
Total preschool teacher participation				72%
Family Day Care				
Mailed	24	26	17	67
Completed	19	16	10	45
Total family day care provider participation				67%
Total Mailed				163
Total Completed				119
Total participation of all groups				73%

of participants for each group. The study comprehensively covered these three population groups throughout the three county area.

All of the survey participants work in Amador, Calaveras, or Tuolumne County. Table 4 displays the educational background of the survey participants. The kindergarten teachers participating in the survey had taught kindergarten for an average of 7.3 years. Their experience ranged from 3 years to 28 years. Most of the kindergarten teachers (74%) had a Bachelor's degree in elementary education. One had a Registered Nursing certificate. A few had Bachelor's degrees in early childhood education or child development.

The experience of preschool and Head Start teachers ranged from 1 to 12 years, averaging 3.8 years. Their educational background varied from a high school diploma to a Bachelor's degree in child development. Approximately one-fourth had Associate of Arts degrees in early childhood education, one-fourth had Bachelor's degrees in elementary education, and another one-fourth had Bachelor's degrees in other, unrelated areas.

Family day care providers had an average of 4.6 years of experience, ranging from 1 year to 13 years. Most (60%) had high school diplomas. A few had Bachelor's degrees. Several had Associate of Arts degrees in early childhood

and child development. A few others had Associate of Arts degrees in non-related areas of study.

TABLE 4
Educational Background of Survey Participants

<u>Educational Degree</u>	<u>Kinder. Teachers</u>	<u>Presch. Teachers</u>	<u>Family Day Care Providers</u>
High School		13%	60%
Associate's Degree ECE or CD	2%	26%	20%
Associates Degree Other		6%	11%
Bachelor's Degree ECE or CD	19%	6%	2%
Bachelor's Degree Elementary	74%	26%	3%
Bachelor's Degree Other	5%	23%	4%

The data from the participants in each group were consolidated. Descriptive statistical analyses were used to determine relative importance of each item on the survey. The findings describe the local standards for social competence and academic survival skills considered important for young children in kindergarten.

Scoring

Each item listed in the SBS Inventory was tallied and rated separately for the two sections. Section I items were rated: (a) critical--3 points, (b) desirable--2 points, and (c) unimportant--1 point. Section II items were rated: (a) unacceptable--3 points, (b) tolerated--2 points, and (c) acceptable--1 point. Survey items not responded to (omitted) were included in the results of the findings (raw data), but not included in the data analysis.

The responses for each survey item were tallied by group. The points for each item were averaged and the resultant mean established the relative importance of each item. For the purposes of this study, the following categories of importance for skill items have been established: (a) 2.5 to 3.0 points--high importance, (b) 1.5 to 2.5 points--moderate importance, and (c) 1.0 to 1.5 points--low importance. For Sections I and II, the skills receiving the highest average points for each group (2.5 or higher) were considered as having high importance for that group. Over 50% of the participants would have had to indicate an item as critical or unacceptable for it to be categorized as having high importance.

Findings

All the data of all survey participants are displayed in Tables 5 through 25. The data are organized according

to the SBS Inventory Section Factors. Each Table displays one participant groups responses to all the survey items associated with that factor.

Section I

Section I of the Inventory consists of a total of 56 items. Three factors of appropriate pupil behavior are associated with Section I items. Factor 1 includes 16 items that load on or relate to "Describes pupil with excellent work habits, who is organized and efficient."

Factor 2 "Describes a pupil who exhibits self-control, is responsive to the teachers, and serves as a behavioral model for others." There are 20 items in Section I that relate to this factor.

Factor 3 "Describes a pupil who is socially skilled and positive with peers." Seven items in Section I relate to this factor.

There are 13 items remaining in Section I of the SBS Inventory. According to Walker (1980) these items are not associated with any of the three factors.

The findings on Section I items (critical, desirable, or unimportant) for kindergarten teachers are given in Tables 5, 8, 11, and 14. Each item number is listed and the corresponding number and percentage of responses for each category are given. The Mean column reflects the mean of all the kindergarten teachers' responses for the survey

item. Tables 6, 9, 12, and 15 display the findings on Section I items for preschool teachers. The responses from family day care providers are listed in Tables 7, 10, 13, and 16. These tables display the number of responses for each item by category, percentages and mean for Section I items grouped according to factors.

The means of Section I items for kindergarten teachers, preschool teachers, and family day care providers were calculated separately. The Section I items that averaged 2.50 to 3.00 points (critical range) were considered to be of high importance for that particular group.

Section I Factor 1

The findings for Section I of the survey are grouped and displayed according to the factor associated with the survey item. Table 5 displays the data on kindergarten teachers' responses to the items associated with Factor 1. Kindergarten teachers rated four items associated with Factor 1 as having high importance or being critical to a child's successful adjustment to kindergarten. One item was rated as unimportant; that was "Child can follow teacher written instructions and directions" (#33). The mean of the kindergarten teachers' responses for Factor 1 items is 2.19, which lies in the moderate or desirable range.

TABLE 5
Kindergarten Teachers' Responses to Section I
Factor 1 Items

Section I: Descriptions of adaptive, appropriate child behaviors.

Factor 1: Describes pupil with excellent work habits, who is organized and efficient.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Crit.</u>		<u>Desir.</u>		<u>Unimp.</u>		<u>Mean</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	
2. Child listens while other children are speaking.	24	56	19	44			2.56
10. Child listens carefully to teacher instructions and directions for assignments.	30	70	13	30			2.70
14. Child is considerate of the feelings of others.	9	21	34	79			2.21
15. Child produces work of acceptable quality given his/her skill level.	16	37	25	58			2.39
16. Child cooperates with peers in group activities or situations.	19	44	24	56			2.44
17. Child follows established classroom rules.	31	72	12	28			2.72
18. Child can have normal conversations with peers without becoming hostile or angry.	24	56	19	44			2.56
22. Child speaks to others in a tone of voice appropriate to the situation.	8	19	33	77	1	2	2.17
24. Child copes with failure in an appropriate manner.	16	37	27	63			2.37

(TABLE 5 continued)

Factor 1: Describes pupil with excellent work habits, who is organized and efficient.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Crit.</u>		<u>Desir.</u>		<u>Unimp.</u>		<u>Mean</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	
27. Child can accept not getting his/her own way.	17	40	26	60			2.40
28. Child attends consistently to assigned tasks.	17	40	26	60			2.40
33. Child can follow teacher written instructions and directions.	3	7	9	21	29	67	1.37
35. Child has good work habits.	16	37	27	63			2.37
38. Child questions rules, directions or instructions that are not clear to him/her.	12	28	31	72			2.28
50. Child does seatwork assignments as directed.	19	44	24	56			2.44
54. Child carries out decision(s) or plan formulated by the group.	2	5	41	95			2.05

The data on preschool teachers' responses to the items associated with Section I Factor 1 are displayed in Table 6. Three items associated with Factor 1 were rated as having high importance or being critical to a child's successful adjustment to kindergarten. No items were considered by preschool teachers to be of low importance for success in kindergarten. The mean of the preschool teachers' responses for Factor 1 items was 2.30, which lies in the moderate range, although slightly higher than the mean of Factor 1 responses of kindergarten teachers.

The data on family day care providers' responses to the items associated with Section I Factor 1 are displayed in Table 7. Three items associated with Factor 1 were rated as having high importance or being critical to a child's successful adjustment to kindergarten. No items were considered by family day care providers to be of low importance for success in kindergarten. The mean of family day care providers' responses for Factor 1 items was 2.28, which lies in the moderate range.

There was quite a range of relative importance of the various items associated with Factor 1. Each participant group's total mean for Section I Factor 1, however, lies within the desirable range.

TABLE 6
Preschool Teachers' Responses to Section I

Factor 1 Items

Section I: Descriptions of adaptive, appropriate child behaviors.

Factor 1: Describes pupil with excellent work habits, who is organized and efficient.

<u>Items</u>	<u>Crit.</u>		<u>Desir.</u>		<u>Unimp.</u>		<u>Mean</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	
2. Child listens while other children are speaking.	14	45	17	55			2.45
10. Child listens carefully to teacher instructions and directions for assignments.	19	61	12	39			2.61
14. Child is considerate of the feelings of others.	11	35	20	65			2.35
15. Child produces work of acceptable quality given his/her skill level.	12	39	19	61			2.39
16. Child cooperates with peers in group activities or situations.	13	42	18	58			2.42
17. Child follows established classroom rules.	12	39	19	61			2.39
18. Child can have normal conversations with peers without becoming hostile or angry.	16	52	15	48			2.52
22. Child speaks to others in a tone of voice appropriate to the situation.			28	90	3	10	1.90
24. Child copes with failure in an appropriate manner.	14	45	16	52	1	3	2.42

(TABLE 6 continued)

Factor 1: Describes pupil with excellent work habits, who is organized and efficient.

<u>Items</u>	<u>Crit.</u>		<u>Desir.</u>		<u>Unimp.</u>		<u>Mean</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	
27. Child can accept not getting his/her own way.	20	64	7	23	4	13	2.52
28. Child attends consistently to assigned tasks.	8	26	20	64	3	10	2.16
33. Child can follow teacher written instructions and directions.	4	13	10	32	16	52	1.60
35. Child has good work habits.	5	16	21	68	4	13	2.03
38. Child questions rules, directions or instructions that are not clear to him/her.	15	48	13	42	3	10	2.39
50. Child does seatwork assignments as directed.	13	42	18	58			2.42
54. Child carries out decision(s) or plan formulated by the group.	6	19	25	81			2.19

TABLE 7
Family Day Care Providers' Responses to Section I
Factor 1 Items

Section I: Descriptions of adaptive, appropriate child behaviors.

Factor 1: Describes pupil with excellent work habits, who is organized and efficient.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Crit.</u>		<u>Desir.</u>		<u>Unimp.</u>		<u>Mean</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	
2. Child listens while other children are speaking.	23	51	22	49			2.51
10. Child listens carefully to teacher instructions and directions for assignments.	27	60	18	40			2.60
14. Child is considerate of the feelings of others.	3	7	42	93			2.07
15. Child produces work of acceptable quality given his/her skill level.	11	24	34	76			2.24
16. Child cooperates with peers in group activities or situations.	12	27	33	73			2.27
17. Child follows established classroom rules.	33	73	12	27			2.73
18. Child can have normal conversations with peers without becoming hostile or angry.	19	42	26	58			2.42
22. Child speaks to others in a tone of voice appropriate to the situation.	9	20	30	67	6	13	2.07
24. Child copes with failure in an appropriate manner.	19	42	26	58			2.42

(TABLE 7 continued)

Factor 1: Describes pupil with excellent work habits, who is organized and efficient.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Crit.</u>		<u>Desir.</u>		<u>Unimp.</u>		<u>Mean</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	
27. Child can accept not getting his/her own way.	18	40	24	53	3	7	2.33
28. Child attends consistently to assigned tasks.	11	24	34	76			2.24
33. Child can follow teacher written instructions and directions.	5	11	23	51	17	38	1.73
35. Child has good work habits.	7	16	38	84			2.15
38. Child questions rules, directions or instructions that are not clear to him/her.	10	22	35	78			2.22
50. Child does seatwork assignments as directed.	17	38	28	62			2.38
54. Child carries out decision(s) or plan formulated by the group.	6	13	39	87			2.13

Section I Factor 2

There are 20 survey items that load on Section I Factor 2. This factor "Describes a pupil who exhibits self-control, is responsive to the teachers, and serves as a behavioral model for others." The number and frequency of kindergarten teachers' responses are shown in Table 8. Six of the items were considered critical for a child's successful adjustment to kindergarten. No items were generally considered unimportant. The mean of kindergarten teachers' responses to Section I Factor 2 items was 2.35.

Preschool teachers' responses to Section I Factor 2 items are displayed in Table 9. Only two items were considered highly important or critical for kindergarten. None were considered unimportant. The mean of preschool teachers' responses to Factor 2 items was 2.24. It is an interesting point that all of the individual participants in this group rated item number 26 ("Child resolves peer conflicts or problems adequately on his/her own without requesting teacher assistance") as desirable.

Table 10 displays the data for family day care providers to Section I Factor 2 items. Two items were also considered highly important (critical) for kindergarten. The mean of family day care providers' responses to Section I Factor 2 items was 2.27.

TABLE 8
Kindergarten Teachers' Responses to Section I
Factor 2 Items

Section I: Descriptions of adaptive, appropriate child behaviors.

Factor 2: Describes a pupil who exhibits self-control, is responsive to the teachers, and serves as a behavioral model for others.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Crit.</u>		<u>Desir.</u>		<u>Unimp.</u>		<u>Mean</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	
1. Child is flexible and can adjust to different instructional situations.	23	53	20	47			2.53
5. Child uses academic tool correctly.	16	37	26	60			2.38
7. Child models or imitates the appropriate behavior of other children.	6	14	37	86			2.14
9. Child makes his/her assistance needs known in an appropriate manner.	24	56	19	44			2.56
12. Child complies with teacher commands.	32	75	10	23	1	2	2.72
13. Child improves academic or social behavior in response to teacher feedback.	22	51	21	49			2.51
23. Child answers or attempts to answer a question when called on by the teacher.	16	37	27	63			2.37
25. Child behaves appropriately in non classroom settings.	24	56	19	44			2.56
26. Child resolves peer conflicts or problems adequately on his/her own without requesting teacher assistance.	7	16	35	82	1	2	2.14
29. Child ignores the distractions or interruptions of other students during academic activities.	19	44	24	56			2.44
30. Child knows when to ask permission of the teacher or other children.	11	26	32	74			2.26

(TABLE 8 continued)

Factor 2: Describes a pupil who exhibits self-control, is responsive to the teachers, and serves as a behavioral model for others.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Crit.</u>		<u>Desir.</u>		<u>Unimp.</u>		<u>Mean</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	
31. Child tolerates usual school frustrations adequately.	13	30	30	70			2.30
40. Child makes productive use of time while waiting for teacher assistance.	5	12	35	82	3	7	2.05
41. Child raises hand before asking a question where appropriate.	12	28	31	72			2.28
42. Child completes tasks within prescribed time limits.	9	21	34	79			2.21
44. Child observes rules governing movement around the room.	19	44	24	56			2.44
49. Child uses playground equipment appropriately.	22	51	21	49			2.51
52. Child waits quietly for recognition before speaking out in class.	6	14	34	79	3	7	2.07
53. Child follows simple directions after hearing them once.	9	21	34	79			2.21
56. Child responds to conventional behavior management techniques.	20	47	23	53			2.31

TABLE 9
Preschool Teachers' Responses to Section I
Factor 2 Items

Section I: Descriptions of adaptive, appropriate child behaviors.

Factor 2: Describes a pupil who exhibits self-control, is responsive to the teachers, and serves as a behavioral model for others.

