

1-1-1977

An investigation of the relationship between the kindergarten goals ascribed to by parents, kindergarten teachers and grade one teachers.

Herbert Gary Dank
University of Massachusetts Amherst

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_1

Recommended Citation

Dank, Herbert Gary, "An investigation of the relationship between the kindergarten goals ascribed to by parents, kindergarten teachers and grade one teachers." (1977). *Doctoral Dissertations 1896 - February 2014*. 3388.
https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_1/3388

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations 1896 - February 2014 by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.

UMASS/AMHERST



312066013537817

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE KINDERGARTEN
GOALS ASCRIBED TO BY PARENTS, KINDERGARTEN
TEACHERS AND GRADE ONE TEACHERS

A Dissertation Presented

By

HERBERT GARY DANK

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

December 1977

Education

©

Herbert Gary Dank 1977

All Rights Reserved

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE KINDERGARTEN
GOALS ASCRIBED TO BY PARENTS, KINDERGARTEN
TEACHERS AND GRADE ONE TEACHERS

A Dissertation Presented

by

Herbert Gary Dank

Approved as to style and content by:

Grace J. Craig, Chairperson

George E. Forman, Member

Warren, F. Schumacher, Member

Grace J. Craig
George E. Forman
Warren F. Schumacher

Mario Fantini
Mario Fantini, Dean
School of Education

DEDICATION

To Gillian and Vibeke

Problems worthy of attack
prove their worth
by hitting back

Piet Hein

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author expresses his gratitude to Dr. Grace J. Craig, chairperson, for her guidance and advice. Her encouragement and direction have been invaluable.

To Dr. George Forman and Dr. Warren Schumacher go special thanks for their assistance.

The author expresses his appreciation to Dr. Marshall Arlin at the University of British Columbia for his advice and encouragement.

To the members of his family sincere appreciation is expressed for their interest and support.

Finally, the author expresses his love and deep thanks to his wife, Marion, who made the endeavor worthwhile and possible.

ABSTRACT

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE KINDERGARTEN
GOALS ASCRIBED TO BY PARENTS, KINDERGARTEN
TEACHERS AND GRADE ONE TEACHERS

February 1978

Herbert Gary Dank, B.A., Brooklyn College

Ed.D. University of Massachusetts

Directed by: Dr. Grace J. Craig

The purpose of this investigation was first to determine if any significant differences existed between kindergartners' parents, kindergarten teachers and grade one teachers with regard to their attitudes toward kindergarten goals. The second purpose was to determine if any significant differences existed between high, middle and low socio-economic status parents regarding their kindergarten goals.

An opinionnaire was distributed to 621 parents of kindergartners from 16 of the 33 elementary schools in North Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. The opinionnaire was also distributed to kindergarten teachers and grade one teachers in 32 of the 33 elementary schools. The opinionnaire consisted of 12 statements: (a) four representing intellectual goals; (b) four representing social goals; (c) four representing personal goals. The parents and teachers were asked to rank order these statements. The data were analyzed in terms of relative means, medians and modes. The analysis of variance and the chi square test were used to determine whether the differences

between the groups was significant.

The analysis of the data revealed that the kindergartener's parents ranked each of the four intellectual goals higher than kindergarten teachers and grade one teachers. In two of the four goals, those of creative thinking and factual knowledge, the difference in rankings between parents and teachers was significant. Within the social dimensions, the goals of group responsibility and of working with adults elicited significantly different responses from parents and teachers. Parents ranked both of these goals lower than both teacher groups. Within the personal dimension each of the four goals, those related to physical development, emotional stability, self concept and aesthetics produced a significant difference between the high, middle and low socioeconomic status parents. Self concept also yielded significantly different rankings between the parents, kindergarten teachers and grade one teachers. Kindergarten teachers ranked self concept highest of the groups while low socioeconomic status parents ranked it lowest. Emotional stability and aesthetics were also ranked lowest by low socioeconomic status parents. Physical development was ranked higher by low socioeconomic status parents than by any other group.

