Portland State University

PDXScholar

Dissertations and Theses

Dissertations and Theses

1972

Preschool Predication of First Grade Social and Emotional Adjustment

Benjamin Sherrill

Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds

Part of the [Social Work Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Sherrill, Benjamin, "Preschool Predication of First Grade Social and Emotional Adjustment" (1972).
Dissertations and Theses. Paper 1569.

<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.1569>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

PRESCHOOL PREDICTION OF FIRST GRADE
SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL ADJUSTMENT

by

Benjamin E. Sherrill
Candace E. Wright

A practicum submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Social Work

Portland State University
1972

APPROVED:

Betty Hall M.S.W., Faculty Advisor

Ray Myers, Community Consultant

Acknowledgments

We wish to acknowledge the support and cooperation of the Salem Elementary School District and Washington Elementary School, especially Dr. Earl Hampton, Assistant Superintendent in charge of elementary education, Mr. Glade Follis, principal of Washington School, and the first grade teachers, Mrs. Linda Peterson, Mrs. Ruth Senter, and Mrs. Dianne Williamson.

In addition, we appreciate the contributions of our research committee, Mrs. Betty Hall M.S.W., Assistant Professor Portland State University School of Social Work, and Mr. Ray Myers, Guidance Supervisor, Salem School District.

Special thanks go to our statistical consultant, Dr. Quentin D. Clarkson, and to Mrs. Nancy Koroloff whose advice and technical skill greatly facilitated the analysis of our data.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	11
LIST OF TABLES	1v
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION	1
Hypothesis	1
II RESEARCH DESIGN	3
III REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	5
Preschool Prediction	5
Related Preschool Studies	7
Evaluation of School Children	9
Teacher Ratings	11
IV INSTRUMENTS	13
V FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION	21
Demographic Data on Pupil Population	21
Pupil Evaluation	23
Background Factors and Poor Adjustment	27
Discussion	32
VI SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	37
REFERENCES CITED	38
APPENDIX	42
Cover Letter for Parent Questionnaire	43
Parent Questionnaire	44
Pupil Evaluation	46

LIST OF TABLES

PAGE

1. Heads of Households	21
2. Number of Children in Subjects' Families	22
3. Subjects' Position in Families	22
4. Mothers' Ages	47
5. Fathers' Ages	47
6. Parents' Occupational Status	48
7. Parents' Education	49
8. Pupil Evaluation Factor I Loadings Used to Generate Adjustment Scores for Subjects	50
9. Poorly Adjusted Children Identified by The Pupil Evaluation	26
10. Comparison of Pupil Evaluation Results and Metropolitan Readiness Test Scores	27
11. Relationship of Length of Residence In Salem To Child's Social-Emotional Adjustment	28
12. Relationship of Child's Position In Family to Social- Emotional Adjustment	29
13. Relationship of Mother's Health During Pregnancy to Child's Social-Emotional Adjustment	29
14. Relationship of Mother's Education to Child's Social- Emotional Adjustment	30
15. Relationship of Mother's Employment Status to Child's Social-Emotional Adjustment	31
16. Relationship of Frequency of Sunday School Attendance to Child's Social-Emotional Adjustment	32

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The prediction and/or early identification of problems of the first grader are of concern to educators, school psychologists, and those engaged in elementary school social work. Social and behavioral problems interfere with the child's ability to succeed in school and it is clear that if these difficulties could be anticipated early in the first grader's school experience there could be immediate intervention to enhance his chances for success. In the words of Daniel Prescott, "Finding the pupils with special needs earlier in their school histories would prevent the deepening of their difficulties and permit remedial or therapeutic work to be done more effectively." (34:57) We concur with Eli Bower who emphasizes that it is important

in any program of early identification that the data collected be ordinarily collected by the system itself, that it be useful in doing something to make the child more effective in the system, and that it be related to the goals and processes of the system, in this case, the school. (4:39)

Hypothesis

This study was based upon the hypothesis that it would be possible to identify predictors of poor first grade social-emotional adjustment through information obtained from a preschool parent questionnaire. We believed that an instrument could be developed that would assist in early identification of the high risk children who were entering school. We were also hopeful that the instrument would prove useful in isolating the specific needs of the child who has been identified in the "risk" category and in this way give direction to the process of early intervention.

Finally, we anticipated that some of the indices of school adjustment problems would be common to a number of students and would indicate the direction for further exploration in methods of preventive intervention at the pre-school level.

CHAPTER II

RESEARCH DESIGN

Selection of School. The selection of a suitable setting for our research was primarily based on four factors. First, we felt the ideal school setting would be one which provided a cross-section of socioeconomic levels of the Salem population. Since Salem is a city that has a relatively low non-white and/or lower socioeconomic component, we wanted to select a school with a number of low income families. By using the Title I eligibility index of the Salem Elementary Schools we were able to determine the approximate number of low income families in each school attendance area. Second, we wanted to conduct the research in a school program that was not involved in Federal programs that provide social work, counseling, or remedial help since the work being done in these areas might effect the data gathered. A third factor influencing choice of a target school was the variation in size of first grade populations from 15 to 93 (1971). We believed that a larger sample would yield data which would be more representative of the total first grade population. A fourth and deciding factor was the willingness of the principal and teaching staff to participate in the project. Washington School met these criteria most satisfactorily.

Washington Grade School has a population of approximately 550 students (1971) and is located in urban northeast Salem. The staff includes the principal, twenty-one classroom teachers (three 1st grade), one learning center coordinator, and one half-time librarian. Washington School is one of the schools identified by the Federal Projects Office

as having a higher than average number of low income families.*

Identification of Potential First Graders. The students in this study, then, were the 1971-72 first grade students at Washington Grade School in Salem, Oregon. In May of 1971, we obtained a list of the families of all children preregistered or listed on the school census who were to enter the first grade in the fall of 1971. In September we obtained an additional list of children that had not preregistered but who would be attending as first graders. Thus the sample included all Washington School first graders who enrolled before November, 1971.

Mailing of Questionnaire. The parent questionnaire and cover letter (see appendix) were mailed out to the home addresses of the students in our sample. Seventy-eight questionnaires were mailed to parents, 45 of which were returned in the stamped envelopes we had provided. With the exception of one refusal, the remaining questionnaires were collected through personal follow-up.

Teacher's Evaluation of Sample Children. During December of 1971, we asked the three Washington first grade teachers to evaluate all of their pupils on the basis of the Pupil Evaluation (see appendix). On the basis of this evaluation each first grader was given a quantitative score which represented his behavioral-social adjustment (discussed below). By comparing the questionnaire information of the group identified as poorly adjusted with that of the children not in the identified group, we expected to be able to determine differences that existed between the two groups. A detailed description of this process is contained below.

*A low income family is defined as a family which is receiving aid to dependent children, foster care, general assistance, or abundant foods services.

CHAPTER III

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Preschool Prediction

Preschool screening is a relatively new phenomenon that has only begun to receive widespread attention in the past 15 years. Around the country projects have been initiated to provide thorough examinations of children entering school. (16) In Oregon, for example, the most notable has probably been the Tillamook County Public Health Department Multiphasic School Entrance Physical Examination. Unfortunately, however, most of these screening clinics or preschool screening projects have emphasized physical evaluation (as in the Tillamook project) or academic readiness alone rather than recognizing the need for and including a method for assessing or estimating emotional readiness and adjustment potential. Some programs have, however, attempted to evaluate and/or predict emotional readiness. For example, the Pre-school Mental Health Screening Project, conducted by the Division of Mental Hygiene, Alabama Department of Public Health, and reported on in 1963 (23) incorporated a brief psychological evaluation into the district's regular public health preschool check-up. First grade teachers then rated the children on a problem checklist. The researchers felt, on the basis of the teacher evaluations, that their preschool screening had adequately predicted which children would have behavioral problems in grade school.