Item	Crit.		Desir.		Unimp.		Mean
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
1. Child is flexible and can adjust to different instructional situations.	14	45	17	55			2.45
5. Child uses academic tool correctly.	13	42	16	52	2	6	2.35
7. Child models or imitates the appropriate behavior of other children.			26	84	5	16	1.84
9. Child makes his/her assistance needs known in an appropriate manner.	13	42	18	58			2.42
12. Child complies with teacher commands.	20	65	11	35			2.65
13. Child improves academic or social behavior in response to teacher feedback.	18	58	13	42			2.58
23. Child answers or attempts to answer a question when called on by the teacher.	10	32	18	58	3	10	2.23
25. Child behaves appropriately in non classroom settings.	14	45	17	55			2.45
26. Child resolves peer conflicts or problems adequately on his/her own without requesting teacher assistance.			31	100			2.00
29. Child ignores the distractions or interruptions of other students during academic activities.	6	19	21	68	4	13	2.06
30. Child knows when to ask permission of the teacher or other children.	6	19	25	81			2.19

(TABLE 9 continued)

Factor 2: Describes a pupil who exhibits self-control, is responsive to the teachers, and serves as a behavioral model for others.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Crit.</u>		<u>Desir.</u>		<u>Unimp.</u>		<u>Mean</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	
31. Child tolerates usual school frustrations adequately.	11	35	20	65			2.35
40. Child makes productive use of time while waiting for teacher assistance.	4	13	24	77	3	10	2.03
41. Child raises hand before asking a question where appropriate.	3	9	25	81	3	10	2.00
42. Child completes tasks within prescribed time limits.	3	9	18	58	10	23	1.77
44. Child observes rules governing movement around the room.	12	39	19	61			2.39
49. Child uses playground equipment appropriately.	13	42	18	58			2.42
52. Child waits quietly for recognition before speaking out in class.	5	16	20	65	6	19	1.97
53. Child follows simple directions after hearing them once.	11	35	17	55	3	10	2.26
56. Child responds to conventional behavior management techniques.	14	45	17	55			2.45

TABLE 10
Family Day Care Providers' Responses to Section I
Factor 2 Items

Section I: Descriptions of adaptive, appropriate child behaviors.

Factor 2: Describes a pupil who exhibits self-control, is responsive to the teachers, and serves as a behavioral model for others.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Crit.</u>		<u>Desir.</u>		<u>Unimp.</u>		<u>Mean</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	
1. Child is flexible and can adjust to different instructional situations.	15	33	30	67			2.33
5. Child uses academic tool correctly.	12	27	31	69	2	4	2.22
7. Child models or imitates the appropriate behavior of other children.	3	7	36	80	6	13	1.93
9. Child makes his/her assistance needs known in an appropriate manner.	25	56	20	44			2.56
12. Child complies with teacher commands.	32	71	12	27			2.73
13. Child improves academic or social behavior in response to teacher feedback.	20	44	25	56			2.44
23. Child answers or attempts to answer a question when called on by the teacher.	11	24	29	65	5	11	2.13
25. Child behaves appropriately in non classroom settings.	22	49	23	51			2.49
26. Child resolves peer conflicts or problems adequately on his/her own without requesting teacher assistance.	1	2	41	91	3	7	1.96
29. Child ignores the distractions or interruptions of other students during academic activities.	6	13	39	87			2.13
30. Child knows when to ask permission of the teacher or other children.	11	24	34	76			2.24

(TABLE 10 continued)

Factor 2: Describes a pupil who exhibits self-control, is responsive to the teachers, and serves as a behavioral model for others.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Crit.</u>		<u>Desir.</u>		<u>Unimp.</u>		<u>Mean</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	
31. Child tolerates usual school frustrations adequately.	4	9	41	91			2.09
40. Child makes productive of time while waiting for teacher assistance.	5	11	37	82	3	7	2.04
41. Child raises hand before asking a question where appropriate.	20	44	25	56			2.44
42. Child completes tasks within prescribed time limits.	6	13	36	80	3	7	2.07
44. Child observes rules governing movement around the room.	25	55	17	38	3	7	2.49
49. Child uses playground equipment appropriately.	17	38	28	62			2.38
52. Child waits quietly for recognition before speaking out in class.	10	22	32	71	3	7	2.16
53. Child follows simple directions after hearing them once.	14	31	31	69			2.31
56. Child responds to conventional behavior management techniques.	11	24	34	76			2.34

Section I Factor 3

Section I Factor 3 consists of seven items. This factor "Describes a pupil who is socially skilled and positive with peers." The survey responses of kindergarten teachers, preschool teachers, and family day care providers to these items are displayed in Tables 11, 12, and 13, respectively. None of the participant groups considered any of these items to be highly important or unimportant for kindergarten; all Factor 3 items are in the moderate range. Kindergarten teachers, preschool teachers, and family day care providers each had a Section I Factor 3 mean of 2.11, 2.09, and 1.92.

Section I Non Factor Related Items

Data on the 13 items in Section I that are not associated with a factor, are shown in Table 14 for kindergarten teachers, Table 15 for preschool teachers, and in Table 16 for family day care providers. Kindergarten teachers considered 3 of the 13 items to be highly important for success in kindergarten. These were items numbered 32, 46, and 48. Preschool teachers considered items numbered 3, 37, and 46 to be highly important for success in kindergarten. Family day care providers rated only one item, number 37, as critical. The means for this group of non factor related items were 2.32 for

TABLE 11
Kindergarten Teachers' Responses to Section I
Factor 3 Items

Section I: Descriptions of adaptive, appropriate child behaviors.

Factor 3: Describes a pupil who is socially skilled and positive with peers.

<u>Items</u>	<u>Crit.</u>		<u>Desir.</u>		<u>Unimp.</u>		<u>Mean</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	
11. Child volunteers for classroom activities.	2	5	34	79	7	16	1.88
20. Child compliments peers regarding some attribute or behavior.	3	7	31	72	9	21	1.86
39. Child shares materials with others in a work situation.	19	44	24	56			2.44
43. Child uses social conventions appropriately.	5	11	36	84	2	5	2.07
45. Child responds to teasing or name calling by ignoring, changing the subject or some other constructive means.	6	14	37	86			2.14
47. Child initiates conversation with peers in informal situations.	14	33	26	60	3	7	2.26
55. Child can recognize and describe moods/feelings of others and self.	9	21	29	67	5	12	2.09

TABLE 12
Preschool Teachers' Responses to Section I
Factor 3 Items

Section I: Descriptions of adaptive, appropriate child behaviors.

Factor 3: Describes a pupil who is socially skilled and positive with peers.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Crit.</u>		<u>Desir.</u>		<u>Unimp.</u>		<u>Mean</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	
11. Child volunteers for classroom activities.	3	10	20	8	26		1.84
20. Child compliments peers regarding some attribute or behavior.	1	3	22	71	8	26	1.77
39. Child shares materials with others in a work situation.	14	45	17	55			2.45
43. Child uses social conventions appropriately.	8	26	23	74			2.26
45. Child responds to teasing or name calling by ignoring, changing the subject or some other constructive means.	5	16	26	84			2.16
47. Child initiates conversation with peers in informal situations.	1	3	25	81	5	16	1.87
55. Child can recognize and describe moods/feelings of others and self.	9	29	22	71			2.29

TABLE 13
Family Day Care Providers' Responses to Section I
Factor 3 Items

Section I: Descriptions of adaptive, appropriate child behaviors.

Factor 3: Describes a pupil who is socially skilled and positive with peers.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Crit.</u>		<u>Desir.</u>		<u>Unimp.</u>		<u>Mean</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	
11. Child volunteers for classroom activities.	3	7	24	53	18	40	1.67
20. Child compliments peers regarding some attribute or behavior.			31	69	14	31	1.69
39. Child shares materials with others in a work situation.	13	29	29	64	3	7	2.22
43. Child uses social conventions appropriately.	13	29	30	67	2	4	2.24
45. Child responds to teasing or name calling by ignoring, changing the subject or some other constructive means.			42	93	3	7	1.93
47. Child initiates conversation with peers in informal situations.	4	9	36	80	5	11	1.98
55. Child can recognize and describe moods/feelings of others and self.			31	69	14	31	1.68

TABLE 14
Kindergarten Teachers' Responses to Section I Items
Not Included in Factors

Section I: Descriptions of adaptive, appropriate child behaviors.

<u>Items</u>	<u>Crit.</u>		<u>Desir.</u>		<u>Unimp.</u>		<u>Mean</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	
3. Child communicates adequately.	23	53	20	47			2.44
4. Child takes his/her turn.	15	35	28	65			2.35
6. Child seeks teacher attention at appropriate times.	14	33	29	67			2.33
8. Child uses free time appropriately.	2	5	41	95			2.05
19. Child can work on projects in class with another student.	11	26	32	74			2.26
21. Child has independent study skills.	16	37	27	63			2.37
32. Child can participate in and contribute to group instructional situations/activities.	22	51	21	49			2.60
34. Child avoids breaking classroom rules(s) even when encouraged by a peer.	7	16	36	84			2.16
36. Child is honest with others.	15	35	28	65			2.35
37. Child responds to requests and directions promptly.	21	49	22	51			2.49
46. Child expresses anger appropriately.	24	56	19	44			2.56
48. Child uses classroom equipment and materials correctly.	25	58	18	42			2.58
51. Child sits up straight in seat during classroom instruction.	2	5	25	58	16	37	1.67

TABLE 15
Preschool Teachers' Responses to Section I Items
Not Included in Factors

Section I: Descriptions of adaptive, appropriate child behaviors.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Crit.</u>		<u>Desir.</u>		<u>Unimp.</u>		<u>Mean</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	
3. Child communicates adequately.	22	71	9	29			2.71
4. Child takes his/her turn.	8	26	23	74			2.26
6. Child seeks teacher attention at appropriate times.	6	19	25	81			2.19
8. Child uses free time appropriately.	7	23	24	77			2.23
19. Child can work on projects in class with another student.	4	13	27	87			2.13
21. Child has independent study skills.	9	29	19	61	3	10	2.19
32. Child can participate in and contribute to group instructional situations/activities.	15	48	16	52			2.48
34. Child avoids breaking classroom rules(s) even when encouraged by a peer.	5	16	26	84			2.16
36. Child is honest with others.	12	39	19	61			2.39
37. Child responds to requests and directions promptly.	16	52	15	48			2.52
46. Child expresses anger appropriately.	18	58	13	42			2.58
48. Child uses classroom equipment and materials correctly.	13	42	18	58			2.42
51. Child sits up straight in seat during classroom instruction.			17	55	14	45	1.55

TABLE 16

Family Day Care Providers' Responses to Section I Items

Not Included in Factors

 Section I: Descriptions of adaptive, appropriate child behaviors.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Crit.</u>		<u>Desir.</u>		<u>Unimp.</u>		<u>Mean</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	
3. Child communicates adequately.	17	38	28	62			2.38
4. Child takes his/her turn.	19	42	26	58			2.42
6. Child seeks teacher attention at appropriate times.	8	18	35	78	2	4	2.13
8. Child uses free time appropriately.	3	7	33	73	9	20	1.91
19. Child can work on projects in class with another student.	19	42	22	49	4	9	2.33
21. Child has independent study skills.	9	20	32	71	4	9	2.11
32. Child can participate in and contribute to group instructional situations/activities.	10	22	35	78			2.22
34. Child avoids breaking classroom rules(s) even when encouraged by a peer.	17	38	28	62			2.38
36. Child is honest with others.	19	42	26	58			2.42
37. Child responds to requests and directions promptly.	28	62	17	38			2.62
46. Child expresses anger appropriately.	20	44	25	56			2.44
48. Child uses classroom equipment and materials correctly.	13	29	32	71			2.29
51. Child sits up straight in seat during classroom instruction.	2	4	25	56	18	40	1.64

kindergarten teachers, 2.29 for preschool teachers, and 2.25 for family day care providers.

At the end of Section I, survey participants were asked if there were any other critical behaviors or skills essential to a successful adjustment to kindergarten. The comments that were listed in this space are as follows:

One kindergarten teacher stated, "It's essential that a child is able to demonstrate a certain amount of 'common sense' by kindergarten age." Another kindergarten teacher commented, "Child knows how to and expects to clean up after himself."

A preschool teacher wrote, "Child can be independent of adult aid."

One family day care provider listed, "normal vision and hearing, no dyslexia, ability to make small muscles do what brain wants (physically able to write)." Another family day care provider noted, "Appropriate socialization skills are critical pre-kindergarten skills."

Section II

Section II of the Inventory consists of a total of 51 items. There are two factors describing maladaptive behavior that are associated with the items in Section II of the survey. Factor 1 includes 26 items that load on or relate to "Describes maladaptive behavior specific to the

pupil, that does not challenge the teacher's authority, or that describe maladaptive social interaction with peers."

Factor 2 "Describes pupil behavior that challenge the teacher's control and authority." There are 20 items in Section II that relate to this factor.

There are five items remaining in Section II of the SBS Inventory. According to Walker (1980) these items are not associated with either of the two factors.

The findings on Section II (unacceptable, tolerated, or acceptable) items for kindergarten teachers are given in Tables 17, 20, and 23. Each item number is listed and the corresponding number and percentage of responses for each of the three categories are given. The Mean column reflects the mean of all the kindergarten teachers' responses for the item. Tables 18, 21, and 24 give the findings on Section II items for preschool teachers. The responses from family day care providers are listed in Tables 19, 22, and 25. These tables display the number of responses, and percentages for each item by category. The corresponding participant group mean for each item is also listed.

The means of Section II items for kindergarten teachers, preschool teachers, and family day care providers were calculated separately. The Section II items that

averaged 2.50 to 3.00 points (unacceptable range) were considered to be of high importance for that group.

Section II Factor 1

The data for Section II of the survey are grouped and displayed according to the factor associated with the survey item. Table 17 displays the data on kindergarten teachers' responses to the items associated with Factor 1. Kindergarten teachers rated three items associated with Factor 1 as having high importance or being unacceptable in the kindergarten classroom. The mean of the kindergarten teachers' responses for Factor 1 items was 2.19, which lies in the acceptable range.

The data on preschool teachers' responses to the items associated with Section II Factor 1 are displayed in Table 18. Two items associated with Factor 1 were rated as having high importance or being unacceptable in kindergarten. One item, number 39 ("Child is excessively demanding"), was rated tolerated by each of the preschool teachers responding to the survey. The mean of the preschool teachers' responses for Factor 1 items was 2.15.

The data on family day care providers' responses to the items associated with Section II Factor 1 are displayed in Table 19. Six items associated with Factor 1 were rated as having high importance (unacceptable) in kindergarten.

TABLE 17
Kindergarten Teachers' Responses to
Section II Factor 1 Items

Section II: Descriptions of maladaptive, inappropriate child behaviors.