It was concluded by the researcher that while there are broad areas of agreement concerning kindergarten goals significant differences do exist.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

I	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement of the Problem	1
	Purpose of the Study	7
	Objectives of the Study	8
	Assumptions of the Study	10
	Limitations of the Study	10
II	JUSTIFICATION THROUGH A REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	11
	Theoretical Goals of the Kindergarten	11
	Research Studies Relating Parent Attitudes Toward Kindergarten Goals	16
	British Columbia Kindergartens	20
	The Opinionnaire	23
	Summary	26
III	DESIGN OF THE STUDY	27
	Hypotheses	27
	Subjects	32
	Grouping of Subjects	34
	Opinionnaire	36
	Procedure	41
	Distribution and collection of data	41
	Analysis of data	42
IV	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	44
	Intellectual Goals	44
	Love of Learning	44
	Communication Skills	47
	Creative Thinking	47
	Factual Information	53
	Social Goals	56
	Peer Relations	56
	Group Responsibility	56
	Relations with Adults	60
	Citizenship	62

Personal Development Goals	64
Physical Development	64
Emotional Stability	64
Self Concept	66
Aesthetics	69
Intellectual Goals of Parents--by Socioeconomic Level	72
Social Goals of Parents--by Socioeconomic Level .	76
Personal Development Goals of Parents--by Socioeconomic Level	77
 V CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS	 83
REFERENCES	90
 APPENDIX	
A THE T.P.E. OPINIONNAIRE	95
B OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION PROFILE	100
C BLISHEN SCALE	102
D TEACHER OPINIONNAIRE	112
E PARENT LETTER	115
F TEACHER LETTER	117
G CHI SQUARE BY GROUP	119
H CHI SQUARE BY SES	132

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1	Parents: High, Middle and Low SES Number and Percent . . .	35
2	Parent Opinionnaire	38
3	Mean Rankings of Educational Goals for Parents, Kindergarten Teachers and Grade 1 Teachers	45
4	Mean Rank Order of Educational Goals for Parents, Kindergarten Teachers and Grade 1 Teachers	46
5	Frequency Distribution--Total Population Statement Number 1--Love of Learning	48
6	Significant Differences Between Parents, Kindergarten Teachers and Grade 1 Teachers and Their Perceptions of the Purpose of the Kindergarten	49
7	Frequency Distribution--Total Population Statement Number 2--Communication Skills	51
8	Frequency Distribution--Total Population Statement Number 3--Creative Thinking	52
9	Frequency Distribution--Total Population Statement Number 4--Factual Information	54
10	Frequency Distribution--Total Population Statement Number 5--Working with Peers	57
11	Frequency Distribution--Total Population Statement Number 6--Group Responsibility	58
12	Frequency Distribution--Total Population Statement Number 7--Working with Adults	61
13	Frequency Distribution--Total Population Statement Number 8--Citizenship	63
14	Frequency Distribution--Total Population Statement Number 9--Physical Development	65
15	Frequency Distribution--Total Population Statement Number 10--Emotional Stability	67
16	Frequency Distribution--Total Population Statement Number 11--Positive Values of Self	68
17	Frequency Distribution--Total Population Statement Number 12--Appreciation, Art	71
18	Significant Differences Between High, Middle and Low Socioeconomic Parents and Their Perceptions of the Purpose of the Kindergarten	73
19	Mean Rankings of Educational Goals for High, Middle and Low Socioeconomic Level Parents	74
20	Mean Rank Order of Educational Goals for High, Middle and Low Socioeconomic Level Parents	75

Table

21	Chi Square by Group, Statement Number 1--Love of Learning	119
22	Chi Square by Group, Statement Number 2--Communication Skills	120
23	Chi Square by Group, Statement Number 3--Creative Thinking	121
24	Chi Square by Group, Statement Number 4--Factual Information	122
25	Chi Squire by Group, Statement Number 5--Working with Peers	123
26	Chi Square by Group, Statement Number 6--Group Responsibility	124
27	Chi Square by Group, Statement Number 7--Working with Adults	125
28	Chi Square by Group, Statement Number 8--Citizenship	126
29	Chi Square by Group, Statement Number 9--Physical Development	127
30	Chi Square by Group, Statement Number 10--Emotional Stability	128
31	Chi Square by Group, Statement Number 11--Positive Values of Self	129
32	Chi Square by Group, Statement Number 12--Appreciation, Art	130
33	Chi Square by SES, Statement Number 1--Love of Learning	132
34	Chi Squire by SES, Statement Number 2--Communication Skills	133
35	Chi Square by SES, Statement Number 3--Creative Thinking	134
36	Chi Square by SES, Statement Number 4--Factual Information	135
37	Chi Square by SES, Statement Number 5--Working with Peers	136
38	Chi Square by SES, Statement Number 6--Group Responsibility	137
39	Chi Square by SES, Statement Number 7--Working with Adults	138
40	Chi Square by SES, Statement Number 8--Citizenship	139
41	Chi Square by SES, Statement Number 9--Physical Development	140
42	Chi Square by SES, Statement Number 10--Emotional Stability	141
43	Chi Square by SES, Statement Number 11--Positive Values of Self	142
44	Chi Square by SES, Statement Number 12--Appreciation, Art	143