The Preschool Check up Program conducted by the Human Relations Service of Wellesley Inc., (25, 23) and the Sumter County School District Pre-School Check-up of the South Carolina Mental Health Commission, both utilized separate parent and child interviews as diagnostic-screening

tools and both emphasized the crisis status of school entry for many children. (23:367) The Wellesley study was originally reported on in 1955 (25) and has been a cumbersome, if comprehensive method of evaluating the preschool child, involving two or more interviews and observations. In South Carolina parents were invited to sign up for a preschool screening interview while attending a general orientation meeting, (23:368) and the screening was carried out in the school building. Both this project and Wellesley's used a team of workers, one of whom saw the parents while the other saw the child. (23:369)

Conrad and Toblissen (8) developed the Schenectady Kindergarten Rating Scales in 1967 to predict learning and behavior disorders. They asked teachers to provide observations that were "descriptive rather than evaluative [so that] teachers are not asked to draw tenuous conclusions about adjustment." (8:359) Unfortunately however, they have not yet published data on the predictive accuracy of the SKRS, which appears to be a promising attempt at preschool prediction of high-risk first graders.

In 1967 Kohn, Rosman and Jordan (24) began a four year project with children in pre-first grade day care to test the hypothesis that the social-emotional functioning of the preschool child is predictive of later intellectual-academic performance. In a previous study they had identified two major personality dimensions in children, Interest-Participation vs. Apathy-Withdrawal and Cooperation-Compliance vs. Anger-Defiance. The authors found that "one type of disturbed social emotional functioning, Apathy-Withdrawal, is predictive of deficient intellectual functioning." (24:39) Although the primary aim of the study was prediction of academic functioning, analysis of factors predictive of

social-emotional performance is included. They found that number of siblings was predictive of higher Apathy-Withdrawal and that broken home status predicted a high Anger-Defiance rating. In general they found that the social-emotional status of a child as measured during preschool was consistent through first grade.

In summary, the preschool studies discussed here were largely conducted on preschool populations which were already involved in an institutional program (day care, kindergarten, etc.). This limits the procedures' usefulness to those districts which have compulsory preschool programs and/or to those children who attend. The "preschool checkup" examination seems to offer a more workable and efficient way to insure evaluation of every child in a district, while it was our expectation that the preschool parent questionnaire would provide yet a simpler method of identifying children who would need special help in first grade

Related Preschool Studies

Above, then, are the few studies which are closely related to the work attempted in this project. There have been, however, several other related pieces of research which provide a picture of the direction which preschool screening more typically has taken, or which provide additional information for considering the present work. Some, as noted above, are concerned with academic success, particularly reading readiness. A study by Mattick in 1963 (27) compared kindergarten teachers' judgments of which children would have "early success" in the first grade (as judged by first grade teachers) with four standardized tests of children's

development and/or readiness.* He found the highest correlation between the Metropolitan Readiness Test and the judgments made by both kindergarten and first grade teachers, with the kindergarten teachers being the second most effective predictor of early first grade success (as determined by first grade teachers' evaluation).

Hirst, et al (19) conducted a three year study ending in 1969 aimed at identifying factors at the kindergarten level which were involved in reading success and failure. They found a variety of predictors including: 1) the numbers subtest of the Metropolitan Readiness Test and child's sex for beginning reading success; 2) socioeconomic status for second grade reading and arithmetic achievement; and 3) teacher predictions of future success or failure. (19:2) This study is critical of attempts to gauge readiness and predict success by means of intelligence scores and age at entering school. A four year study (1970) in Missouri found that the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities was a "reasonably good predictor" of performance on the Metropolitan Readiness Test. (33)

A study which is reminiscent of the Kohn, Rosman and Jordan project cited above was conducted by Carrithers in 1965 to test whether reading patterns and success during the early grades could be predicted from a child's "emotional classification" during preschool years. (6) The preschool "classification" was based on the combined information of a school psychologist, a social worker who visited the child's mother at home, and the child's teacher. Based on the study results the author

*The Metropolitan Readiness Test, the Lee-Clark Reading Readiness Test, Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Test, and the California Short Form Test of Mental Maturity.

accepted her original hypotheses: 1) children with preschool emotional difficulties have more difficulty learning to read, follow different reading patterns, and have more negative attitudes; 2) assessment of emotional classifications during preschool can provide clues of later reading difficulty.

Two interesting studies involve prediction before preschool. Schwarz and Wynn studied the reactions of children starting nursery school, utilizing background social-experience information provided by mothers to predict initial emotional reactions to separation. Their results supported the view that the separation distress that some children exhibit is a function of the novelty of the situation for those children. (39) Another project involving pre-preschoolers is the recent (1971) attempt of Richman and Graham to develop a behavior screening questionnaire to identify disturbed three year olds. (37) The researchers found nine items which were indicative of the disturbed children, most discriminatory of which were encopresis, marked unhappiness or irritability, and poor concentration. (37:19-20) By use of their scale alone the authors identified 75% of "disturbed" children (those attending a psychiatric clinic), while the addition of severe speech difficulty as a diagnostic factor raised their accuracy to 90%. (37:18)

Evaluation of School Children

Another area of research that is related to the work undertaken in this project is that surrounding the development of evaluative instruments for use in the schools to identify emotionally handicapped children. Early identification within the school system has been of more interest

to the majority of researchers than has preschool prediction. Even at that, however, many of the measures developed have been normed on older children--third grade and above--rather than on primary grade children.

Since 1959 The South Shore Guidance Center of Quincy, Massachusetts has been utilizing a "Classroom Disturbance Index" for screening and identifying emotionally disturbed children in a classroom setting. (9) The Index is composed of a 37-item check list and used in conjunction with observation in the classroom. Comparison of the Index rating to psychiatric evaluation of children showed a positive correlation. In 1963 Glidewell, Donke and Kantor reported on the use of a "symptom inventory" completed by children's mothers as a screening device. (13) They stated that "it can be used with 74% effectiveness to screen and select for further study children who will be rated as disturbed by teachers." (13:514) More recently, a 1971 study concludes that "direct observation procedures are an effective method of identifying and describing conduct disturbed children." (29:506)

One of the best known and most extensive studies of the past decade is that sponsored by the California State Department of Education and of Mental Hygiene and reported by Eli Bower in Early Identification of Emotionally Handicapped Children In School. (4) Bower obtained a variety of information on each child and concluded that the following factors differentiated the emotionally handicapped children (identified by clinicians) from others: 1) low score on group IQ tests; 2) low scores on reading and arithmetic achievement tests; 3) dissatisfaction with self; 4) negative peer perception; and 5) teacher ratings. (4:78) A comparable study was done by Maes in 1966, with the conclusion that two

variables, teacher rating and IQ scores, could differentiate as effectively as Bower's five variables.

Other evaluative-type instruments are those developed by Kohn (24) and by Butler (5), intended for preschool children.

A substantial number of scales and checklists have been developed, but unfortunately many are designed to be used in conjunction with other measures, while others have not received a truly reliable use and evaluation themselves. Therefore it is difficult to rely upon one or another of them with confidence.