Factor 1: Describes maladaptive behavior specific to the pupil, that does not challenge the teacher's authority, or that describe maladaptive social interaction with peers.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Unacc.</u>		<u>Toler.</u>		<u>Accep.</u>		<u>Mean</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	
1. Child whines.	13	30	29	67			2.31
3. Child is easily distracted from the task or activity at hand.	8	19	35	81			2.19
5. Child babbles to him/herself.	6	14	30	70	7	16	1.98
7. Child engages in stereotyped reptetitive behavior.	20	47	22	51			2.48
8. Child refuses to share.	24	56	19	44			2.56
15. Child pouts or sulks.	6	14	37	86			2.14
19. Child becomes visibly upset or angry when things do not go his/her way.	7	16	36	84			2.16
20. Child talks out of turn.	2	5	41	95			2.05
21. Child ignores the social initiations of other children.	2	5	38	88	3	7	1.98
23. Child asks irrelevant questions.			40	93	3	7	1.93
27. Child obeys only when threatened with punishment.	31	72	12	28			2.72
28. Child refuses to play in games with other children.	11	25	27	63	5	12	2.14
31. Child starts activities but does not finish them.	10	23	31	72	2	5	2.19

(TABLE 17 continued)

Factor 1: Describes maladaptive behavior specific to the pupil, that does not challenge the teacher's authority, or that describe maladaptive social interaction with peers.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Unacc.</u>		<u>Toler.</u>		<u>Accep.</u>		<u>Mean</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	
32. Child argues and must have the last word in verbal exchanges with peers and/or teacher.	23	53	20	47			2.53
33. Child appears to be unmotivated.	8	19	35	81			2.19
35. Child displays high levels of dependence.	1	2	39	91	3	7	1.95
36. Child does not respond when called upon.	3	7	40	93			2.07
38. Child is overly affectionate with other children and/or adults.	3	7	37	86	3	7	2.00
39. Child is excessively demanding.	6	14	37	86			2.14
40. Child is inexcusably late for the beginning of class activities.	15	35	28	65			2.35
41. Child is seriously withdrawn.	14	33	29	67			2.33
45. Child wants to participate in playground activity in progress but is afraid to ask to join.			38	88	5	12	1.88
46. Child does not share toys and equipment in a play situation.	11	26	32	74			2.26
48. Child does not correct mistakes when teacher indicates there are errors.	10	23	31	72	2	5	2.19
50. Child's remarks or questions are irrelevant to classroom discussions.	2	5	38	88	3	7	1.98
51. Child reacts negatively to assigned school work.	14	33	29	67			2.33

TABLE 18
Preschool Teachers' Responses to
Section II Factor 1 Items

Section II: Descriptions of maladaptive, inappropriate child behaviors.

Factor 1: Describes maladaptive behavior specific to the pupil, that does not challenge the teacher's authority, or that describe maladaptive social interaction with peers.

<u>Item</u>	Unacc.		Toler.		Accep.		Mean
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
1. Child whines.	9	29	22	71			2.29
3. Child is easily distracted from the task or activity at hand.	6	19	24	78			2.20
5. Child babbles to him/herself.	7	23	19	61	3	10	2.14
7. Child engages in stereotyped repetitive behavior.	11	35	20	65			2.35
8. Child refuses to share.	14	45	16	52			2.47
15. Child pouts or sulks.	6	19	25	81			2.19
19. Child becomes visibly upset or angry when things do not go his/her way.	6	19	24	78	1	3	2.16
20. Child talks out of turn.	5	16	22	71	4	13	2.52
21. Child ignores the social initiations of other children.			29	94	1	3	1.97
23. Child asks irrelevant questions.			25	81	6	19	1.81
27. Child obeys only when threatened with punishment.	15	48	16	52			2.48
28. Child refuses to play in games with other children.	8	26	13	42	10	32	1.94
31. Child starts activities but does not finish them.	5	16	19	61	7	23	1.94

(TABLE 18 continued)

Factor 1: Describes maladaptive behavior specific to the pupil, that does not challenge the teacher's authority, or that describe maladaptive social interaction with peers.

<u>Item</u>	Unacc.		Toler.		Accep.		Mean
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	
32. Child argues and must have the last word in verbal exchanges with peers and/or teacher.	12	39	19	61			2.39
33. Child appears to be unmotivated.	6	19	20	65	5	16	2.03
35. Child displays high levels of dependence.	7	22	21	68	3	10	2.13
36. Child does not respond when called upon.	10	32	19	61	2	7	2.26
38. Child is overly affectionate with other children and/or adults.	2	7	23	74	6	19	1.87
39. Child is excessively demanding.			31	100			2.00
40. Child is inexcusably late for the beginning of class activities.	11	36	15	48	5	16	2.19
41. Child is seriously withdrawn.	9	29	19	61	3	10	2.19
45. Child wants to participate in playground activity in progress but is afraid to ask to join.			22	71	9	29	1.71
46. Child does not share toys and equipment in a play situation.	6	19	25	81			2.19
48. Child does not correct mistakes when teacher indicates there are errors.	5	16	26	84			2.16
50. Child's remarks or questions are irrelevant to classroom discussions.	3	10	21	68	7	22	1.87
51. Child reacts negatively to assigned school work.	16	52	15	48			2.52

TABLE 19
Family Day Care Providers' Responses to
Section II Factor 1 Items

Section II: Descriptions of maladaptive, inappropriate child behaviors.

Factor 1: Describes maladaptive behavior specific to the pupil, that does not challenge the teacher's authority, or that describe maladaptive social interaction with peers.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Unacc.</u>		<u>Toler.</u>		<u>Accep.</u>		<u>Mean</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	
1. Child whines.	19	42	26	58			2.42
3. Child is easily distracted from the task or activity at hand.	10	22	35	78			2.22
5. Child babbles to him/herself.	9	20	34	76	2	4	2.16
7. Child engages in stereotyped reptetitive behavior.	26	58	19	42			2.58
8. Child refuses to share.	27	60	18	40			2.60
15. Child pouts or sulks.	11	24	31	69	3	7	2.18
19. Child becomes visibly upset or angry when things do not go his/her way.	16	35	26	58	3	7	2.29
20. Child talks out of turn.	5	11	38	85	2	4	2.07
21. Child ignores the social initiations of other children.			40	89	5	11	1.89
23. Child asks irrelevant questions.	8	18	25	56	12	26	1.91
27. Child obeys only when threatened with punishment.	27	60	18	40			2.60
28. Child refuses to play in games with other children.	13	29	27	60	5	11	2.17
31. Child starts activities but does not finish them.	12	27	33	73			2.27

(TABLE 19 continued)

Factor 1: Describes maladaptive behavior specific to the pupil, that does not challenge the teacher's authority, or that describe maladaptive social interaction with peers.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Unacc.</u>		<u>Toler.</u>		<u>Accep.</u>		<u>Mean</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	
32. Child argues and must have the last word in verbal exchanges with peers and/or teacher.	24	53	21	47			2.53
33. Child appears to be unmotivated.	24	53	21	47			2.53
35. Child displays high levels of dependence.	9	20	36	80			2.20
36. Child does not respond when called upon.	21	47	24	53			2.47
38. Child is overly affectionate with other children and/or adults.	4	9	37	82	4	9	2.33
39. Child is excessively demanding.	19	42	23	51	3	7	2.36
40. Child is inexcusably late for the beginning of class activities.	18	40	27	60			2.40
41. Child is seriously withdrawn.	15	33	30	67			2.33
45. Child wants to participate in playground activity in progress but is afraid to ask to join.			40	89	5	11	1.89
46. Child does not share toys and equipment in a play situation.	23	51	22	49			2.51
48. Child does not correct mistakes when teacher indicates there are errors.	15	33	30	67			2.33
50. Child's remarks or questions are irrelevant to classroom discussions.	3	7	39	86	3	7	2.00
51. Child reacts negatively to assigned school work.	25	56	20	44			2.56

The mean of the family day care providers' responses for Factor 1 items was 2.30.

There were no items associated with Section II Factor 1 that received an average of 3.0, nor were there any items considered to be of low importance. Each participant group's total mean for Section II Factor 1 lies within the acceptable range.

Section II Factor 2

There are 20 survey items that are associated with Section II Factor 2. This factor "Describes pupil behavior that challenge the teacher's control and authority." The number and frequency of kindergarten teachers' responses are shown in Table 20. Kindergarten teachers considered 17 of these items unacceptable in kindergarten. Item numbers 22 and 29 were each rated 3.0. The mean of kindergarten teachers' responses to Section II Factor 2 items was 2.73.

Preschool teachers' responses to Section II Factor 2 items are displayed in Table 21. Preschool teachers considered 18 items unacceptable in kindergarten. Three items (numbers 13, 17 and 22) were rated unacceptable by all respondents. The mean of preschool teachers' responses to Factor 2 items was 2.78.

Table 22 displays the data for family day care providers to Section II Factor 2 items. Six items (numbers 4, 14, 17, 22, 29, and 34) were each rated 3.0 by all

TABLE 20
Kindergarten Teachers' Responses to
Section II Factor 2 Items

Section II: Descriptions of maladaptive, inappropriate child behaviors.

Factor 2: Describes pupil behavior that challenge the teacher's control and authority.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Unacc.</u>		<u>Toler.</u>		<u>Accep.</u>		<u>Mean</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	
2. Child tests or challenges teacher imposed limits.	19	44	24	56			2.44
4. Child has tantrums.	34	79	9	21			2.79
6. Child disturbs or disrupts the activities of others.	30	70	13	30			2.70
9. Child engages in silly, attention getting behavior.	20	47	23	53			2.47
10. Child lies.	25	58	18	42			2.58
11. Child is verbally aggressive with others.	33	77	10	23			2.77
13. Child refuses to obey teacher imposed classroom rules.	41	95	2	5			2.95
14. Child uses obscene language.	33	77	10	23			2.77
16. Child ignores teacher warnings or reprimands.	37	86	6	14			2.86
17. Child is physically aggressive with others.	42	98	1	2			2.98
18. Child cheats.	11	26	25	58	7	16	2.09
22. Child damages others' property.	43	100					3.00

(TABLE 20 continued)

Factor 2: Describes pupil behavior that challenge the teacher's control and authority.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Unacc.</u>		<u>Toler.</u>		<u>Accep.</u>		<u>Mean</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	
24. Child reacts with defiance to instructions or commands.	35	81	8	19			2.81
25. Child steals.	36	84	6	14			2.86
26. Child does not follow specified rules of games and/or class activities.	25	58	18	42			2.58
29. Child behaves inappropriately in class when corrected.	43	100					3.00
34. Child makes lewd or obscene gestures.	42	98	1	2			2.98
37. Child creates a disturbance during class activities.	22	51	21	49			2.51
43. Child engages in inappropriate sexual behavior.	35	81	7	19			2.83
49. Child does not ask permission to use others' property.	25	58	18	42			2.58

TABLE 21
Preschool Teachers' Responses to
Section II Factor 2 Items

Section II: Descriptions of maladaptive, inappropriate child behaviors.

Factor 2: Describes pupil behavior that challenge the teacher's control and authority.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Unacc.</u>		<u>Toler.</u>		<u>Accep.</u>		<u>Mean</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	
2. Child tests or challenges teacher imposed limits.	20	64	8	26	3	10	2.55
4. Child has tantrums.	28	90	3	10			2.90
6. Child disturbs or disrupts the activities of others.	26	84	5	16			2.84
9. Child engages in silly, attention getting behavior.	14	46	16	53			2.47
10. Child lies.	22	71	9	29			2.71
11. Child is verbally aggressive with others.	25	81	6	19			2.81
13. Child refuses to obey teacher imposed classroom rules.	31	100					3.00
14. Child uses obscene language.	21	68	10	32			2.68
16. Child ignores teacher warnings or reprimands.	28	90	3	10			2.90
17. Child is physically aggressive with others.	31	100					3.00
18. Child cheats.	21	68	10	32			2.68
22. Child damages others' property.	31	100					3.00

(TABLE 21 continued)

Factor 2: Describes pupil behavior that challenge the teacher's control and authority.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Unacc.</u>		<u>Toler.</u>		<u>Accep.</u>		<u>Mean</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	
24. Child reacts with defiance to instructions or commands.	26	84	5	16			2.84
25. Child steals.	28	90	31	0			2.90
26. Child does not follow specified rules of games and/or class activities.	8	26	23	74			2.26
29. Child behaves inappropriately in class when corrected.	30	97	1	3			2.97
34. Child makes lewd or obscene gestures.	27	87	4	13			2.87
37. Child creates a disturbance during class activities.	23	74	8	26			2.74
43. Child engages in inappropriate sexual behavior.	26	84	5	16			2.84
49. Child does not ask permission to use others' property.	19	61	12	39			2.61

TABLE 22
Family Day Care Providers' Responses to
Section II Factor 2 Items

Section II: Descriptions of maladaptive, inappropriate child behaviors.

Factor 2: Describes pupil behavior that challenge the teacher's control and authority.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Unacc.</u>		<u>Toler.</u>		<u>Accep.</u>		<u>Mean</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	
2. Child tests or challenges teacher imposed limits.	27	60	18	40			2.60
4. Child has tantrums.	45	100					3.00
6. Child disturbs or disrupts the activities of others.	41	91	4	9			2.91
9. Child engages in silly, attention getting behavior.	30	67	15	33			2.67
10. Child lies.	40	89	5	11			2.89
11. Child is verbally aggressive with others.	38	84	7	16			2.84
13. Child refuses to obey teacher imposed classroom rules.	43	96	2	4			2.96
14. Child uses obscene language.	45	100					3.00
16. Child ignores teacher warnings or reprimands.	42	93	3	7			2.93
17. Child is physically aggressive with others.	45	100					3.00
18. Child cheats.	29	64	16	36			2.64
22. Child damages others' property.	45	100					3.00

(TABLE 22 continued)

Factor 2: Describes pupil behavior that challenge the teacher's control and authority.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Unacc.</u>		<u>Toler.</u>		<u>Accep.</u>		<u>Mean</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	
24. Child reacts with defiance to instructions or commands.	34	76	11	24			2.76
25. Child steals.	42	43	3	7			2.93
26. Child does not follow specified rules of games and/or class activities.	22	49	23	51			2.49
29. Child behaves inappropriately in class when corrected.	45	100					3.00
34. Child makes lewd or obscene gestures.	45	100					3.00
37. Child creates a disturbance during class activities.	38	84	7	16			2.84
43. Child engages in inappropriate sexual behavior.	43	96	2	4			2.96
49. Child does not ask permission to use others' property.	24	53	21	47			2.53

family day care providers. Family day care providers considered 19 items to be unacceptable in kindergarten. Only item number 26 ("Child does not follow specified rules of games and/or class activities") was considered to be tolerated in kindergarten. The mean of family day care providers' responses to Section II Factor 2 items was 2.85.

Section II Non Factor Related Items

Data on the five items in Section II that are not associated with a factor, are shown in Table 23 for kindergarten teachers, Table 24 for preschool teachers, and in Table 25 for family day care providers. All participants in each group rated number 44 ("Child is self abusive") as unacceptable in kindergarten. None of the groups considered any of the items acceptable for kindergarten. The means for this group of items were 2.58 for kindergarten teachers, 2.56 for preschool teachers, and 2.65 for family day care providers.

At the end of Section II, survey participants were asked if there were any other unacceptable behaviors for kindergarten. The comments listed in this space are as follows:

One kindergarten teacher stated, "Eating classroom materials." Another kindergarten teacher wrote, "A child leaving the classroom without telling the teacher (running away)." A third kindergarten teacher commented, "Poor

TABLE 23
Kindergarten Teachers' Responses to Section II Items
Not Included in Factors

Section II: Descriptions of maladaptive, inappropriate child behaviors.

<u>Item</u>	Unacc.		Toler.		Accep.		Mean
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	
12. Child manipulates other children. and/or situations in order to get his/her own way.	22	51	20	47			2.51
30. Child forces the submission of peers by being dominant, bossy and/or overbearing.	23	53	20	47			2.53
42. Child interrupts the teacher when the teacher is engaged in a presentation or activity.	15	35	28	65			2.35
44. Child is self abusive.	43	100					3.00
47. Child does not follow and/or give into necessary rules of games and class activities.	23	53	20	47			2.53

TABLE 24
Preschool Teachers' Responses to Section II Items
Not Included in Factors

Section II: Descriptions of maladaptive, inappropriate child behaviors.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Unacc.</u>		<u>Toler.</u>		<u>Accep.</u>		<u>Mean</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	
12. Child manipulates other children. and/or situations in order to get his/her own way.	15	48	16	52			2.48
30. Child forces the submission of peers by being dominant, bossy and/or overbearing.	14	45	17	55			2.45
42. Child interrupts the teacher when the teacher is engaged in a presentation or activity.	14	46	16	54			2.47
44. Child is self abusive.	31	100					3.00
47. Child does not follow and/or give into necessary rules of games and class activities.	13	42	18	58			2.42

TABLE 25

Family Day Care Providers' Responses to Section II Items

Not Included in Factors

 Section II: Descriptions of maladaptive, inappropriate child behaviors.

<u>Item</u>	Unacc.		Toler.		Accep.		Mean
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	
12. Child manipulates other children. and/or situations in order to get his/her own way.	22	49	23	51			2.49
30. Child forces the submission of peers by being dominant, bossy and/or overbearing.	27	60	15	33	3	7	2.53
42. Child interrupts the teacher when the teacher is engaged in a presentation or activity.	28	62	17	38			2.62
44. Child is self abusive.	45	100					3.00
47. Child does not follow and/or give into necessary rules of games and class activities.	28	62	17	38			2.62

bathroom habits--not going in the toilet but on the floor and not flushing the toilet."

One preschool teacher listed, "Throwing food." Another preschool teacher wrote, "Leaving classroom by his/her self."

The analysis of these findings are presented in the following section. The analysis addresses the questions asked in the problem of the study. The expectations regarding social competence and academic survival skills needed for a successful adjustment to kindergarten are revealed.

Analysis

Which academic survival skills are required by kindergarten teachers?

Kindergarten teachers indicated that 13 skills listed in Section I of the the SBS Inventory survey were essential to a successful adjustment in kindergarten. The mean of these skills ranged from 2.51 to 2.72, with a total mean of 2.59. Table 26 discloses these skills of high importance to the kindergarten teachers participating in the survey. The skills are listed in rank order. The two skills most important to kindergarten teachers are "Child complies with teacher demands" (#12), and "Child follows established classroom rules" (#17). Of these 13 skills, 5 are associated with Factor 1, 5 are associated with Factor 2,

TABLE 26

Section I Skills of High Importance (Critical)
to Kindergarten Teachers

Section I: Descriptions of adaptive, appropriate child behaviors.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Mean</u>
12. Child complies with teacher commands.	1	2.72
17. Child follows established classroom rules.	1	2.72
10. Child listens carefully to teacher instructions and directions for assignments.	3	2.70
32. Child can participate in and contribute to group instructional situations/activities.	4	2.60
48. Child uses classroom equipment and materials correctly.	5	2.58
2. Child listens while other children are speaking.	6	2.56
9. Child makes his/her assistance needs known in an appropriate manner.	6	2.56
18. Child can have normal conversations with peers without becoming hostile or angry.	6	2.56
25. Child behaves appropriately in non classroom settings.	6	2.56
46. Child expresses anger appropriately.	6	2.56
1. Child is flexible and can adjust to different instructional situations.	11	2.53
13. Child improves academic or social behavior in response to teacher feedback.	12	2.51
49. Child uses playground equipment appropriately.	12	2.51

and 3 are not associated with any Factor. There were no skills related to Factor 3 that kindergarten teachers considered critical for success in kindergarten.

Which academic survival skills do preschool teachers consider as being necessary for kindergarten?

Table 27 lists the 8 skills that preschool and Head Start teachers considered essential to a successful adjustment in kindergarten. The mean of these skills ranged from 2.52 to 2.71, with a total mean of 2.59. Of the 8 critical skills, 3 relate to Factor 1, 2 relate to Factor 2, and 3 are not associated with any Factor. The skill considered most important was "Child communicates adequately" (#3), an item not related to any Factor. There were no skills considered essential for kindergarten relating to Factor 3.

Which academic survival skills do family day care providers consider as being necessary for kindergarten?

Family day care providers considered 6 skills as being essential to a successful adjustment in kindergarten. The mean weighted scores for these skills ranged from 2.51 to 2.73. The total mean was 2.60. Table 28 displays these skills in rank order. Factor 1 accounts for 3 skills of high importance, Factor 2 accounts for 2 skills, and Factor 3 accounts for 1 skill. The two skills considered most

TABLE 27
Section I Skills of High Importance (Critical)
to Preschool Teachers

Section I: Descriptions of adaptive, appropriate child behaviors.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Mean</u>
3. Child communicates adequately.	1	2.71
12. Child complies with teacher commands.	2	2.65
10. Child listens carefully to teacher instructions and directions for assignments.	3	2.61
13. Child improves academic or social behavior in response to teacher feedback.	4	2.58
46. Child expresses anger appropriately.	4	2.58
18. Child can have normal conversations with peers without becoming hostile or angry.	6	2.52
27. Child can accept not getting his/her own way.	6	2.52
37. Child responds to requests and directions promptly.	6	2.52

TABLE 28
Section I Skills of High Importance (Critical)
to Family Day Care Providers

Section I: Descriptions of adaptive, appropriate child behaviors.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Mean</u>
12. Child complies with teacher commands.	1	2.73
17. Child follows established classroom rules.	1	2.73
37. Child responds to requests and directions promptly.	3	2.62
10. Child listens carefully to teacher instructions and directions for assignments.	4	2.60
9. Child makes his/her assistance needs known in an appropriate manner.	5	2.56
2. Child listens while other children are speaking.	6	2.51

critical were "Child complies with teacher commands" (#12), and "Child follows established classroom rules" (#17).

What are the similarities among kindergarten teachers, preschool teachers, and family day care providers in academic survival skills considered necessary for success in kindergarten?

There were only two skills that all three participant groups rated as being of high importance or critical for a successful adjustment to kindergarten. These were "Child listens carefully to teacher instructions and directions for assignments" (#10), and "Child complies with teacher demands" (#12). Number 10 relates to Factor 1 and number 12 relates to Factor 2. This information is displayed in Table 29.

TABLE 29

Section I Skills of High Importance (Critical) to
All Participant Groups

Factor 1: Describes pupil with excellent work habits, who is organized and efficient.

Item 10. Child listens carefully to teacher instructions and directions for assignments.

Factor 2: Describes a pupil who exhibits self-control, is responsive to the teachers, and serves as a behavioral model for others.

Item 12. Child complies with teacher commands.

There was agreement on 5 skills that were considered highly important by both preschool teachers and kindergarten teachers. Of the 6 skills that family day care providers marked as critical, they agreed with kindergarten teachers on 5 of the skills and with preschool teachers on 3 of the skills.

As a group, family day care providers agreed with kindergarten teachers and preschool teachers that no skills in Factor 2 were unimportant for kindergarten. None of the participant groups considered any of the skills listed in Section I Factor 3 to be highly important or unimportant for kindergarten; all Factor 3 skills were in the moderate range. None of the non factor related skills were considered unimportant for kindergarten by any of the three participant groups. Table 30 shows the skills considered highly important to success in kindergarten according to the three participant groups.

What are the differences among kindergarten teachers,
preschool teachers, and family day care providers in
academic survival skills considered necessary for success
in kindergarten?

Table 30 also displays the differences among the three participant groups. Preschool teachers were the only group that thought skills "Child communicates adequately"

TABLE 30

Similarities and Differences on Section I Skills Rated

High Importance (Critical) for Kindergarten

Factor 1: Describes pupil with excellent work habits, who is organized and efficient.

<u>Item</u>	Rated High Importance		
	<u>Kind.</u>	<u>PreS.</u>	<u>FDC</u>
2. Child listens while other children are speaking.	+		+
17. Child follows established classroom rules.	+		+
18. Child can have normal conversations with peers without becoming hostile or angry.	+	+	
27. Child can accept not getting his/her own way.		+	

Factor 2: Describes a pupil who exhibits self-control, is responsive to the teachers, and serves as a behavioral model for others.

<u>Item</u>	Rated High Importance		
	<u>Kind.</u>	<u>PreS.</u>	<u>FDC</u>
1. Child is flexible and can adjust to different instructional situations.	+		
9. Child makes her/his assistance needs known in an appropriate manner.	+		+
13. Child improves academic or social behavior in response to teacher feedback.	+	+	
25. Child behaves appropriately in non classroom settings.	+		
49. Child uses playground equipment appropriately.	+		

(TABLE 30 continued)

Non Factor Items

<u>Item</u>	Rated High Importance		
	<u>Kind.</u>	<u>PreS.</u>	<u>FDC</u>
3. Child communicates adequately.		+	
32. Child can participate in and contribute to group instructional situations/activities.	+		
37. Child responds to requests and directions promptly.		+	+
46. Child expresses anger appropriately.	+	+	
48. Child uses classroom equipment and materials correctly.	+		

(#3), and "Child can accept not getting his/her own way" (#27) as being critical for success in kindergarten.

There were five skills in Section I indicated only by kindergarten teachers as necessary for success. These skills were not considered as being highly important by either preschool teachers or family day care providers. These skills are displayed in Table 31.

Which behaviors are unacceptable to kindergarten teachers?

There were 24 behaviors listed in Section II of the SBS Inventory survey that kindergarten teachers would not tolerate occurring in kindergarten. These are displayed in Table 32. The weighted mean for each of these 24 behaviors ranged from 2.51 to 3.00. The total mean was 2.75. Three behaviors were rated unacceptable by all participating kindergarten teachers. These behaviors were "Child damages others' property" (#22), "Child behaves inappropriately in class when corrected" (#29), and "Child is self abusive" (#44).

All but seven of the unacceptable behaviors are related to Factor 2--pupil behavior that challenge the teacher's control and authority. Only 3 unacceptable behaviors relate to Factor 1; 4 unacceptable behaviors are not related to a Factor.

TABLE 31

Section I Skills that Only Kindergarten Teachers
Rated High Importance (Critical)

Factor 2. Describes a pupil who exhibits self-control, is responsive to the teachers, and serves as a behavioral model for others.

Item 1. Child is flexible and can adjust to different instructional situations.

Item 25. Child behaves appropriately in non classroom settings.

Item 49. Child uses playground equipment appropriately.

Non Factor Items

Item 32. Child can participate in and contribute to group instructional situations/activities.

Item 48. Child uses classroom equipment and materials correctly.

TABLE 32
Section II Behaviors of High Importance (Unacceptable)
to Kindergarten Teachers

Section II: Descriptions of maladaptive, inappropriate child behaviors.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Mean</u>
22. Child damages others' property.	1	3.00
29. Child behaves inappropriately in class when corrected.	1	3.00
44. Child is self abusive.	1	3.00
17. Child is physically aggressive with others.	4	2.98
34. Child makes lewd or obscene gestures.	4	2.98
13. Child refuses to obey teacher imposed classroom rules.	6	2.95
16. Child ignores teacher warnings or reprimands.	7	2.86
25. Child steals.	7	2.86
43. Child engages in inappropriate sexual behavior.	9	2.83
24. Child reacts with defiance to instructions or commands.	10	2.81
4. Child has tantrums.	11	2.79
11. Child is verbally aggressive with others.	12	2.77
14. Child uses obscene language.	12	2.77
27. Child obeys only when threatened with punishment.	14	2.72
6. Child disturbs or disrupts the activities of others.	15	2.70

(TABLE 32 continued)

Section II: Descriptions of maladaptive, inappropriate child behaviors.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Mean</u>
10. Child lies.	16	2.58
26. Child does not follow specified rules of games and/or class activities.	16	2.58
49. Child does not ask permission to use others' property.	16	2.58
8. Child refuses to share.	19	2.56
30. Child forces the submission of peers by being dominant, bossy and/or overbearing.	20	2.53
32. Child argues and must have the last word in verbal exchanges with peers and/or teacher.	20	2.53
47. Child does not follow and/or give into necessary rules of games and class activities.	20	2.53
12. Child manipulates other children and/or situations in order to get his/her own way.	23	2.52
37. Child creates a disturbance during class activities.	24	2.51

Which behaviors do preschool teachers consider as
being unacceptable in kindergarten?

Preschool teachers considered 21 behaviors unacceptable in kindergarten. The unacceptable behaviors and the corresponding rank and means are listed in Table 33. The means ranged from 2.52 to 3.00. The total mean for these 24 unacceptable items was 2.80. Four behaviors were rated unacceptable by all Head Start and preschool teachers participating in the survey. These behaviors were "Child refuses to obey teacher imposed classroom rules" (#13), "Child is physically aggressive with others" (#17), "Child damages other's property" (#22), and "Child is self abusive" (#44). Besides item number 44, the most unacceptable behaviors were associated with Factor 2, relating to pupil behavior that challenge the teacher's authority. The two lowest ranking unacceptable behaviors related to Factor 1.

Which behaviors do family day care providers consider
as being unacceptable in kindergarten?