Teachers' Ratings

One question that has been of importance to clinicians for decades has been whether or not teachers can make adequate evaluations and ratings of children. Since E. K. Wickman's memorable study of 1928, which showed a great disparity between the ranking of children's problems made by teachers and those made by "mental hygienists" (43), there has been a steady stream of similar studies with slightly or considerably dissimilar results. Research by Mitchell in 1942 (28) and by Schrupp and Gjerde in 1953 (38) showed that teachers were becoming increasingly closer in their judgments to those of mental hygienists. In 1970 two studies were published in follow-up on Wickman's findings. Westbrook found that teachers are recognizing more problems, with learning problems of primary concern, aggression second, and withdrawn behavior last. (42:394) Ziv found "a significant positive correlation between teachers' and psychologists' ratings," with teachers considering overt behavior problems more serious, and psychologists being more concerned about withdrawal. (45)

Because of Bower's desire that identification of emotionally handicapped children be accomplished through "the use of information ordinarily available to teachers" (4:113), he has also explored the area of the teacher's ability to identify poorly adjusted children appropriately. In 1958 he demonstrated that of 206 clinically-identified disturbed children, teachers identified 197 as among the most poorly adjusted. (3) Bower's subsequent work in the 1960's confirmed this ability, with the added information: "Teachers selected about the same number of children as being overly withdrawn or timid as overly aggressive or defiant." (4:79) Thus teachers do not always over estimate the importance of overt behavior problems as opposed to withdrawal problems. Moreover, a 1968 study showed that teachers' ability to recognize "social and emotional problems" can be effectively increased through training. (14) In general, then, there is considerable evidence that teachers can be used to rate and/or evaluate children in their classrooms for signs of social and emotional maladjustment.

CHAPTER IV

INSTRUMENTS

Parent Questionnaire

The purpose of the parent questionnaire was to obtain a picture of the child's developmental level, his experiential background, and of the family's orientation toward the school system. We believed that this information could be obtained through a simple questionnaire completed by the parents of the entering first grader. Development of the questionnaire was the culmination of research, consultation with educators and clinicians, and pretesting with representative parents. To gather the appropriate psycho-social information we organized the questionnaire around five general areas. We were interested in demographic information, developmental history, social maturity factors, family interaction patterns, and social experiences which would be considered as preparation for school. Since responding to the questionnaire was strictly voluntary and because a high return rate was needed, we attempted to ask questions that would give us the desired information without threatening the privacy of the family. Each of the forty one questions was designed to gain information in one or more of the five general areas of interest. A number of considerations influenced the development of the questionnaire but each question was selected for a specific purpose.

The Demographic Data. In addition to the sex and age of each child, which is available through the school census, we wanted to know basic information about the family. Identifying children not living with both their natural parents was of primary interest since the disrupted home is often cited as a contributing factor to childhood maladaptation. Question

four gives information as to the size of the family, ages of siblings, and identifies parents who have had no contact with the public school as a parent. There is some evidence that children from large families are apt to need additional help in the school setting and considerable evidence that sibling rivalry, especially when the rival is an infant, may contribute to initial adjustmental problems. (22:446, 12:45-58)

Mobility (questions 5 and 6) is a family characteristic of considerable interest to educators. We wanted to determine if a correlation existed between frequency of moves or recent moves and social-emotional adjustment. It was our intention to determine the socio-economic level of the family by the parent's occupation and educational level (questions 7 and 8), in that we felt a request for exact income would be a highly sensitive area to many people. Though we did not ask for information about race, we were certain that there would not be an appreciable non-white element. (This proved to be the case, with only one black child in the final sample).

Developmental History. In this section we were looking for information in the child's developmental background that would be considered atypical. Ill health during pregnancy (question 10) has often been related to the mother's negative attitude toward the child and to subsequent negative treatment of the infant which in turn may create an emotionally-damaged child. (40:210) Question 11 is intended to gain information as to possible birth trauma which is seen by some as a forerunner of later emotional problems. (36) In question 12 we were primarily concerned with serious early illness and the possible long-range effects of such an experience. Separation from parents and home caused by

hospitalization may color the child's later reactions to such major separations as the beginning of school. (35)

An affirmative response on question 13 (regarding dizziness, seizures, etc.) would suggest a possible neurological problem. Enuresis (question 14) at this age, and marked sleep disturbance (question 17) are often seen in conjunction with emotional difficulties. (22:448) Question 15 (age when child walked, talked, was toilet trained) was to identify children whose development in these areas was unusual, perhaps indicating the slow child. The parents' concern and understanding about general and preventive medical care was the focus of question 16, regarding shots and immunizations. Questions 18, 19, and 20 are a means of determining which children have already been defined by parent or physician as having adjustment problems that may make the school experience difficult. The final question in the section, number 21, is a "catch-all" that encourages parents to list difficulties they perceive the child to have that have not been elicited by the previous questions.

Social Maturity. Since chronological age is seldom an accurate index of a child's social abilities and since social maturity has been cited as more crucial to successful first grade adjustment than simply attainment of age six, (44:8) we included questions 22 through 25 and question 39 to provide an index of social maturity. These items are derived from the Vineland Social Maturity Scale and all describe activities which are normally mastered by a child before first grade. Included are questions regarding Locomotion, Occupation, Communication, and Socialization, as defined by the V.S.M.S. (10)

Three other questions relate to the child's social maturity: 32,

36, and 37. These questions, which ask about activities the child enjoys engaging in by himself, focus on the individual's ability to entertain himself, to engage in sustained activities and to be self-directing. Our expectation was that most responses would be unremarkable and that the atypical response would be our focus.

Family Interaction Patterns. There were many things that we wanted to know about the family. Demographic material, although useful, cannot make clear the quality or type of family interaction or family lifestyle. To gather information of this nature is difficult and in this section of the questionnaire we focused on parental involvement with the child (questions 33, 34, and 35) and parental expectations of him (questions 34 and 41). Earlier questions which relate well to this section are questions 24 and 29.

Social Experience and Preparation for School. In the fourth and fifth sections we were interested specifically in pre-school skills, socializing and school-like experiences. Color identification (question 27) and the willingness to take turns or "share" (question 30) are abilities which contribute to first grade adjustment. (17:13-17)

A yes response on question 26 (visiting the school) would indicate that the child had had an opportunity to anticipate attending school and would also suggest that the parents were in some measure preparing the child for school entrance. In question 29 we obtained a report of the child's earlier school-like experiences. We expected that children with these experiences would adjust more readily to first grade. Question 31 was designed to determine which children find it especially difficult to separate from their parents since ease in separation is an important

ability for children who will soon be leaving home to enter school.

(25:86) The number of playmates (question 38) was a means of identifying children who were unaccustomed to or avoided interaction with other children since the ability to get along with others is seen as a necessary ability in satisfactory school adjustment. (17:13)

The parent questionnaire is a non-complex method of obtaining a large bank of common data on a pre-first grade population. Our questionnaire was organized around the five areas that have been discussed above. With this in mind, it should also be noted that the questions are often inter-related and it was expected that the value of the data would come from combinations of responses as opposed to isolated points of information.

Pupil Evaluation Scale

A method for identification of the first graders in our sample who were having social-emotional adjustment problems was a crucial issue in this research. After considering alternative ways of obtaining evaluations of the children, we felt that the teachers of the children would not only provide the most efficient means of obtaining ratings, but also would be in the best position to evaluate the children. Berkowitz and Rothman state that teachers can have the professional objectivity and do have a unique opportunity to observe and evaluate their students. (1:2)

In development of the Schenectady Kindergarten Rating Scales Conrad and Tobiessen state that they wanted to develop a method whereby the teacher's observations would be "descriptive rather than evaluative [so that] teachers are not asked to draw tenuous conclusions about adjustment." (8:359) In agreement with Conrad and Tobiessen, we wanted

the evaluation form to spell out precisely the areas that are observable by, and that should be of primary concern to, the first grade teacher. Basing development of our evaluation scale on this premise, we were further guided by two additional concerns. First we wished the instrument to be concise and of a manageable length for teachers who would be asked to rate more than twenty children individually. Second, we wanted the evaluation items to cover a wide enough spectrum to provide a complete picture of the child's adjustment, from feelings on the one hand, to actions and to achievement on the other.