Family day care providers considered 29 of the 51 behaviors in Section II of the survey to be unacceptable in kindergarten. The means ranged from 2.51 to 3.00, with a total mean of 2.77. Table 34 displays the behaviors that family day care providers found unacceptable. Seven behaviors were rated unacceptable by all of the family day

TABLE 33
Section II Behaviors of High Importance (Unacceptable)
to Preschool Teachers

Section II: Descriptions of maladaptive, inappropriate child behaviors.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Mean</u>
13. Child refuses to obey teacher imposed classroom rules.	1	3.00
17. Child is physically aggressive with others.	1	3.00
22. Child damages others' property.	1	3.00
44. Child is self abusive.	1	3.00
29. Child behaves inappropriately in class when corrected.	5	2.97
4. Child has tantrums.	6	2.90
16. Child ignores teacher warnings or reprimands.	6	2.90
25. Child steals.	6	2.90
34. Child makes lewd or obscene gestures.	9	2.87
6. Child disturbs or disrupts the activities of others.	10	2.84
24. Child reacts with defiance to instructions or commands.	10	2.84
43. Child engages in inappropriate sexual behavior.	10	2.84
11. Child is verbally aggressive with others.	13	2.81

(TABLE 33 continued)

Section II: Descriptions of maladaptive, inappropriate child behaviors.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Mean</u>
37. Child creates a disturbance during class activities.	14	2.74
10. Child lies.	15	2.71
14. Child uses obscene language.	16	2.68
18. Child cheats.	16	2.68
49. Child does not ask permission to use others' property.	18	2.61
2. Child tests or challenges teacher imposed limits.	19	2.55
20. Child talks out of turn.	20	2.52
51. Child reacts negatively to assigned school work.	20	2.52

TABLE 34

Section II Behaviors of High Importance (Unacceptable)
to Family Day Care Providers

Section II: Descriptions of maladaptive, inappropriate child behaviors.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Mean</u>
4. Child has tantrums.	1	3.00
14. Child uses obscene language.	1	3.00
17. Child is physically aggressive with others.	1	3.00
22. Child damages others' property.	1	3.00
29. Child behaves inappropriately in class when corrected.	1	3.00
34. Child makes lewd or obscene gestures.	1	3.00
44. Child is self abusive.	1	3.00
43. Child engages in inappropriate sexual behavior.	8	2.96
16. Child ignores teacher warnings or reprimands.	9	2.93
25. Child steals.	9	2.93
6. Child disturbs or disrupts the activities of others.	11	2.91
10. Child lies.	12	2.89
11. Child is verbally aggressive with others.	13	2.84
37. Child creates a disturbance during class activities.	13	2.84
24. Child reacts with defiance to instructions or commands.	15	2.76
32. Child argues and must have the last word in verbal exchanges with peers and/or teacher.	16	2.71

(TABLE 34 continued)

Section II: Descriptions of maladaptive, inappropriate child behaviors.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Mean</u>
9. Child engages in silly, attention getting behavior.	17	2.67
18. Child cheats.	18	2.64
42. Child interrupts the teacher when the teacher is engaged in a presentation or activity.	19	2.62
47. Child does not follow and/or give into necessary rules of games and class activities.	19	2.62
2. Child tests or challenges teacher imposed limits.	21	2.60
8. Child refuses to share.	21	2.60
27. Child obeys only when threatened with punishment.	23	2.60
7. Child engages in stereotyped repetitive behavior.	24	2.58
51. Child reacts negatively to assigned school work.	25	2.56
30. Child forces the submission of peers by being dominant, bossy and/or overbearing.	26	2.53
33. Child appears to be unmotivated.	26	2.53
49. Child does not ask permission to use others' property.	26	2.53
46. Child does not share toys and equipment in a play situation.	29	2.51

care providers. These behaviors were: "Child has tantrums" (#4), "Child uses obscene language" (#14), "Child is physically aggressive with others" (#17), "Child damages others' property" (#22), "Child behaves inappropriately in class when corrected" (#29), "Child makes lewd or obscene gestures" (#34), and "Child is self abusive" (#44). Family day care providers considered 7 behaviors related to Factor 1 unacceptable, 18 behaviors related to Factor 2 unacceptable, and 4 behaviors unacceptable that were not related to either factor.

What are the similarities among kindergarten teachers, preschool teachers, and family day care providers in behaviors considered unacceptable in kindergarten settings?

There is much similarity among kindergarten teachers, preschool teachers, and family day care providers in behaviors considered unacceptable in kindergarten. There was uniform agreement among all survey participants that behaviors "Child damages others' property" (#22) and "Child is self abusive" (#44) were not tolerated in kindergarten. Table 35 displays these similarities among all participants. Altogether, 16 behaviors in Section II of the survey were rated unacceptable by all three participant groups. All behaviors were related to Factor 2 except number 44, which was not affiliated with a factor. There

TABLE 35

Section II Behaviors of High Importance (Unacceptable)
to All Participant Groups

Factor 2: Describes pupil behavior that challenge the teacher's control and authority.

Item 4. Child has tantrums.

Item 6. Child disturbs or disrupts the activities of others.

Item 10. Child lies.

Item 11. Child is verbally aggressive with others.

Item 14. Child uses obscene language.

Item 16. Child ignores teacher warnings or reprimands.

Item 17. Child is physically aggressive with others.

Item 22. Child damages others' property.

Item 24. Child reacts with defiance to instructions or commands.

Item 25. Child steals.

Item 29. Child behaves inappropriately in class when corrected.

Item 34. Child makes lewd or obscene gestures.

Item 37. Child creates a disturbance during class activities.

Item 43. Child engages in inappropriate sexual behavior.

Item 49. Child does not ask permission to use others' property.

Non Factor Item

Item 44. Child is self abusive.

were no behaviors in Section II Factor 2 that were rated as having low importance for kindergarten by any of the participant groups.

Both kindergarten teachers and family day care providers considered 4 of the 5 non factor related behaviors in Section II to be unacceptable in kindergarten. All participants in each group rated number 44 ("Child is self abusive") as unacceptable in kindergarten. None of the groups considered any of the items acceptable for kindergarten.

What are the differences among kindergarten teachers, preschool teachers, and family day care providers in behaviors considered unacceptable in kindergarten settings?

Kindergarten teachers were the only group who indicated "Child manipulates other children and/or situations in order to get his/her own way" (#12) and "Child does not follow specified rules of games and/or class activities" (#26) as unacceptable in kindergarten.

Preschool teachers were the only group that considered "Child talks out of turn" (#20) as unacceptable in kindergarten. Family day care providers listed several additional behaviors that they considered unacceptable in kindergarten. These were behaviors numbered 7, 9, 33, 42, and 46. These differences are displayed in Table 36.

TABLE 36

Similarities and Differences on Section II Behaviors Rated

High Importance (Unacceptable) for Kindergarten

Factor 1: Describes maladaptive behavior specific to the pupil that does not challenge the teacher's authority, or that describe maladaptive social interaction with peers.

<u>Item</u>	Rated High Importance		
	<u>Kind.</u>	<u>PreS.</u>	<u>FDC</u>
7. Child engages in stereotyped repetetitive behavior.			+
8. Child refuses to share.	+		+
20. Child talks out of turn.		+	
27. Child obeys only when threatened with punishment.	+		+
32. Child argues and must have the last word in verbal exchanges with peers and/or teacher.	+		+
33. Child appears to be unmotivated.			+
46. Child does not share toys and equipment in a play situation.			+
51. Child reacts negatively to assigned school work.		+	+

Factor 2: Describes pupil behavior that challenge the teacher's control and authority.

<u>Item</u>	Rated High Importance		
	<u>Kind.</u>	<u>PreS.</u>	<u>FDC</u>
2. Child tests or challenges teacher imposed limits.		+	+
9. Child engages in silly, attention getting behavior.			+

(TABLE 36 continued)

Factor 2: Describes pupil behavior that challenge the teacher's control and authority.

<u>Item</u>	Rated High Importance		
	<u>Kind.</u>	<u>PreS.</u>	<u>FDC</u>
13. Child refuses to obey teacher imposed classroom rules.	+	+	
18. Child cheats.		+	+
26. Child does not follow specified rules of games and/or class activities.	+		

Non Factor Items

<u>Item</u>	Rated High Importance		
	<u>Kind.</u>	<u>PreS.</u>	<u>FDC</u>
12. Child manipulates other children and/or situations in order to get his/her own way.	+		
30. Child forces the submission of peers by being dominant, bossy and/or overbearing.	+		+
42. Child interrupts the teacher when the teacher is engaged in a presentation or activity.			+
47. Child does not follow and/or give into necessary rules of games and class activities.	+		+

Discussion

All Section I skills are appropriate for kindergarten as well as the elementary classroom range they were originally designed for, except for item number 33. Section I item number 33 states, "Child can follow teacher written instructions and directions." This is the only skill listed in either Section I or II of the SBS Inventory that may be considered inappropriate for kindergarten, because it assumes the child can read. It is interesting to look at the scoring for this particular item number. Kindergarten teachers were the only group that rated this item as unimportant with a mean of 1.37. Preschool teachers rated it slightly higher with a mean of 1.60. Family day care providers rated it even higher with a mean of 1.73. It is difficult to determine if all survey participants realized that this item number required expectation that the child could read and then follow the written direction or instructions. Perhaps some respondents overlooked the word "written" and read the item as, "Child can follow teacher instructions and directions." All Section II skills are appropriate for kindergarten as well as the elementary classroom range they were originally designed for.

Only two academic survival skills were agreed upon by all participant groups as being necessary for success in

kindergarten. These were "Child listens carefully to teacher instructions and directions for assignments" (#10), and "Child complies with teacher demands" (#12).

Both preschool teachers and kindergarten teachers agreed on 5 skills that were considered highly important. Of the 6 skills that family day care providers marked as critical, they agreed with kindergarten teachers on 5 of the skills and with preschool teachers on 3 of the skills. Kindergarten teachers considered more of the skills to be necessary for academic survival than either preschool teachers or family day care providers.

Section I Factor 3 skills were generally considered not to be as critical to success in kindergarten as Factor I, Factor II, and non factor related skills. Social skills and positive interactions with peers are not as critical for academic survival as other types of skills.

Several differences were found among kindergarten teachers, preschool teachers, and family day care providers in academic survival skills considered necessary for success in kindergarten. There were 5 skills in Section I indicated by kindergarten teachers as necessary for success which were not considered as being highly important by either preschool teachers or family day care providers. These were "Child is flexible and can adjust to different instructional situations" (#1); "Child behaves

appropriately in non classroom settings" (#25); "Child can participate in and contribute to group instructional situations/activities" (#32); "Child uses classroom equipment and materials correctly" (#48); and "Child uses playground equipment appropriately" (#49). Preschool teachers were the only group that thought skills "Child communicates adequately" (#3), and "Child can accept not getting his/her own way" (#27) as being critical for success in kindergarten.

There were many similarities among kindergarten teachers, preschool teachers, and family day care providers in behaviors considered unacceptable in kindergarten settings. There was uniform agreement among all survey participants that behaviors "Child damages others' property" (#22) and "Child is self abusive" (#44) were not tolerated in kindergarten. Altogether, 16 behaviors in Section II of the survey were rated unacceptable by all three participant groups. All behaviors were related to Factor 2 except number 44, which was not affiliated with a factor. None of the groups considered any of the Section II (maladaptive) behaviors acceptable in kindergarten.

The lowest ranking maladaptive behaviors were associated with Factor I. Maladaptive social interaction

with peers was more tolerated in kindergarten than other behaviors.

There were some differences among kindergarten teachers, preschool teachers, and family day care providers in behaviors considered unacceptable in kindergarten settings. Kindergarten teachers were the only group who indicated "Child manipulates other children and/or situations in order to get his/her own way" (#12) and "Child does not follow specified rules of games and/or class activities" (#26) as unacceptable in kindergarten. Preschool teachers were the only group that considered "Child talks out of turn" (#20) as unacceptable in kindergarten. Family day care providers listed several additional behaviors that they considered unacceptable in kindergarten, such as "Child appears to be unmotivated" (#33) and "Child engages in silly, attention getting behavior" (#9).

Far more maladaptive behaviors were rated as highly important than appropriate behaviors. The findings indicate that all participant groups felt more strongly about unacceptable, maladaptive behaviors than critical, appropriate behaviors.

Smooth articulation between preschool or family day care and kindergarten is based upon similar expectations of academic survival skills needed for kindergarten success.

Agreement on behaviors inappropriate for kindergarten is also necessary. The differences among the participant groups are revealed as issues to be addressed in transitioning children from preschool settings to kindergarten classrooms.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Education of children in preschool compensatory, special education or regular programs should emphasize those skills most crucial to prepare them for success in the normal or mainstreamed kindergarten classroom. The criteria for school success, however, are up for question. Explicit agreement or consensus on prerequisite skills necessary for school success is non-existent. Children are designated "at-risk" for school failure without a clear definition, criteria, or listing of skills required for school success.

A recently posited conceptualization of at-risk children emphasizes the use of functional skills required for survival in the school environment (Dettre, 1983). School readiness must be defined and measured in relation to the skills directly associated with successful school performance (Leigh, 1983). Many skills, not traditionally considered "readiness skills," are critical for young children to develop before entering the mainstream of kindergarten. Critical prerequisite skills are believed by teachers to be important, are necessary for participation in school learning activities, and may distinguish between school success and failure. Academic survival skills appear to be these prerequisite skills that enable the

child to take advantage of the educational opportunities offered in the classroom.

Establishing a goal of successful functioning and social competence may be an appropriate and sensible curricular goal for the young at-risk child (Bricker, 1986). The young child's social competence is an important predictor of later personal/vocational adjustment (Walker & Rankin, 1983). Society appears to have agreed that assisting the at-risk child to gain social competence and to be successful is important. At present, however, social competence is not clearly defined in terms of skills needed for kindergarten. More attention must be given to determining the skills needed for a successful adjustment to kindergarten.

The Study

Recognition of academic survival skills and emphasis on teaching them may result in success in educational tasks despite possible delays or deficiencies in some developmental dimensions. This approach may provide direction for remediation of the child's at-risk status. Many children are at-risk in specific abilities yet perform successfully in educational programs (Keogh & Becker, 1973). Academic survival skills may provide the social competence needed to overcome possible effects of at-risk conditions.

Problem

The child's progress and success depends upon his or her functional behaviors and the results of the interactions of those behaviors in subsequent environments. By increasing the child's repertoire of appropriate responses for the classroom setting, the child's social competence and success in kindergarten will increase. Preschool may positively affect adaptive functioning in the actual school environment (Clark, 1984; Impact of Head Start, 1985). The more complex problem is to specify the academic survival skills that determine whether a child will or will not have a successful adjustment to kindergarten.

To resolve this problem, the following questions were be examined:

1. Which academic survival skills do kindergarten teachers consider critical for success in kindergarten?
2. Which academic survival skills do preschool teachers consider critical for success in kindergarten?
3. Which academic survival skills do family day care providers consider critical for success in kindergarten?
4. Which behaviors do kindergarten teachers consider unacceptable in kindergarten?
5. Which behaviors do preschool teachers consider as being unacceptable in kindergarten?

6. Which behaviors do family day care providers consider as being unacceptable in kindergarten?

7. What are the similarities among kindergarten teachers, preschool teachers, and family day care providers in academic survival skills considered critical for a successful adjustment to kindergarten?

8. What are the differences among kindergarten teachers, preschool teachers, and family day care providers in academic survival skills considered critical for a successful adjustment to kindergarten?

9. What are the similarities among kindergarten teachers, preschool teachers, and family day care providers in behaviors considered unacceptable in kindergarten?

10. What are the differences among kindergarten teachers, preschool teachers, and family day care providers in behaviors considered unacceptable in kindergarten?

Purpose

The primary purpose of this study was to identify academic survival skills considered necessary for a successful adjustment to kindergarten. A second purpose was to determine which behaviors are indicative of social competence in a kindergarten setting. Information and data valuable to early childhood educators and researchers was obtained. (This information and data may later be utilized to develop an academic survival skills curriculum for young

children at-risk for school failure.) A further purpose of this study was to assess preschool teachers' and family day care providers' understanding of skills needed for successful adjustment to local kindergartens.

The study was designed to give preschool educators and family day care providers an insight into the expectations of kindergarten teachers. It was also designed to give kindergarten teachers an insight into preschool educators and family day care providers' understandings of kindergarten survival skills.

The ecological congruence model for educational planning (Thurman & Widerstrom, 1985) was the paradigm used for this study. The first step was to identify the major environmental settings that are important in the child's life. The kindergarten classroom was identified as the major subsequent educational environmental setting. The second step was to develop an inventory of critical tasks in those settings.

The focus of this study was to identify the academic survival skills (critical tasks) needed for a successful adjustment to kindergarten. First, the literature was reviewed and past research examined in order to gain a theoretical background and framework of academic survival skills for the kindergarten child. Second, the author ascertained which skills local early childhood educators

considered crucial for successful adjustment to kindergarten.

Past Research

In the review of the literature, the author examined the historical background of early childhood special education, attempted to define the at-risk child, discussed the importance of appropriate goals, and provided descriptions of various curricular goals for the young child at-risk for school failure. Imprecise language in the literature has hindered the coalescence of the field of early childhood special education. Claims and criticisms tend to be articulated in broad pronouncements that elicit confusion rather than assist in clarifying issues, positions, and programmatic goals. The previous sections on the Definition of Terms, Curricula Goals and Skills, Social Competence, and The At-Risk Child indicate some of the confusion in the field.

A thorough search of the literature revealed that very little research exists on academic survival skills needed for success in kindergarten. The literature addressing the needs of the child at-risk for school failure is not well-grounded or developed. Skills needed by young children at-risk for school failure are not systematically addressed in curriculum planning. For example, the only survival skills checklist in the

literature designed for preschool age children was designed from an unpublished master's thesis and was field tested on 15 first grade teachers (McCormick & Kawate, 1982).

Apart from the work done by Walker (1980) and Stephens (1978) specifically aimed at identifying the behavior that elementary teachers expect of children, and McCormick and Kawate's study (1982), this researcher could find no methodical inquiry that determined academic survival skills needed for success in kindergarten. A comprehensive review of the current literature confirmed the fact that there has been no systematic research that clearly indicates skills needed by young children at-risk for school failure.

Methodology

In order to ascertain which skills early childhood educators consider crucial for the child's successful survival in kindergarten, the Social Behavior Skills Inventory (Walker & Rankin, 1980) was utilized as a survey instrument to obtain the relevant data. The survey obtained data that describe the specific social competence and academic survival skills considered important for kindergarten children in Calaveras, Amador, and Tuolumne Counties in rural California.

All early childhood educators working in these three counties were surveyed. The number of participants in the

survey were as follows: 43 kindergarten teachers (81% return), 31 preschool teachers (72% return), and 45 family day care providers (67% return). Each participant completed Sections I and II of the SBS Inventory according to his or her expectations of skills and behaviors appropriate or maladaptive to the kindergarten classroom.

The number of adaptive behaviors of the SBS Inventory, Section I (56 items), which each participant group rated critical, desirable, or unimportant was examined to determine expectations of academic survival skills needed for kindergarten success. Similarly, the number of maladaptive behaviors of the SBS Inventory, Section II (51 items), rated unacceptable, tolerated, or acceptable was examined to determine behaviors considered unacceptable for kindergarten. The distribution of each group's total scores for each of these two Sections on pre-determined factors was analyzed. The Section I (appropriate) skills rated as having high importance were analyzed for similarities and differences. The Section II (maladaptive) behaviors rated as having high importance were also analyzed for similarities and differences. These findings describe the academic survival skills perceived as necessary for successful adjustment to local kindergarten classrooms.

Conclusions

The results of the study revealed information regarding perceptions of social competence and academic survival skills needed for a successful adjustment to kindergarten.

1. There were only two academic survival skills agreed upon by kindergarten teachers, preschool teachers, and family day care providers as being critical for a successful adjustment in a kindergarten classroom. These were "Child listens carefully to teacher instructions and directions for assignments", and "Child complies with teacher demands".

2. There were many similarities among kindergarten teachers, preschool teachers, and family day care providers in behaviors considered unacceptable in kindergarten settings. Every survey participant agreed that behaviors "Child damages others' property", and "Child is self abusive" were not tolerated in kindergarten. Altogether, 16 behaviors in Section II of the survey were rated unacceptable by all three participant groups.

3. Far more maladaptive behaviors were rated as highly important than appropriate behaviors by all groups. The findings indicate that all participant groups felt more strongly about unacceptable, maladaptive behaviors than critical, appropriate behaviors.

4. The majority of behaviors rated as unacceptable in kindergarten were behaviors that challenged the teacher's control and authority.

5. None of the maladaptive behaviors were considered acceptable in kindergarten by any of the participant groups.

6. Social skills and positive interactions with peers were not as critical for academic survival as other types of skills.

7. The lowest ranking maladaptive behaviors were also related to peer socialization. Maladaptive social interaction with peers was more tolerated in kindergarten than other behaviors by all participant groups.

To some degree, it is to be expected that there will be some similarities among the participant groups in agreement on skills and behaviors of high importance. This agreement may be due in part to a general understanding of appropriate and inappropriate behaviors for school. To the degree that the general evaluations are based upon these shared understandings, the ratings should agree.

8. Several differences were found among kindergarten teachers, preschool teachers, and family day care providers in academic survival skills considered necessary for a successful adjustment to kindergarten. Kindergarten teachers indicated that an additional 5 academic survival

skills were needed. These skills were not considered as being highly important by either preschool teachers or family day care providers. These were "Child is flexible and can adjust to different instructional situations"; "Child behaves appropriately in non-classroom settings"; "Child can participate in and contribute to group instructional situations/activities"; "Child uses classroom equipment and materials correctly"; and "Child uses playground equipment appropriately".

9. Kindergarten teachers considered more of the adaptive skills to be necessary for academic survival than either preschool teachers or family day care providers.

10. In behaviors considered unacceptable in kindergarten settings there were some differences among kindergarten teachers, preschool teachers, and family day care providers. Kindergarten teachers were the only group who indicated "Child manipulates other children and/or situations in order to get his/her own way", and "Child does not follow specified rules of games and/or class activities" as unacceptable in kindergarten.

11. Family day care providers rated more behaviors as unacceptable in kindergarten than preschool teachers or kindergarten teachers.

Some level of disagreement, however, is expected. Some groups of participants will have had more

opportunities, not available to others to obtain knowledge of appropriate kindergarten behavior. For example, preschool teachers spend little time in kindergarten classrooms. If variations occur in the responses to the survey due to these different situations, disagreement in their ratings can be expected.

Participants may also disagree because of different standards or expectations they may hold for children's social competence. For example, kindergarten teachers may place higher value on the child's skills related to complying with teacher requests and resolving problems than preschool teachers and family day care providers would anticipate.

Also the educational background of preschool teachers and kindergarten teachers may reflect different philosophies and perspectives. Preschool teachers are usually fairly well versed in child development theory and practice, such as knowing appropriate developmental behaviors for young children. The emphasis in their training has been on developing the whole child. Whereas, kindergarten teachers usually have a strong background in elementary education, with the emphasis on educational strategies and methodology. Without formal education related to early childhood education, family day care providers often rely on experiences with children in the

home to provide a practical background in appropriate child behaviors.

12. All SBS Inventory items are appropriate for kindergarten as well as the elementary classroom range they were originally designed for, except for Section I item number 33. This item states, "Child can follow teacher written instructions and directions." This is the only skill listed in either Section I or II of the SBS Inventory that may be considered inappropriate for kindergarten, because it assumes the child can read.

13. It is questionable whether all survey participants realized that Section I item number 33 required expectation that the child could read and then follow the written direction or instructions. Some participants may have overlooked the word "written" and read the item as, "Child can follow teacher instructions and directions."

14. It appears that Walker's factors for Sections I and II of the SBS Inventory relate to a particular area of skills, but the factors do not discriminate between skills and behaviors as having high or low importance. Section I Factors describe: (a) an organized efficient pupil with excellent work habits, (b) a pupil who is responsive to the teacher and has self-control, and (c) a pupil who has positive social interactions with peers. Section II Factors

describe maladaptive behaviors that: (a) are specific to the pupil or are inappropriate interactions with peers, and (b) challenge the teacher's control and authority.

Interactions with peers, either positive or maladaptive, were generally rated the least important of all the skills and behaviors. Other than this there were no significant findings related to the factor structure. Perhaps a different factor structure would yield findings that discriminated skills and behaviors as having high or low importance according to the factor structure.

The analyses of data identified the academic survival skills perceived as necessary for a successful adjustment to kindergarten in Amador, Calaveras, and Tuolumne Counties in California. These skills could form an operational definition of social competence for local kindergartens.

It is evident that the investigation of the research questions posed in this study has provided some insight into the standards and expectations for kindergarten success held by different groups of early childhood educators. This is of concern since a child's transition from a preschool or family day care placement into a kindergarten placement may be affected by differential standards and expectations.

Smooth articulation between preschool or family day care and kindergarten is based upon similar expectations of academic survival skills needed for a successful adjustment

to kindergarten. Agreement on behaviors inappropriate for kindergarten is also necessary. Differences among the participant groups are issues that need to be addressed in transitioning children from preschool settings to kindergarten classrooms.

Significance of Study

This study was a beginning in determining the particular adaptive precursor skills needed by the at-risk child. By identifying academic survival skills considered necessary for a successful adjustment to kindergarten, the study provided data on skills needed by the young child at-risk for school failure. These resultant findings should be of practical value to preschool teachers, family day care providers, para-professionals, and parents. The clarification of academic survival skills will advance knowledge in the fields of early childhood development and early childhood special education.

It is expected that the results of this study have:

1. Brought attention to often overlooked skills crucial to kindergarten success.
2. Provided a knowledge base for developing smooth transitions from preschool and day care settings to kindergarten.
3. More clearly defined "social competence" as a goal for Head Start and other preschool programs.

4. Clarified academic behavior priorities of teachers and para-professionals involved in the education of young children.

5. Made possible the development of a criterion-referenced academic survival skills curriculum for preschool and kindergarten children.

Competence in an academic environment is determined at the local level and is therefore specific to the area. The research data provided information relevant for the local Head Start and preschool programs in the area. This information can be utilized in developing appropriate curricula goals and objectives. Already, the local Head Start program is planning to incorporate this information into the curriculum.

The range of the Social Behavior Skills Project was extended by this research study. The use of the SBS Inventory as a survey instrument to possibly identify academic survival skills has been initiated. The data will also be analyzed to provide valuable insight into the differences between preschool, kindergarten, and elementary level teachers' standards and expectations for children. For example, the California State Department of Education requested to include the findings as part of their investigation into school readiness.

Most importantly, the study provided a general base from which to formulate more specific research questions and methodologies in regard to social competence and academic survival skills. As the parameters of future research in these particular areas are established, findings may produce significant benefits to Head Start and other preschool programs.

Further research in this area of academic survival skills has potential for effecting major curricular revisions in focus and goals for that aspect of early childhood education concerned with the child at-risk for school failure. Skills critical for survival in the subsequent environment may be the curricular goals for the preceding environment. Goals, skills, and behaviors can be organized and elaborated into a criterion-referenced curriculum for young children at-risk for school failure. With this identification of environmental demands and expectations that exist within the kindergarten classroom, it will be possible to systematically prepare the young child to more effectively cope in kindergarten and thereby alleviate the child's at-risk status.

Replication of this study would contribute important information regarding expected academic survival skills for the district or region surveyed. This information could

then be utilized as would best benefit that district or region.

Assumptions and Limitations

The research in the literature did not reflect consideration that school success or failure is culturally based and reflects society's contemporary values. Due to the variances in school and individual philosophies, goals, and practices, the resultant findings may not be valid for any other population. Therefore the findings of this study are assumed to be valid only for the geographical regions and school districts participating in the survey.

This study was limited to the rural counties of Amador, Calaveras, and Tuolumne. Only those participants who responded to the survey have data included in the findings and results. The findings reflect the academic survival and social competence skills considered important in the geographical area included in the study.

The author does not advise interpreting and generalizing the results of this study to other geographical areas. The complexity of the nature of rural areas and community variables is such as to make these findings unique to the area. The process of determining the academic survival skills, however, is generalizable to other areas and educators.

Emergent Issues

Throughout this paper, a number of important themes or issues have emerged. The more important of these themes are the need for (a) the development and implementation of programs using goals and objectives; (b) an ecological approach; and (c) the inclusion of salient environmental elements in the curriculum.

In particular, work is needed on instruments that assess aspects of programs previously ignored and provide information from which to develop individual intervention programs. Early childhood educators need tools that are practical to administer and that yield useful data on children and educational programs. The nature of these data should be such that relevant goals, objectives, and specific program curricula can be formulated. The move has begun to shift the curricular focus from developmental milestones to include behaviors more social and functional. Already developed instruments, procedures, strategies, and materials can provide a starting point for such an endeavor.

A future trend that seems certain is increased attention to determining the impact of early education programs on at-risk children. In particular, an emphasis will be on research designed to determine what goals and approaches produce the the most significant outcomes, and

what is the comparative cost-outcomes of specific interventions. The current federal emphasis (PL 99-457) on early childhood special education may rapidly advance the further development and sophistication of the field.

A number of important issues concerning the young child at-risk for school failure require further study and the formation of acceptable solutions, but these solutions need to be developed with an appreciation for the larger ecological context of which they are a part. Educational ecological context of which they are a part. Educational goals and programs cannot be usefully viewed apart from the larger political, social, and economic contexts in which they occur.

Of particular interest would be the further investigation of possible differences based on ethnic variables. Because of the consideration evidenced in all areas of education emphasizing cultural differences, any additional information regarding differences that might relate ethnicity or "culture" to teacher standards and expectations for academic survival skills would be of some importance and interest to early childhood educators.

For more information and research, it may be necessary to move beyond the field of early childhood special education and examine what is available in other fields, such as reading, educational psychology, language,

social psychology, etc. Expansion of research has potential for effecting major curricular revisions regarding the focus and goals for that aspect of early childhood special education concerned with the young at-risk child.

The field of early childhood special education is just beginning to blend conceptual understandings with implementation strategies. While the literature in the specific area of curricular goals and skills for young children at-risk for school failure is minimal, a number of concerns appear to be evolving. Some of these are: What types of program goals are needed by children at-risk for school failure? What is the efficacy of various curricula? Are certain teaching strategies more appropriate for at-risk children? In future years will at-risk children receive the services and education they need? Should special curricula be designed for the at-risk child? If so, would the local school district be the most appropriate level for determining the academic survival skills needed for success in kindergarten? These concerns should not be examined in terms of the limitations they might set for the educational situation, but in terms of revealing the opportunities and possibilities to be realized in the emerging field of early childhood special education.

Recommendations

Based on the summary of the study, conclusions, and emerging issues, the following recommendations are presented for consideration:

1. Conduct a a replication of this study in other districts or regions to obtain the academic survival skills needed for kindergarten success in that locality.

2. Re-evaluate Walker's factor analysis of Sections I and II of the SBS Inventory. Investigate if a different factor structure and grouping may be useful for discriminating skills and behaviors having high importance for a successful adjustment to kindergarten.

3. Carry out systematic research that compares skills needed for academic survival in kindergarten in different geographical areas, such as northeast, southwest, urban, suburban, etc.

4. Identify whether or not there are various cultural demands and expectations within the United States.

5. Compare academic survival skills needed for kindergarten in the United States with those needed in other nations.

6. Develop a criterion-referenced academic survival skills curriculum for young children at-risk for school failure.

7. Examine educational programs in institutes of higher education in order to clarify the academic behavior priorities in training programs for teachers and para-professionals involved in the education of young children.