The Pupil Evaluation (copy in appendix) basically reflects evaluative scales of other researchers in this field. (4:143-154, 5) In addition, ideas were gained through discussion and pretesting of our initial evaluative scale with experienced teachers in the field.

In the Pupil Evaluation the teachers were asked to give each child a numerical score of 1 to 5 in each of the twelve areas. A score of "1" would indicate that the child is functioning at or below the level described in the left margin (below the normal range of behavior), and a "5" would indicate performance at or above the level described in the right margin (at the upper end of the normal range of behavior). Items 1 through 7 are adapted from Butler (5) and deal with: the child's feelings about himself; his ability to become engaged in meaningful activity; social adaptability; and tolerance for new experience. In the first two items the area of self awareness is the focus. Self awareness and acceptance, basic trust in others, and personal initiative (41:168, 11:247) are observable in the first grader and are crucial to his adjustment in the early school experience. Items 3 and 4 relate to investment

in tasks and activities and questions 5 and 6 reflect the child's ability to interact socially and cooperatively with other children. Hildreth (17:13-17), Bower (4), and others agree that these abilities are crucial in the adjustment of the first grader. Reaction to change (question 7) can be a barometer of a child's emotional security. For the first grader new ideas and activities are continually forcing themselves into his attention, and the insecure, anxious child has difficulty in accepting the new and moving from the relatively secure to the unknown.

Item 8 was included at the suggestion of teachers involved in preliminary discussion of the scale. The intent of the question is to differentiate between the child who can direct his activities in a meaningful way and the youngster who is easily stimulated and distractable to the point that he cannot effectively control his impulses. The over-activity may reflect general immaturity, situational stress, or in some cases a possible neurological disorder. (7:217-219) Question 9, Verbal Accessibility, was developed in order to provide an index for those abilities of an individual which are involved in communication and in being open to interaction with others. Polansky defines verbal accessibility as a person's "readiness . . . to communicate verbally, and to permit others to communicate with him, about his most important attitudes." (32:2) Lacking this, the child lacks the key to effective and satisfying relationships. (32)

Items 10, 11, and 12, were closely related to Bower's scale. (4:143ff) Item 10, the ability to learn, is an area that readily identifies the child's success in school. Research has shown that academic achievement level and social emotional adjustment level are interrelated. (15, 24)

Items 11 and 12 give an appraisal of observable emotional extremes. According to Bower, inappropriately aggressive behavior (question 11) is often a symptom of adjustment problems (4:146), and question twelve is adapted from Bower's identification of a pervasive mood of unhappiness or depression as one of the criteria of the "emotionally handicapped" child. (4:23)

In summary then the Pupil Evaluation provides for a broad picture of the child, both as he performs on each of the twelve items, and in how he compares generally to all the other children rated. Further discussion of the Pupil Evaluation is included in the section on research findings and in the presentation of statistical analysis of the Evaluation.

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Demographic Data on Pupil Population

Sex. There were 28 boys and 34 girls in the sample.

Age. Ages were consistent with Oregon School entrance age requirements, ranging from the minimum entrance age of five years, ten months to seven years, three months. There were four each five year olds and seven year olds. The mean age was six years and five months.

Family Composition. Two thirds of the sample children (43 of 62) lived with both parents. Of the remainder all lived with at least one parent and twelve lived with mother alone. (see Table 1).

TABLE 1
HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS

	Number	%
mother and father	43	69.3
mother alone	12	19.3
mother and stepfather	4	6.4
father and stepmother	2	3.2
mother and adoptive father	1	1.6
Totals	62	99.8

All but four children had siblings, ranging from 21 children with only one brother or sister to one child with seven siblings. Excluding the four "only" children, Table 2 shows the relative positions within the sibling group of sample children.

TABLE 2
NUMBER OF
CHILDREN IN SUBJECTS' FAMILIES

Total Children in Family	number	%
two	21	36.2
three	12	20.7
four	20	34.5
five	2	3.4
six	2	3.4
eight	1	1.7
Total	58	99.9

TABLE 3
SUBJECTS' POSITION IN FAMILIES

Position in Family	number	%
oldest	16	27.5
middle	23	39.6
youngest	19	32.7
Total	58	99.8

Parents' Ages. The ages of 62 mothers and of 57 fathers were reported on the questionnaires. The average ages of 31 for mothers and 33 for fathers reflects the tendency for the group to be in their late twenties or early thirties. There were two mothers of 22 and one of 51,

representing the extremes, while the fathers' ages ranged from a low of 22 to a high of 55. (A more detailed breakdown is contained in Tables 4 and 5 of the Appendix.)

Parents' Occupations and Education. The parents in this group were predominantly skilled or unskilled and were moderately educated. Sixty-one percent, or 38, of the mothers* listed themselves as housewives, and of the remainder only five were business, professional or white collar. The "housewife" status does, of course, conceal occupational potential of a large share of the mothers, but educational attainment does not indicate a significantly different pattern. Forty-seven mothers had no education past high school, and only 6 indicated completion of college. Similarly, there were only 13 fathers whose occupations were not in the skilled or unskilled categories and only fourteen whose educational level exceeded high school. Overall, the fathers tended to be slightly less educated than the mothers, with five having completed college, but with four not having gone beyond eighth grade. (Full data on parents' occupational status and education may be found in the Appendix, Tables 6 and 7.)

Pupil Evaluation

Factor Analysis. Factor analysis of the Pupil Evaluation form revealed three independent factors. In Factor I the variables (i.e. the twelve questions) were of very similar weights and of the same sign. (see Table 8, Appendix) In addition there are relatively few close correlations between the variables. Questions 1, 9, 11, and 12 have no close

*This number includes one "unemployed" and one "no response."

correlates while 2, 6, 8, and 10 have only one each. Each of the remaining four questions correlate with two others. The highest correlation is .83 between five and six ("ability to relate to "others" and "group participation").

Through the consistency of Factor I loadings and the general independence of the variables, each of the twelve variables appeared to make a unique contribution approximately equal to each other variable. Therefore the Factor I loadings of all twelve variables were taken into consideration in generating a weighted Evaluation score for each child. The individual score thus computed represents the child's position on a continuum ranging from the seriously emotionally handicapped child through the borderline child, to the child with superior adjustment status. It includes in one score all twelve facets of a child's adjustment. These scores were then used for selections of the poorly-adjusted children (discussed below).

We found that the children's position with respect to one another could be quickly and simply approximated by adding together the individual scores for each item of the Evaluation. For example, the child who received the highest weighted score, 16.8, received the highest score by the shorthand method, a 59. The lowest weighted score, 7.5, received the low 27 by the simplified method.

Factors II and III were not applicable to the present population. Factor II appears to represent the split between how a child feels, as in question two (feeling about self), and what he does, as in question eight (activity level). These two sides are represented by opposite signs and in a normal child should vary together. As he feels positive

towards himself, is socially involved, his activities should be purposeful and controlled (and vice versa). Thus for most children a score generated from Factor II would approach zero. The farther a score deviated from zero, the more it would indicate inconsistency in the responses on the Evaluation. For the children in this study, scores did not reach above 1.9, with three exceptions (4.5, 2.5, and 2.6). Not surprisingly the three exceptions were included in children identified as poorly adjusted by the Factor I score. In general though, Factor II was not of use with this sample. Factor III has no relevance to the population under consideration.