8. Determine a more precise definition of social competence.

REFERENCES

- Alcohol and Drug Abuse Program. (1986). Unpublished raw data. San Andreas, CA.
- Almy, M. (1975). The early childhood educator at work. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Anastasiow, N. J. (1981). Early childhood education for the handicapped in the 1980's: Recommendations. Exceptional Children, 47, 276-284.
- Anastasiow, N. J. (1978). Strategies and models for early childhood intervention programs in integrated settings. In M. J. Guralnick (Ed.), Early intervention and the integration of handicapped and nonhandicapped children. Baltimore: University Park Press.
- Bagnato, S. J., & Neisworth, J. T. (1981). Linking developmental assessment and curricula: Prescriptions for early intervention. Rockville, MD: Aspen.
- Bailey, D. B., Jr., & Simeonsson, R. J. (1985). A functional model of social competence. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 4(4), 20-31.
- Beckman-Brindley, S., & Bell, R. Q. (1981). Issues in early identification. In J. M. Kauffman & D. P. Hallahan (Eds.), Handbook of special education. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

- Bender, M., & Bender, R. K. (1979). Disadvantaged preschool children: A source book for teachers. Baltimore: Paul Brookes.
- Bloom, B. (1964). Stability and change in human characteristics. New York: Wiley.
- Bricker, D. (1986). Early education of at-risk and handicapped infants, toddlers, and preschool children. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman & Co.
- Census Data Center. (1986). Unpublished raw data. Dept. of Finance. Sacramento.
- Clark, A. M. (1984). Early experience and cognitive development. In E. W. Gordon (Ed.), Review of research in education, 11. American Educational Research Assoc.
- Clay, M. M. (1979). The early detection of reading difficulties: A diagnostic survey with recovery procedures. Auckland, New Zealand: Heinemann Educational.
- Cobb, J. A. (1972). Academic survival skills and elementary academic achievement. In E. L. Meyen, G. A. Vergason, & R. J. Whelan (Eds.), Strategies for teaching exceptional children: essays from focus on exceptional children. Denver: Love.

- Cohen, K. J., Solnit, A. J., & Wohlford, P. (1979). Mental health services in Head Start. In E. Zigler & J. Valentine (Eds.), Project Head Start: A legacy of the war on poverty. New York: Free Press.
- Cohen, S., Semmes, M., & Guralnick, M. J. (1979). Public law 94-142 and the education of preschool handicapped children. Exceptional Children, 45, 279-285.
- Cook, R. E., & Armbruster, V. B. (1983). Adapting early childhood curricula: Suggestions for meeting special needs. St. Louis: C. V. Mosby.
- Council for Exceptional Children. (1983). Special education and professional standards <Special issue>. Exceptional Children, 50(3).
- Cryan, J. R., & Surbeck, E. (1979). Early childhood education: Foundations for life long learning. Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa.
- Dettre, J. H. (1983). Bridges to academic success for young at-risk children. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 3(3), 57-64.
- Dewey, J. (1902). The child and the curriculum. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Doll, R. C. (1982). Curriculum improvement: Decision making and process (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

- Doyle, M. (1982). A comparative study of pre-service teacher's social behavior expectations of pupils in the regular classroom. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, Eugene.
- DuBose, R., & Kelly, J. (1981). Curricula and instruction for young handicapped children: A guideline for selection and evaluation. Monmouth, OR: Western States Technical Assistance Resource.
- The efficacy and cost effectiveness of early education for handicapped infants and preschool children. (1982). Sacramento: California State Department of Education.
- Fewell, R. R. (1983). School failure: Problems in definition and prediction. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 3(3), viii-x.
- Foster, S. L. & Ritchey, W. L. (1979). Issues in the assessment of social competence in children. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 12, 625-638.
- Fowler, A. A. (1978). Ecological considerations in the education and integration of young handicapped children. Lawrence, KS: Kansas Research Institute. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 191 214).
- Frost, J. L., & Kissinger, J. B. (1976). The young child and the educative process. San Francisco: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

- Garland, C. (Ed.). (1981). Early intervention for children with special needs and their families. Monmouth, OR: Western States Technical Assistance Resource.
- Glick, J. (1971). Some problems in the evaluation of preschool intervention programs. In R. H. Anderson & H. G. Shane (Eds.), As the twig is bent. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Gordon, I. J. (1972). An instructional theory approach to the analysis of selected early childhood programs. In I. J. Gordon (Ed.), The seventy-first yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education: Part II. Early childhood education. Chicago: NSSE.
- Greenwood, C. R., Hops, H., Delquadri, J., & Walker, H. (1974). Program for academic survival skills. Eugene: University of Oregon.
- Gresham, F. M. (1983). Social skills assessment as a component of mainstreaming placement decisions. Exceptional Children, 50, 331-336.
- Hammill, D. D., & Leigh, J. E. (1983). Basic school skills inventory. Austin: Pro-Ed.
- Handicapped infant and preschool children: Program guidelines. (1981). Sacramento: California State Department of Education.

- Hendrick, J. (1980). Total learning for the whole child: Holistic curriculum for children ages 2 to 5. St. Louis: C. V. Mosby.
- Hersh, R., & Walker, H. (1983). Great expectations: Making schools effective for all students. The Policy Studies Journal, 1, 147-188.
- Hops, H. (1983). Children's social competence and skill: Current research practices and future directions. Behavior Therapy, 14, 3-18.
- Hops, H., & Cobb, J. A. (1973). Survival behaviors in the educational setting: Their implications for research and intervention. In L. A. Hammerlynck, L. C. Handy, & E. J. Mash (Eds.), Behavior change: Methodology, concepts, and practice. Champaign: Research Press.
- Hughes, A., & Frommer, K. (1982). A system for monitoring affective objectives. Educational Leadership, 39, 521-523.
- Hunt, J. McV. (1961). Intelligence and experience. New York: Ronald Press.
- The impact of Head Start on children, families and communities: Final report of the Head Start evaluation, synthesis and utilization project. (1985). Washington, D.C.: CSR.

- Johns, J. L. (1980). First graders' concepts about print. Reading Research Quarterly, 15(4), 7-15.
- Jordan, J. B., & Dailey, R. F. (Eds.). (1971). Not all little wagons are red: The exceptional child's early years. Reston: Council for Exceptional Children.
- Kauffman, J. M., & Hallahan, D. P. (1974). The medical model and the science of special education. Exceptional Children, 40, 97-102.
- Keogh, B. K., & Becker, L. D. (1973). Early detection of learning problems: Questions, cautions, and guidelines. Exceptional Children, 40(1), 5-11.
- Keogh, B., & Daley, D. (1983). Early identification: One component of comprehensive services for at-risk children. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 3(3), 7-16.
- Keogh, B., Tchir, C., & Windeguth-Behn, A. (1974). Teachers' perceptions of educationally high risk children. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 7(6), 43-50.
- Kirk, S. A. (1958). Early education of the mentally retarded. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- LaVor, M. L. (1977). Federal legislation for exceptional children: Implications and a view of the future. In Changing perspectives in special education. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill.

- LeBlanc, J., Etzel, B., & Domash, M. (1978). A functional curriculum for early intervention. In K. Allen, V. Holmes, & R. Schiefelbusch (Eds.), Early intervention--A team approach. Baltimore: University Park Press.
- Leigh, J. E. (1983). Early labeling of children: Concerns and alternatives. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 3(3), 1-6.
- Martin, E. W. (1971). Bureau of education for the handicapped commitment and program in early childhood education. Exceptional Children, 37, 661-663.
- McCormick, L., & Kawate, J. (1982). Kindergarten survival skills: New directions for preschool special education. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 4, 247-252.
- McKinney, D. (1979). Adaptive behavior in the classroom. In Status report on programs and projects as of March 1, 1979. Chapel Hill: North Carolina University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 174 717).
- Meisels, S. J. (1979). Special education and development. In Meisels, S. J. (Ed.), Special education and development. Baltimore: University Park Press.
- Mercer, C. D., Algozzine, B., & Trifiletti, J. J. (1980). Early identification: Issues and considerations. Exceptional Children, 47, 52-54.

- Meyen, E. L., & Moran, M. R. (1979). A perspective on the unserved mildly handicapped. Exceptional Children, 45(7), 526-530.
- Mori, A. A., & Neisworth, J. T. (1983). Curricula in early childhood education: Some generic and special considerations. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 2(4), 1-8.
- Mori, A. A., & Olive, J. E. (1980). Handbook of preschool special education. Rockville, MD: Aspen Systems.
- Mother Lode Job Training Agency. (1986). Economic data study. Sonora, CA: Author.
- Mott, S. E., Fewell, R. R., Lewis, M., Meisels, S. J., Shonkoff, J. P., & Simeonsson, R. J. (1986). Methods for assessing child and family outcomes in early childhood special education programs: Some views from the field. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 6(2), 1-15.
- National Association for the Education of Young Children. (1982). Early childhood teacher education: Guidelines for four- and five-year programs. Washington, DC.
- O'Connell, J. C. (1983). Education of handicapped preschoolers: A national survey of services and personnel requirements. Exceptional Children, 49, 538-540.

- Odom, S. L., & McConnell, S. R. (1985). A performed-based conceptualization of social competence of handicapped preschool children: Implications for assessment. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 4(4), 1-19.
- Office of Program Evaluation & Research. (1982). Guide to Special Education Program Evaluation. Sacramento: CA State Department of Education.
- O'Shea, L. J., & Gajar, A. (1983). Comparing predictions of future trends in special education. Exceptional Children, 50, 117-179.
- Public Laws 88-164, 90-538, 92-424, 93-112, 94-142, 99-457. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office.
- Putallaz, M., & Gottman, J. (1982). Conceptualizing social competence in children. In P. Karoly & J. Steffen (Eds.), Improving children's competence: Advances in child behavioral analysis and therapy. Toronto: Lexington.
- Reynolds, L., Egan, R., & Lerner, J. (1983). Efficacy of early identification of preacademic deficits: A review of the literature. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 3(3), 47-56.

- Reynolds, M. C., & Rosen, S. W. (1976). Special education: Past, present, and future. Educational Forum, 40, 5-11.
- Simner, M. L. (1983). The warning signs of school failure: An updated profile of the at-risk kindergarten child. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 3(3), 17-27.
- Skeels, H. M. (1966). Adult status of children with contrasting early life experiences. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 31(3), 1-65.
- Smith, B. J. (1982). Policy considerations related to early childhood special education. Reston: Council for Exceptional Children.
- Stephens, T. M. (1977). Teaching skills to children with learning and behavior disorders. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill.
- Stephens, T. M. (1978). Social skills in the classroom. Columbus: Cedars Press.
- Strain, P. S., & Cordisco, L. K. (1983). Child characteristics and outcomes related to mainstreaming. In J. Anderson & T. Black (Eds.), Mainstreaming in early education. Chapel Hill: TADS.
- Swan, W. W. (1981). Efficacy studies in early childhood special education: An overview. Journal of the Division for Early Childhood, 4, 1-4.

- Thurman, S., & Widerstrom, R. (1985). Young children with special needs: A developmental and ecological approach. Newton, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (1984). Head Start program performance standards. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (1986). The status of handicapped children in Head Start programs: Thirteenth annual report of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services to the congress of the United States on services provided to handicapped children in Project Head Start. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Vincent, L. J., Salisbury, C., Walter, G., Brown, P., Gruenwald, L. J., & Powers, M. (1980). Program evaluation and curriculum development in early childhood/special education. In W. Sailor, B. Wilcox, & L. Brown (Eds.), Methods of instruction for severely handicapped students. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.
- Walker, H. (1984). Teacher social behavior standards and expectations as determinants of classroom ecology, teacher behavior, and child outcomes. Eugene: University of Oregon.

- Walker, H., & Rankin, R. (1983). Assessing the behavioral expectations and demands of less restrictive settings. School Psychology Review, 12, 274-284.
- Walker, H., & Rankin, R. (1980). The SBS inventory of teacher social behavior standards and expectations. Eugene: University of Oregon.
- Walker, J. (1984). An investigation of the relationship of levels of formal education and ethnicity to Head Start teachers' standards and expectations for handicapped students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, Eugene.
- Walter, G., & Vincent, L. (1982). The handicapped child in the regular kindergarten classroom. Journal of the Division for Early Childhood, 6, 84-95.
- Weikert, D. P. (1972). A traditional nursery program revisited. In R. K. Parker (Ed.), The preschool in action: Exploring early childhood programs. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Weiss, J. (1980). Assessing nonconventional outcomes of schooling. In D. C. Berliner (Ed.), Review of research of education, 8. American Educational Research Assoc.
- Wolery, M. R. (1983). Evaluating curricula: Purposes and strategies. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 2(4), 15-24.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

The SBS Inventory
of
Teacher Standards and Expectations

by
Hill M. Wlaker, Ph.D. and Richard Rankin, Ph.D.
University of Oregon

February 1980

ACADEMIC SURVIVAL SKILLS FOR THE YOUNG CHILD AT-RISK FOR
SCHOOL FAILURE

Demographic Information

Please complete all information regarding your current
teaching or work position.

	Years of Experience
---Kindergarten Teacher	-----
---Public School	-----
---Private School	-----
---Preschool/Day Care Teacher	-----
---Head Start Teacher	-----
---Family Day Care Provider	-----
---Other: _____	

Educational Background:

---High School			
---AA Degree	---Early Childhood	---Other	
---BA/BS Degree	---Child Dev.	---Elem. Educ.	---Other

Name of Local Elementary School: _____

County you work in: _____

---Amador	---Calaveras	---Tuolumne
-----------	--------------	-------------

The SBS Inventory of Teacher Standards and Expectations
by
Hill M. Walker, Ph.D. and Richard Rankin, Ph.D.
University of Oregon
February 1988

Instructions

This inventory consists of two sections of items descriptive of child behavior in the classroom setting. Section I describes child behavior competencies and skills that are considered appropriate to the classroom setting. Section II describes child behavior that is considered inappropriate and/or disruptive to the classroom setting. As a survey participant, you are asked to make one of three rating judgements about each item in Sections I and II of the inventory.

Instructions for Section I

For the items in this section, please indicate whether the behavior described is (a) critical, (b) desirable or (c) unimportant to a successful adjustment in a kindergarten classroom by placing a check in the appropriate parentheses.

Critical means that the behavior is absolutely essential to a successful or satisfactory adjustment to kindergarten.

Desirable means that the behavior is not essential or critical to a satisfactory kindergarten adjustment but is encouraged.

Unimportant means that you perceive the behavior as not being necessary or required for a satisfactory adjustment in kindergarten.

Section 1: Descriptions of adaptive, appropriate child behaviors.