Selection of Target Children. To select the children who would be considered poorly adjusted for purposes of analysis, an arbitrary cut-off point of 10.3 was chosen. This score corresponds to a score of 36 by the simplified method and a child who received that score would at best be performing at a marginal level just as much of the time as at an acceptable level. The attempt to identify predictors of unsatisfactory adjustment was based on the 22 children identified in this manner. Table 9 shows these children, their Evaluation score, sex, and school entrance age.

TABLE 9
POORLY ADJUSTED CHILDREN IDENTIFIED
BY THE PUPIL EVALUATION

Identification Number	Evaluation Score	Sex	Entrance Age
01	9.6	F	6.5
09	9.5	M	6.2
10	10.3	F	6.1
11	8.5	F	6.7
12	9.5	F	6.11
15	9.3	F	5.11
18	9.7	M	6.5
20	7.8	F	6.5
23	10.7	M	6.5
31	9.7	M	6.3
32	9.7	M	6.6
33	9.0	M	6.1
35	9.9	M	6.5
36	7.8	F	5.11
39	7.5	M	5.11
40	10.3	F	6.1
44	9.9	F	6.7
45	9.9	F	6.11
46	9.9	M	6.10
48	9.9	F	6.0
53	9.1	M	6.3
56	9.0	F	6.11

Comparison of Pupil Evaluation Results and Metropolitan Readiness

Test Scores. In order to provide a standard of comparison for the Pupil Evaluation and our selection of target children, we obtained scores from the Metropolitan Readiness Test (18), a standardized instructional readiness evaluator which is routinely given to all Salem first graders during the first week of school. (Five children in our sample enrolled too late to take the MRT.) Through use of the Chi square test of significance we found that the Evaluation-identified children were highly underrepresented in the 'A' (Superior Readiness) and 'B' (High Normal) categories, and

overrepresented in the 'C,' 'D' and 'E' classifications (Average, Low Normal, and Low Readiness Status). These results, which are significant at the .01 level are summarized in Table 10.

TABLE 10
COMPARISON OF PUPIL EVALUATION RESULTS AND
METROPOLITAN READINESS TEST SCORES

	Total	MRT Score Classification				
		A	B	C	D	E
Identified Children (Pupil Evaluation)	18	1	1	8	5	3
Others	39	15	12	8	3	1
Total	57	16	13	16	8	4
$\chi^2 = 17.5, 4 \text{ d.f.}; p < .01$						

Since the children identified as poorly adjusted on the Pupil Evaluation are highly similar to those who scored low on the MRT, it is clear that academic readiness and emotional readiness go hand in hand in this population. In addition we are reminded of Mattick's study which found the MRT to be correlated with children's success in the first grade. These results lend support to our belief that the Pupil Evaluation is an effective tool for estimating the child's adjustment.

Background Factors and Poor Adjustment

Heads of Household. Twelve of the identified children lived with both parents and the remainder had one parent absent from the home. (Seven lived with mother alone, and one each lived with mother and step-

father, mother and adoptive father, and father and stepmother.) A Chi square value of 3.58 (1 d.f., $p < .10$) was calculated for the relationship between broken homes and poor adjustment and although not statistically significant, it is a value high enough to suggest significance in the relationship.

Time in Salem. The identified group contained 16 children whose families had lived in Salem for a year or more and 6 who had been in Salem for a shorter period. Table 11 shows the Chi square for this factor.

TABLE 11

RELATIONSHIP OF LENGTH OF RESIDENCE IN
SALEM TO CHILD'S SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL ADJUSTMENT

	Total	Time in Salem	
		less than 1 year	year or more
Identified Children	22	6	16
Others	39	2	37
Total	62	8	53

$\chi^2 = 4.5, 1 \text{ d.f.}; p < .05$

There was clearly a significant relationship between whether or not a family had been in the community for a period of time before their first grader entered school and how well he adjusted in first grade.

Siblings. A Chi square analysis of the family position of the identified children as opposed to the other children revealed that "only" children and middle children were overrepresented in the identified group.

while eldest children were considerably underrepresented. Youngest children appeared in expected frequency. Table 12 presents this data.

TABLE 12
RELATIONSHIP OF CHILD'S POSITION IN
FAMILY TO SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL ADJUSTMENT

	Total	Only	Child's Rank in Family		
			Youngest	Middle	Oldest
Identified Children	22	3	6	11	2
Others	40	1	13	12	14
Total	62	4	19	23	16

$\chi^2 = 7.88, 3 \text{ d.f.}, p < .05$

Mother's Health During Pregnancy. As Table 13 shows, there was a highly significant relationship between poor health during a woman's pregnancy with a child and that child's later difficulty in adjusting to first grade.

TABLE 13
RELATIONSHIP OF MOTHER'S HEALTH DURING
PREGNANCY TO CHILD'S SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL ADJUSTMENT

	Total	Mother's Health During Pregnancy	
		Good	Poor
Identified Children	21	16	5
Others	40	38	2
Total	61	54	7

$\chi^2 = 4.83, 1 \text{ d.f.}; p < .05; 1 \text{ n.r.}$

Mother's Education. A third factor which appeared to be related to a child's adjustment potential was the mother's educational level. College educated mothers were considerably underrepresented in the problem group, as can be seen in Table 14:

TABLE 14
RELATIONSHIP OF MOTHER'S EDUCATION TO
CHILD'S SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL ADJUSTMENT

	Total	Mother's Education	
		high school or less	above high school
Identified Children	22	20	2
Others	37	26	11
Total	59	46	13

$\chi^2 = 3.76, 1 \text{ d.f. } p < .05; 3 \text{ n.r.}$

The Working Mother. In addition to how well a mother was educated, whether or not she was employed also was related to the children's adjustment. There were more working mothers in the identified group than would have been expected and fewer in the other group. This is shown in Table 15.

TABLE 15

RELATIONSHIP OF MOTHER'S EMPLOYMENT
STATUS TO CHILD'S SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL ADJUSTMENT

	Total	Mother Working	Mother at Home
Identified Children	22	13	9
Others	39	11	28
Total	61	24	37
$\chi^2 = 5.44, 1 \text{ d.f.}; p < .02$			

Sunday School Attendance. A last variable which was significantly related to the children's adjustment was whether or not Sunday School was attended frequently. By combining the "sometimes" and "never" attendance responses, we obtained the rather surprising results summarized in Table 16, below. "Sometimes" and "never" were combined because the "sometimes" response appeared to indicate only a most casual attendance at best, and at worst simply a reluctance to say that the child had never gone to Sunday School. "Often," on the other hand, appeared to represent a family commitment to church attendance, since first graders would typically not be going to Sunday School frequently without parental involvement and assistance. As can be seen in the table, it appears that those children who attended Sunday School frequently were considerably less likely to have adjustment difficulty in first grade.

TABLE 16

RELATIONSHIP OF FREQUENCY OF SUNDAY SCHOOL ATTENDANCE TO
CHILD'S SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL ADJUSTMENT

	Total	Child Attends Sunday School	
		Often	Sometimes or Never
Identified Children	21	3	18
Others	38	23	15
Total	59	26	33

$\chi^2 = 11.3, 1 \text{ d.f.}; p < .01 (3 \text{ n.r.})$

Regression Analysis. A regression analysis of the most significant background variables established no linear combination of variables which would be an effective predictor of first grade social emotional adjustment status.

Discussion

Rejection of Hypothesis. The findings of this study did not support the hypothesis that through information obtained from a preschool parent questionnaire we would be able to identify predictors of poor first grade social-emotional adjustment. There are three possible explanations of this result. First, it may be that the attempt to identify predictors by such a simple method is over-ambitious. Information obtained entirely from parents may have a built-in bias which interferes with the objective analysis of the data. Or, it may be that this method presents too narrow a perspective and that additional indices (observation, testing of the child, etc.) are needed in order to identify the problem child early. If this is the case, then early identification is going to require a more

complex administrative structure and more active participation on the part of parents, each increase of which generally seems to decrease the number of children reached.

On the other hand, a second reason why the study did not identify predictors might be that, although it can be done by this method, the questionnaire did not obtain enough information or appropriate information. For example, socioeconomic status and family income were not accurately obtained, while other areas of information were missing (parents' school experience, family disruption by parental illness, etc.).

A third possibility, of course, lies in the Pupil Evaluation. If the Evaluation is not in fact identifying poorly-adjusted children, then the variables were analyzed in terms of wrong children.

Significant Variables. Despite the lack of support for the original hypothesis, a number of background variables significantly related to inadequate adjustment were identified. These are all at least somewhat different from the findings of other researchers. Suggestive of other findings are the relationships between the child's adjustment and: 1) intact family; 2) sibling status; 3) mother's employment; and 4) health during pregnancy. The Kohn study, discussed above, found that if a child were from a broken home he was much more likely to score high on the Anger-Defiance factor. In our study, children from non-intact homes also had a higher tendency to have adjustment problems. Kohn also found, as have other researchers, that a child from a large family had a higher chance of scoring in the extreme range on the Apathy-Withdrawal factor. In our analysis, however, it was not the number of siblings a child had, but his position with regard to his siblings that was related to his

adjustment. Eldest children had by far a better chance to be adequately adjusted, while only and middle children were at high risk for poor adjustment. These results are reminiscent of those found by Harris in Emotional Blocks to Learning. He found that eldest children were twice as likely to be in the "learner" group. (15:55) On the other hand he also found that youngest children were much more likely to be in the "learning problem" group (14:55), which is not consistent with our findings. With regard to mother's employment Harris found that children whose mothers worked were below average in IQ scores. (15:21) In our sample the children of working mothers were much more likely to be having adjustment problems. Last, the finding that poor health during pregnancy is significantly related to the child's subsequent poor social emotional adjustment is not only supported by psychoanalytic theory, but is affirmed by a report in The American Journal of Psychiatry which states that the authors found a "high significance of complications of pregnancy for children with behavior disorders." (30:615)

The remaining significant background variables do not seem to have close parallels in the results of other researchers. The length of time spent in Salem prior to first grade entrance, mother's educational level, and whether a child attended Sunday School frequently are all somewhat unique and are good subjects for speculation as to causes. It appears to us that the significance of having lived at least a year in Salem before the child enters school may lie in the fact that the family has had time to establish roots in the community and some feeling of familiarity and permanency. Whether or not they have remained at one residence during this period (number of moves was not significant), they have had time to

establish relationships with other people in the area. Second, in thinking about the relationship of mother's education to adjustment, we feel that it may be that educational level was our most accurate index of socio-economic level, which has been shown to correlate with adjustment. (15:14) It may be that a higher educational level would suggest that the mother would be more encouraging and supportive on the child's early educational experience thereby aiding him in his adjustment. The question of frequent Sunday School attendance appears to us to be a broadly-based problem which indicates as much a lifestyle as it does simply degree of religiosity. It seems most likely that the family with frequent Sunday School attendance is one with a considerable degree of integration and stability. That is, the parents have commonly held beliefs and role definitions and the family is able to reach beyond itself to a consistent involvement in an activity and with other people.

Non-significant variables. As can be seen, many of the background variables which we had originally postulated would be significant in pointing out the emotionally handicapped children showed no relationship to the selection of poorly adjusted students. In one sense this finding is just as significant as the establishment of a clear relationship to a few background factors. Behind this statement is the fact that many or all of these factors are widely held to be important indicators of social and/or behavioral maladjustment (as outlined early in this paper). Among the more important of these non-significant factors are: the number of moves the family had made in the past five years; hospitalization of the child prior to school entry; enuresis; lack of self reliance; unwillingness to share; inability to tolerate losing; large number of

siblings; "nervousness;" and extent of preschool group experience. None of these things was related to the level of marginal adjustment as determined by low scores on the Pupil Evaluation. If one accepts the validity of the Evaluation, then the reliance that educators and clinicians place on many common predictors must be reexamined.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary. The purpose of this study was to determine whether predictors of first grade social-emotional adjustment level could be determined from an analysis of background material received from a parent questionnaire. This end the research did not achieve. Although not at a level to support prediction, poor adjustment was significantly related to the following factors:

- 1) residence in Salem of less than one year;
- 2) child's position with respect to siblings--either between older and younger siblings, or an only child;
- 3) poor health of the mother during pregnancy;
- 4) mother's education at high school or less;
- 5) mother employed; and
- 6) infrequent Sunday School attendance.

In addition, the work completed in this study calls into question a number of assumptions that have been made by educators and clinicians about indices of poor adjustment in primary age children.

The area of preschool prediction of children who will make a marginal adjustment to school remains one of primary importance. Much work must still be done if we are to find methods and channels for bringing preventive services to the young child.

REFERENCES CITED

1. Berkowitz, Pearl H. and Esther P. Rothman, The Disturbed Child. New York: New York University Press, 1961.
2. Bluth, Linda et al. "Emotional Disturbance: Preschool Intervention and Prevention" ERIC Clearinghouse on Early Childhood Education, Department of Health Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C. ERIC ED 048517.
3. Bower, Eli M., Peter J. Tashnovian and Carl Larson, A Process for Early Identification of Emotionally Disturbed Children: Sacramento, California: State Department of Education, 1958.
4. Bower, Eli M., Early Identification of Emotionally Handicapped Children in School. Springfield, Ill: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1969. (Second edition)
5. Butler, Annie L., An Evaluation Scale for Four and Five-Year-Old Children. Bloomington, Indiana: Bureau of Educational Studies and Testing, School of Education, Indiana University, 1965.
6. Carrithers, Lura M., "Beginning Reading Patterns and Preschool Emotional Problems," Educational Horizons, 44:3-9, Fall, 1965.
7. Chapman, A. H., Management of Emotional Problems of Children and Adolescents. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1965.
8. Conrad, W. Glenn and Jon Tobiessen "The Development of Kindergarten Behavior Rating Scales for the Prediction of Learning and Behavior Disorders," Psychology In The Schools 4:359-363, 1967.
9. Cooper, Saul, William Ryan and B. R. Hutcheson "Classroom Screening for Emotional Disturbance," American Psychologist 14:341, 1959.
10. Doll, Edgar A., The Measurement of Social Competence. Educational Test Bureau, 1953.
11. Erikson, Erik H., Childhood and Society. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1963, Second Edition.
12. Gerard, M. W., "Enuresis: A Study in Etiology," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 9, 1939.
13. Glidewell, John C., Herbert R. Domke and Mildred B. Kantor, "Screening in Schools for Behavior Disorders: Use of Mothers' Reports of Symptoms," The Journal of Educational Research 56(10):508-515, 1963.
14. Gropper, G. L., G. C. Kress, R. Hughes and J. Pekich, "Training Teachers to Recognize and Manage Social and Emotional Problems in the Classroom," The Journal of Teacher Education, 19(4):477-485, 1968.