	<u>Critical Desirable Unimportant</u>		
1. Child is flexible and can adjust to different instructional situations, e.g. changes in routine, teachers, setting, etc.	()	()	()
2. Child listens while other children are speaking, e.g. as in circle or sharing time.	()	()	()
3. Child communicates adequately, e.g. speaks normally and can be understood.	()	()	()
4. Child takes his/her turn.	()	()	()
5. Child uses academic tool correctly, e.g. paper, pencils, scissors, etc.	()	()	()
6. Child seeks teacher attention at appropriate times.	()	()	()
7. Child models or imitates the appropriate behavior of other children.	()	()	()
8. Child uses free time appropriately.	()	()	()
9. Child makes his/her assistance needs known in an appropriate manner, e.g. asks to go to the bathroom, raises hand when finished with work, asks for help with work, lets teacher know when sick or hurt.	()	()	()
10. Child listens carefully to teacher instructions and directions for assignments.	()	()	()
11. Child volunteers for classroom activities, e.g. assisting the teacher, reading aloud, classroom games, etc.	()	()	()
12. Child complies with teacher commands.	()	()	()
13. Child improves academic or social behavior in response to teacher feedback.	()	()	()
14. Child is considerate of the feelings of others, e.g. says or does things indicating an awareness of another's feelings.	()	()	()
15. Child produces work of acceptable quality given his/her skill level.	()	()	()
16. Child cooperates with peers in group activities or situations.	()	()	()
17. Child follows established classroom rules.	()	()	()
18. Child can have normal conversations with peers without becoming hostile or angry.	()	()	()
19. Child can work on projects in class with another student.	()	()	()

	<u>Critical</u>	<u>Desirable</u>	<u>Unimportant</u>
20. Child compliments peers regarding some attribute or behavior.	()	()	()
21. Child has independent study skills, e.g. can work adequately with minimal teacher support, attempts to solve a problem with schoolwork before asking for help.	()	()	()
22. Child speaks to others in a tone of voice appropriate to the situation.	()	()	()
23. Child answers or attempts to answer a question when called on by the teacher.	()	()	()
24. Child copes with failure in an appropriate manner, e.g. doesn't give up on assignment or project involved in.	()	()	()
25. Child behaves appropriately in non classroom settings (bathroom, hallways, lunchroom, playground), e.g. walks quietly, follows playground rules, etc.	()	()	()
26. Child resolves peer conflicts or problems adequately on his/her own without requesting teacher assistance.	()	()	()
27. Child can accept not getting his/her own way.	()	()	()
28. Child attends consistently to assigned tasks.	()	()	()
29. Child ignores the distractions or interruptions of other students during academic activities.	()	()	()
30. Child knows when to ask permission of the teacher or other children.	()	()	()
31. Child tolerates usual school frustrations adequately, e.g. delays, schedule changes, etc.	()	()	()
32. Child can participate in and contribute to group instructional situations/activities.	()	()	()
33. Child can follow teacher written instructions and directions.	()	()	()
34. Child avoids breaking classroom rules(s) even when encouraged by a peer.	()	()	()
35. Child has good work habits, e.g. makes efficient use of class time, is organized, stays on task, etc.	()	()	()
36. Child is honest with others, e.g. tells the truth, isn't deceptive.	()	()	()
37. Child responds to requests and directions promptly.	()	()	()
38. Child questions rules, directions or instructions that are not clear to him/her.	()	()	()

	<u>Critical</u>	<u>Desirable</u>	<u>Unimportant</u>
39. Child shares materials with others in a work situation.	()	()	()
40. Child makes productive use of time while waiting for teacher assistance, e.g. continues to work on problems that do not prove to be difficult.	()	()	()
41. Child raises hand before asking a question where appropriate.	()	()	()
42. Child completes tasks within prescribed time limits.	()	()	()
43. Child uses social conventions appropriately, e.g. says "thank you", "please", apologizes, etc.	()	()	()
44. Child observes rules governing movement around the room, e.g. when and how to move.	()	()	()
45. Child responds to teasing or name calling by ignoring, changing the subject or some other constructive means.	()	()	()
46. Child expresses anger appropriately, e.g. reacts to situation without being violent or destructive.	()	()	()
47. Child initiates conversation with peers in informal situations.	()	()	()
48. Child uses classroom equipment and materials correctly.	()	()	()
49. Child uses playground equipment appropriately.	()	()	()
50. Child does seatwork assignments as directed.	()	()	()
51. Child sits up straight in seat during classroom instruction.	()	()	()
52. Child waits quietly for recognition before speaking out in class.	()	()	()
53. Child follows simple directions after hearing them once.	()	()	()
54. Child carries out decision(s) or plan formulated by the group.	()	()	()
55. Child can recognize and describe moods/feelings of others and self.	()	()	()
56. Child responds to conventional behavior management techniques.	()	()	()

Any other critical behaviors or skills:

Instructions for Section II

For the items in this section, please indicate whether the behavior described is (a) unacceptable, (b) tolerated or (c) acceptable in a kindergarten classroom.

Unacceptable means that the teacher would not tolerate the behavior occurring in kindergarten. Should an instance of the behavior occur, the kindergarten teacher would try to suppress or eliminate it and prevent its future occurrence.

Tolerated means that while the kindergarten teacher would "put up" with the behavior in (at least temporarily), s/he would prefer to see it reduced in frequency and/or replaced by an appropriate behavior.

Acceptable means that the behavior presents no problems for kindergarten and the teacher would not try to decrease or eliminate it.

Section II: Descriptions of maladaptive, inappropriate child behaviors.

	<u>Unacceptable</u>	<u>Tolerated</u>	<u>Acceptable</u>
1. Child whines.	()	()	()
2. Child tests or challenges teacher imposed limits, e.g. classroom rules.	()	()	()
3. Child is easily distracted from the task or activity at hand.	()	()	()
4. Child has tantrums.	()	()	()
5. Child babbles to him/herself.	()	()	()
6. Child disturbs or disrupts the activities of others.	()	()	()
7. Child engages in stereotyped repetitive behavior, e.g. repeats the same response over and over in the same way such as pencil tapping, drumming fingers or playing with objects.	()	()	()
8. Child refuses to share.	()	()	()
9. Child engages in silly, attention getting behavior, e.g. makes unusual noises/gestures.	()	()	()
10. Child lies.	()	()	()
11. Child is verbally aggressive with others, e.g. teases, taunts, engages in name-calling.	()	()	()
12. Child manipulates other children and/or situations in order to get his/her own way.	()	()	()
13. Child refuses to obey teacher imposed classroom rules.	()	()	()
14. Child uses obscene language.	()	()	()
15. Child pouts or sulks.	()	()	()
16. Child ignores teacher warnings or reprimands.	()	()	()
17. Child is physically aggressive with others, e.g. hits, bites, chokes, holds.	()	()	()

	<u>Unacceptable</u>	<u>Tolerated</u>	<u>Acceptable</u>
18. Child cheats, e.g. copies work from others.	()	()	()
19. Child becomes visibly upset or angry when things do not go his/her way.	()	()	()
20. Child talks out of turn.	()	()	()
21. Child ignores the social initiations (overtures, advances, etc.) of other children.	()	()	()
22. Child damages others' property, e.g. academic materials, personal possessions, etc.	()	()	()
23. Child asks irrelevant questions, e.g. questions serve no functional purpose and are not task related.	()	()	()
24. Child reacts with defiance to instructions or commands.	()	()	()
25. Child steals.	()	()	()
26. Child does not follow specified rules of games and/or class activities.	()	()	()
27. Child obeys only when threatened with punishment.	()	()	()
28. Child refuses to play in games with other children.	()	()	()
29. Child behaves inappropriately in class when corrected, e.g. shouts back, defies the teacher, etc.	()	()	()
30. Child forces the submission of peers by being dominant, bossy and/or overbearing.	()	()	()
31. Child starts activities but does not finish them.	()	()	()
32. Child argues and must have the last word in verbal exchanges with peers and/or teacher.	()	()	()
33. Child appears to be unmotivated, e.g. not interested in school work.	()	()	()
34. Child makes lewd or obscene gestures.	()	()	()
35. Child displays high levels of dependence, e.g. needs excessive amounts of assistance, feedback and/or supervision to complete simple tasks.	()	()	()
36. Child does not respond when called upon.	()	()	()
37. Child creates a disturbance during class activities, e.g. is excessively noisy, bothers other students, is out of seat, etc.	()	()	()
38. Child is overly affectionate with other children and/or adults, e.g. touching, hugging, kissing.	()	()	()

	<u>Unacceptable</u>	<u>Tolerated</u>	<u>Acceptable</u>
39. Child is excessively demanding, e.g. demands too much individual attention.	()	()	()
40. Child is inexcusably late for the beginning of class activities.	()	()	()
41. Child is seriously withdrawn, e.g. whenever possible avoids social contact with other children and/or adults.	()	()	()
42. Child interrupts the teacher when the teacher is engaged in a presentation or activity.	()	()	()
43. Child engages in inappropriate sexual behavior, e.g. masturbates, exposes self, etc.	()	()	()
44. Child is self abusive, e.g. biting, cutting or buising self, head banging, etc.	()	()	()
45. Child wants to participate in playground activity in progress but is afraid to ask to join.	()	()	()
46. Child does not share toys and equipment in a play situation.	()	()	()
47. Child does not follow and/or give into necessary rules of games and class activities.	()	()	()
48. Child does not correct mistakes when teacher indicates there are errors.	()	()	()
49. Child does not ask permission to use others' property.	()	()	()
50. Child's remarks or questions are irrelevant to classroom discussions.	()	()	()
51. Child reacts negatively to assigned school work, e.g. complains, sulks, refuses to start task.	()	()	()

Any other unacceptable behaviors:

FOLD HERE

Barbara Foulks, Calaveras Head Start
P. O. Box 684 (134 E. St. Charles St.)
San Andreas, CA 95249

Appendix B

Cover Letters

Memorandum

Date: September 18, 1986

To: Superintendent of Schools

From: Barbara Foulks
Calaveras Head Start
P. O. Box 684 (134 E. St. Charles)
San Andreas, CA 95249

Subject: Request for participation in a research activity

The purpose of this memo is to request your schools' involvement in a research project that I am conducting. The research activity covers Amador, Calaveras and Tuolumne Counties. This research is being done as part of my doctoral dissertation in Curriculum and Instruction at the University of the Pacific.

The research activity has been designed for the following purposes:
1) determine needed academic survival skills for the kindergarten child;
2) obtain opinions of kindergarten teachers, pre-school teachers, and family day care providers; and 3) compare the findings within Amador, Calaveras, and Tuolumne Counties.

It is anticipated that the research findings will provide important information on skills young children need for kindergarten success. This information will be useful for preschool curriculum planning. At the conclusion of the study a summary of the findings will be sent to you.

I would appreciate your schools' involvement in this research activity. Enclosed is a sample survey packet. The individuals to receive and complete the research survey are kindergarten teachers and assistants.

An estimate of the number of teachers in your schools has been made in determining how many survey packets to send. If you do not receive enough surveys, I would appreciate your doing one of the following: 1) duplicate the needed number of packets, or 2) call me and I can forward additional packets.

All completed surveys are to be returned by October 1, 1986 to:
Barbara Foulks, Calaveras Head Start
P. O. Box 684
San Andreas, CA 95249

Telephone: (209) 754-3114

Your consideration and cooperation in this research activity are greatly appreciated.

Barbara Foulks

September 10, 1986

Dear Kindergarten Teacher,

You are requested to participate in a research project. The research activity has been designed for the following purposes:

1. Determine needed academic survival skills for the Kindergarten child;
2. Survey opinions of Kindergarten teachers, pre-school teachers, and family day care providers and;
3. Compare the findings within Amador, Calaveras, and Tuolumne Counties.

It is anticipated that the research findings will provide important information on skills young children need for Kindergarten success. This information will be useful for preschool curriculum planning. At the conclusion of the study a summary of the findings will be available to you.

Your participation in this research activity is entirely voluntary. If you decide to participate in the study please do the following:

1. Review this letter explaining the activity, providing instructions on how to complete the inventory, and and guaranteeing confidentiality.
2. Complete the SBS Inventory.
3. Return the completed SBS Inventory.

INSTRUCTIONS

As a participant in this research activity you are being asked to provide demographic information and complete a survey. The survey is the SBS Inventory to determine Academic Survival Skills needed for Kindergarten. The rater instructions for completing the inventory are specific and are written on the SBS Inventory. Please use the following guidelines in completing this survey.

1. Be sure to read the instructions provided before filling out the survey.
 2. Be sure to complete the Demographic Information section accurately and completely.
 3. Complete the SBS Inventory from your perspective.
 4. Mark only one parenthesis () for each item on the SBS Inventory.
 5. Mark only in parenthesis catagories. Do not mark between catagories.
 6. Be sure to mark a parenthesis () for every item. Do not leave any items unmarked.
 7. There are no "right" answers.
 8. Completion of the SBS Inventory should take about 15 to 20 minutes.
- When you have completed the survey, please fold in half, so that the address shows for return and secure with a staple or tape. Return the survey by October 1, 1986 to:
- Barbara Foulks, Calaveras Head Start (209) 754-3114
134 E. St. Charles St. (Mt. Families Services Office)
P.O. Box 684, San Andreas, CA 95249

The information that you provide in response to the inventory will be held in strictest confidence by the researcher. No individual or personally identifiable information will be provided to any person or agency. A coding system has been developed and will be used when analyzing the data.

Your participation in this study will be of significant value to early childhood educators and, specifically to those in Amador, Calaveras, and Tuolumne Counties.

Barbara Foulks

Barbara Foulks

September 10, 1986

Dear Preschool Teacher and Family Day Care Provider,

You are requested to participate in a research project. The research activity has been designed for the following purposes:

1. Determine needed academic survival skills for the Kindergarten child;
2. Survey opinions of Kindergarten teachers, pre-school teachers, and family day care providers and;
3. Compare the findings within Amador, Calaveras, and Tuolumne Counties.

It is anticipated that the research findings will provide important information on skills young children need for Kindergarten success. This information will be useful for preschool curriculum planning. At the conclusion of the study a summary of the findings will be available to you.

Your participation in this research activity is entirely voluntary. If you decide to participate in the study please do the following:

1. Review this letter explaining the activity, providing instructions on how to complete the inventory, and and guaranteeing confidentiality.
2. Complete the SBS Inventory.
3. Return the completed SBS Inventory.

INSTRUCTIONS

As a participant in this research activity you are being asked to provide demographic information and complete a survey. The survey is the SBS Inventory to determine Academic Survival Skills needed for Kindergarten. The rater instructions for completing the inventory are specific and are written on the SBS Inventory. Please use the following guidelines in completing this survey.

1. Be sure to read the instructions provided before filling out the survey.
 2. Be sure to complete the Demographic Information section accurately and completely.
 3. Complete the SBS Inventory from your perspective.
 4. Mark only one parenthesis () for each item on the SBS Inventory.
 5. Mark only in parenthesis categories. Do not mark between categories.
 6. Be sure to mark a parenthesis () for every item. Do not leave any items unmarked.
 7. There are no "right" answers.
 8. Completion of the SBS Inventory should take about 15 to 20 minutes.
- When you have completed the survey, please fold in half, so that the address shows for return and secure with a staple or tape. Return the survey by October 1, 1986 to:
- Barbara Foulks, Calaveras Head Start (209) 754-3114
134 E. St. Charles St. (Mt. Families Services Office)
P.O. Box 684, San Andreas, CA 95249

The information that you provide in response to the inventory will be held in strictest confidence by the researcher. No individual or personally identifiable information will be provided to any person or agency. A coding system has been developed and will be used when analyzing the data.

Your participation in this study will be of significant value to early childhood educators and, specifically to those in Amador, Calaveras, and Tuolumne Counties.

Barbara Foulks

Barbara Foulks