15. Harris, Irving D., M.D., Emotional Blocks to Learning, Glencoe, Ill: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961.
16. Hartman, Evelyn D. "Preschool Screening in Well Child Clinics," Journal of School Health, 32(7):283-291, 1962.
17. Hildreth, Gertrude Readiness for School Beginners Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York: World Book Company, 1950.
18. Hildreth, Gertrude H., Nellie L. Griffiths, and Mary E. McGauvran, Metropolitan Readiness Test: Manual of Directions. Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1969.
19. Hirst, Wilma E. et al "Identification in the Kindergarten of Factors that make for Future Success in Reading and Identification and Diagnosis in the Kindergarten of Potential Reading Disability Cases: Final Report." Wyoming State Department of Education, Cheyenne. ERIC ED 029 710, February 1969.
20. Hoepfner, Ralph et al "CSE-ECRC Preschool Kindergarten Test Evaluations," ED 055123.
21. Ilg, Frances L. and Louise Bates Ames, School Readiness: Behavior Tests Used at the Gesell Institute, New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1965.
22. Kanner, Leo, Child Psychiatry. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1957.
23. Klein, Donald C. and Elizabeth Lindemann, "Approaches to Preschool Screening" The Journal of School Health, 34(8):365-373, 1964.
24. Kohn, Martin, Bernice Rosman and Lawrence A. Jordan, "Prediction of First Grade Social-Emotional and Intellectual Functioning," USDHEW Educational Resource Information Center, Washington, D.C., 1970.
25. Lindemann, Elizabeth B. and Ann Ross, "A Follow-Up Study of a Predictive Test of Social Adaptation in Preschool Children," in Gerald Caplan, editor, Emotional Problems of Early Childhood. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1955.
26. Maes, Wayne R., "The Identification of Emotionally Disturbed Elementary School Children," Exceptional Children, 32:607-609, 1966.
27. Mattick, William E., "Predicting Success in the First Grade," Elementary School Journal, 63:273-276, February, 1963.
28. Mitchell, J.A., "A Study of Teachers' and Mental Hygienists Ratings of Certain Behavior Problems of Children," Journal of Educational Research, 36:292-307, 1942.

29. Nelson, C. Michael "Techniques for Screening Conduct Disturbed Children," Exceptional Children, 37(3):501-507, 1971.
30. Pasamanick, Benjamin, Martha E. Rogers, and Abraham M. Lillienfeld, "Pregnancy Experience and the Development of Behavior Disorder in Children," The American Journal of Psychiatry, 112(8):613-618, 1956.
31. Phillips, Beeman H. "Problem Behavior In The Elementary School," Child Development 39(Sept.):895-903, 1968.
32. Polansky, Norman A. "The Concept of Verbal Accessibility," Smith College Studies In Social Work, 36(1):1-48.
33. "Prediction of Readiness in Kindergarten and Achievement in the First Primary Year" DHEW University City School District, No. ERIC ED 043393. January, 1970.
34. Prescott, Daniel A., Factors that Influence Learning. Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press, 1958.
35. Prugh, Dane G., et al "A Study of the Emotional Reactions of Children and Families to Hospitalization and Illness," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 23:70, 1953.
36. Rank, Otto, The Trauma of Birth. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1939.
37. Richman, N. and P. J. Graham, "A Behavioural Screening Questionnaire for Use with Three-Year-Old Children, Preliminary Findings," Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 12(1):5-33, 1971.
38. Schrupp, Manfred H., and Clayton M. Gjerde, "Teacher Growth in Attitudes Toward Behavioral Problems In Children," Journal of Educational Psychology, 44:203, 1953.
39. Schwarz, J. Conrad and Ruth Wynn, "Starting Nursery School, II: Predictions of Children's Initial Emotional Reactions from Background Information: Final Report." Syracuse Center for Research and Development in Early Childhood Education. ERIC ED 047814.
40. Spitz, Rene A., The First Year of Life. New York: International Universities Press, Inc., 1965.
41. Stone, L. J. and Joseph Church, Childhood and Adolescence, New York: Random House, 1957.
42. Westbrook, Arlen, "Teachers' Recognition of Problem Behavior and Referrals of Children to Pupil Personnel Services," The Journal of Educational Research, 63(9):391-394, 1970.

43. Wickman, E. K., Children's Behavior and Teachers' Attitudes, New York: Commonwealth Fund, 1928.
44. Wyatt, Gertrud L., "Early Identification of Children with Potential Learning Disabilities." ERIC ED 041 063. Report of Title VI project 1968-1969, January, 1970.
45. Ziv, Avner, "Children's Behavior Problems as Viewed by Teachers, Psychologists and Children," Child Development 41(3):871-879, 1970.

APPENDIX

(COVER LETTER FOR PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE)

Dear Parent:

43

Parents and teachers are interested in providing the best education for their children. Research is often helpful in achieving this goal. With the permission of Dr. Earl Hampton, the Assistant Superintendent of elementary education, the following questionnaire has been prepared by a group of independent researchers. We are hoping that your answers to this questionnaire will help us to develop a method to identify the children who may need extra help in adjusting to first grade.

All the parents of next year's first grade class at Washington School are being mailed this questionnaire. Although your response is voluntary, we need your help. We will very much appreciate it if you will fill out and return this questionnaire as soon as you can. The information we receive from you will not be seen by any person other than the researchers. The final research findings will be given to Dr. Hampton, but it will not contain specific information about a particular child or family.

If you have questions, please feel free to call us: Mrs. Candace Wright may be reached at 581-2848 on Tuesday and Thursday evenings between 7:00 p.m. and 9:00 p.m. Or you may call Ben Sherrill at 364-7949 Monday or Wednesday evenings between 7:00 p.m. and 9:00 p.m.

Thank you for your help toward providing a better school experience for Salem's first graders.

INSTRUCTIONS: You will find that most of the questions can be answered by simply

placing a check (✓) in the space to the right of each choice. Some questions ask

that you write in your answer and some ask for more than one answer, or for an

answer from each parent. Please read each question carefully before you answer it.

1. CHILD'S FULL NAME _____

2. BIRTHDATE _____ SEX: male _____ female _____
Month Day Year

3. THIS CHILD NOW LIVES WITH (CHECK ONE OR MORE):

Mother _____ Father _____ Stepmother _____ Stepfather _____
Adoptive Mother _____ Adoptive Father _____ Foster Mother _____
Foster Father _____ Other (please state) _____

4. PLEASE LIST THE OTHER CHILDREN LIVING IN YOUR HOME:

Name _____	Age _____	Sex _____	School grade _____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

5. HOW LONG HAVE YOU LIVED IN SALEM: 0-11 months _____ 1 year _____ 2 years _____
3 years _____ 4 years _____ 5 years _____ 6 years _____ 7 years _____
8 years _____ 9 years _____ 10 or more _____

6. HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU MOVED IN THE LAST FIVE YEARS (INDICATE NUMBER): _____

7. WHAT ARE THE AGES OF THIS CHILD'S PARENTS: Mother _____ Father _____

8. PLEASE STATE YOUR OCCUPATION: Mother _____ Father _____

9. WHAT IS THE LAST GRADE YOU ATTENDED IN SCHOOL: Mother _____ Father _____

10. THE HEALTH OF THE MOTHER DURING PREGNANCY WITH THIS CHILD WAS (CHECK ONE):

Good _____ Some illness _____ Poor _____

11. WAS THIS CHILD PREMATURE: Yes _____ No _____ PLEASE GIVE BIRTH WEIGHT: _____

25. THIS CHILD: Plays "tea party" or "house" with other children Yes ____ No ____
- Sings or play-acts for other children or adults Yes ____ No ____
26. THIS CHILD HAS VISITED THE SCHOOL HE OR SHE WILL BE GOING TO NEXT YEAR Yes ____ No ____
27. THIS CHILD KNOWS THE NAMES OF (CHECK ONE): Some colors ____ Most colors ____
All colors ____
28. THIS CHILD LIKES TO PLAY ALONE RATHER THAN WITH OTHER CHILDREN (CHECK ONE):
All the time ____ Most of the time ____ Sometimes ____
Almost never ____ Never ____
29. THIS CHILD HAS GONE TO: Sunday School Never ____ Sometimes ____ Often ____ (Check one)
Kindergarten Yes ____ No ____ How long ____
Nursery School Yes ____ No ____ How long ____
"Head start" Yes ____ No ____ How long ____
30. THIS CHILD KEEPS HIS TOYS FOR HIMSELF AND DOESN'T LIKE TO HAVE HIS BROTHERS AND SISTERS OR OTHER CHILDREN PLAY WITH THEM (CHECK ONE):
Never ____ Sometimes ____ Always ____
31. THIS CHILD CRIES WHEN HE IS LEFT AT A BABYSITTERS OR AT KINDERGARTEN, NURSERY SCHOOL OR SUNDAY SCHOOL (CHECK ONE): Usually ____ Sometimes ____
Almost never ____ Never ____
32. BELOW IS A LIST OF THINGS THAT CHILDREN OFTEN LIKE TO DO OR ARE INTERESTED IN.
PLACE AN "X" ON THE LINE NEXT TO EVERYTHING WHICH YOUR CHILD LIKES:
Singing ____ Roller skating ____ Kite flying ____ Playing with guns ____
Painting ____ Playing "school" ____ Listening to stories or fairy tales ____
33. BELOW IS A LIST OF PLACES CHILDREN OFTEN VISIT AND THINGS THEY OFTEN DO WITH THEIR PARENTS. PLACE AN "X" ON THE LINE NEXT TO EACH PLACE YOU HAVE GONE WITH YOUR CHILD AND NEXT TO EACH THING YOU HAVE DONE TOGETHER:
Visit the zoo ____ Visit another state ____ Visit a museum ____
Go to a party ____ Go to a grocery store ____ Visit the county or state fair ____
Go on a picnic ____ Go camping ____ Go to the beach ____
Go fishing ____ Go to a sports event ____

(Teacher's Instructions)

PUPIL EVALUATION

45

Attached are the evaluation rating sheets for your students. You will note that they are slanted towards the evaluation of social and behavioral skills rather than towards academic achievements.

Please complete one sheet on each student. At the end there is space to note down any additional observations of this child that you would like us to be aware of.

The numbers of the rating scale should be assigned as follows:

1 2 3 4 5

- 1....The child consistently performs at a lower level of behavior than is described in the left column.
- 2....The child usually behaves in accordance with the description in the left column. He may occasionally show more or less advanced behavior but this is a good description of his usual behavior.
- 3....The child's behavior cannot easily be classified in either the left or the right column. His behavior fluctuates from one level to the other; he falls somewhere on a continuum between the two descriptions.
- 4....The child usually behaves in accordance with the description in the right column. He may not quite measure up to one aspect of the described behavior; he may always measure up to other aspects of the description.
- 5....The child's performance always reaches or exceeds the behavior described in the right hand column.

Remember that number 2 is most like the left hand description, while number 4 is most like the right description. To fit number one or five, a child's behavior must be either lower (for number 1) or higher (number 5) than in the description.

1. Awareness of Self

1	2	3	4	5
Is self-conscious and shy; very easily embarrassed.			Free from inappropriate self-consciousness, appears self composed.	

2. Feeling About Himself

1	2	3	4	5
Unsure whether he is liked--dominates, defends, blames, rejects. Tends to respond negatively to the approaches of others.			Sees himself as liked--approaches children with positive suggestions and ideas of things to do. Responds positively to the suggestions of others.	

3. Progress toward self-sufficiency

1	2	3	4	5
Needs constant direction or support from the teacher, or shows much dependence on another child.			Needs only a minimum of direction by the teacher to become involved in productive activity. Abides by his own idea of what he wants to do in his relationships with children.	

4. Involvement in Task

1	2	3	4	5
Flits from one activity to another. Samples but does not become deeply involved.			Plans and persists in activity for the satisfaction within the activity.	

5. Ability to Relate to Others

1	2	3	4	5
Does not relate easily to other children, has no close friends.			Can find friendship relationships with a number of different children.	

6. Group Participation

1	2	3	4	5
Has difficulty joining in a group; hangs on the fringes.			Is able to play in a group of 4 or 5 children, settling minor difficulties without adult assistance. Assumes leadership role capably, also able to share leadership with others--organizes games. Is able to compromise and make concessions.	

7. Reaction to Change in Program

1	2	3	4	5
Is hesitant to accept changes in program or in leadership of the group. Relies heavily on the teacher for security. Needs adult assistance in making transitions from one activity to another.			Readily adapts himself to changes in program or to the presence of different people in the classroom--responds favorably to the teachers suggestions. Makes transitions from one activity to another independently.	

8. Physical

1	2	3	4	5
Seems to be constantly moving; unable to sit still. "Into everything."			Has good control of physical energies.	

9. Verbal Accessibility

1	2	3	4	5
Has difficulty in understanding verbal directions; is unaware of or unable to express thoughts and feelings--"I am angry" or "That makes me happy."			Responds to verbal communication and is able to express thoughts and feelings.	

10. Ability to Learn

1	2	3	4	5
Has difficulty learning basic skills.			Quick to learn school subjects; anxious to go on.	

TABLE 4

MOTHERS' AGES

		one	two	three	four	five	six	seven	eight	nine	
twenty			2	3	5	3	2	5	4	9	(33)
thirty	1	7	1	3	4	2			2		(20)
forty		1	1	3	1						(8)
fifty		1									(1)
									Total		69

TABLE 5

FATHERS' AGES

		one	two	three	four	five	six	seven	eight	nine	
twenty				1	2		2	5	4	4	(18)
thirty	5	5	3	4	2	3	2	3		2	(29)
forty		1	2	3		1			1		(8)
fifty		1				1					(2)
									Total		57

TABLE 6

PARENTS' OCCUPATIONAL STATUS

	Classification								Total	
	unemployed	unskilled	skilled	white collar	business	profession	housewife	student		no response
mother	1	7	11	2	1	2	36	1	1	62
father		15	22	8	2	2		1	12	62
Total	1	22	33	10	3	4	36	2	13	

TABLE 7

PARENTS' EDUCATION

	through eighth grade	grade nine through eleven	high school graduate	trade or tech- nical school	Education some college	bachelor degree	graduate training	no response	Total
mother	1	13	33		7	5	1	2	62
father	4	13	22	1	8	4	1	9	62
Total	5	26	55	1	15	9	2	11	

TABLE 8

PUPIL EVALUATION FACTOR I LOADINGS
USED TO GENERATE ADJUSTMENT SCORES FOR SUBJECTS

variable	factor loading
1	-0.23920
2	-0.28654
3	-0.32808
4	-0.29551
5	-0.31235
6	-0.28460
7	-0.33261
8	-0.27570
9	-0.29472
10	-0.28581
11	-0.19150
12	-0.30865