C H A P T E R I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

In the past thirty years there has been a significant increase in the number of children under six attending educational institutions in British Columbia. This increase is evidenced by the number of children attending day care institutions, nursery schools and kindergartens. There has also been a major increase in the amount of parent involvement in early education as well as parent involvement in the public schools. Parent participation cooperative preschools have gained popularity and are required to have a parent education component. Community schools have also been started in several communities. But what substantive parent teacher interaction has there been with regard to goals for the young child's first year in formal school?

In 1922 the first provision was made by the provincial government of British Columbia through the Public Schools Act, chapter 22, section 50, for the establishment of kindergartens by the school boards of municipal districts. Although this provision was made and some financial support was available, there is no evidence of local boards having established kindergartens prior to 1944. This appears to have been due to a combination of factors: lack of interest by local boards, unavailability of appropriate classroom facilities, cost of providing

these facilities and the fact that private nurseries and kindergartens were available in urban areas (King, 1945).

During World War II general interest in public kindergartens was growing in British Columbia and special interest groups such as parent teacher associations, primary teachers and primary supervisors were pressing municipalities for action. At the same time the Department of Education of British Columbia expressed continued interest in the establishment of public kindergartens. In the 1944-1945 British Columbia Public Schools Report, Dr. H. B. King, Chief Inspector of Schools, expressed his concern about the tendency of private kindergartens to introduce reading and arithmetic at the preschool level. In this report, referring to kindergartens as nursery schools, Dr. King stated that:

No system of education is complete without provision for nursery schools. If public nursery schools are not established, under a scientifically trained staff, private institutions, under people with dubious qualifications, are bound to arise. The public schools then will have the difficult task of undoing, or attempting to undo, the damage which the children will have suffered. (King, 1945).

The first public kindergartens were opened in Vancouver and Victoria in 1944. Since that time the institution has gained acceptance throughout the province of British Columbia. In their first year public kindergartens enrolled 260 pupils, 1.7% of the grade one enrollment. By 1967 the provincial kindergarten enrollment had increased to 15,368, approximately 95% of Vancouver's eligible children, 70% of Victoria's and a smaller but increasing proportion from the forty-one other school districts (Conway, 1968). By September 1976 there were

3,893 children enrolled in kindergarten in Vancouver and 1,509 enrolled in kindergarten in Victoria. At the same time there were 35,071 children in British Columbia registered in kindergarten classrooms, 87.4% of the province's total grade one enrollment. This increase in the number of eligible children attending public kindergarten is consistent with the recent trend in the United States. For example, in 1949 there were 960,000 children enrolled in public kindergartens in the United States. These figures had swelled to 2.4 million by 1966 (Ream, 1968) and 3.1 million by 1968 (Nehrt and Hurd, 1969).

With an ever increasing number of children attending kindergartens in British Columbia, Canada and the United States, an examination of the kindergarten goals and curriculum priorities of parents and teachers seems necessary. When asked by the Canadian Education Association to define the goals of their kindergarten programs, most Boards of Education across Canada gave broad, general responses, referring to the child's need to develop physically, socially, intellectually and emotionally (CEA, 1972). In the Ontario Ministry of Education's Guidelines for Kindergarten (1966) generally stated child centered goals are set for each child: goals in relation to himself, to other people, to physical development and to the world of ideas. From Saskatchewan (1972) came similar comments, indicating that the major objectives of kindergarten education should be the promotion of self actualization, socialization and a commitment to learning. Phrases such as: developing self worth, individuality, getting along with others, bridging the gap and preparation for formal school, were the most frequently repeated in the Canadian Education Association survey (1972).

Thus it appears that there is general agreement with regard to these widely diffused goals of the kindergarten program; however, are there major differences of opinion when one speaks of program priorities and emphases?

To what extent should one view the kindergarten experience as an educational opportunity to allow for the natural unfolding of the inner drives and tendencies of the child and the development of a positive self concept? How important a goal is preparation for formal schooling and an integration of the kindergarten and grade one programs? Do parents and teachers now see kindergarten as a downward extension of grade one? In a report prepared for the Educational Research Institute of British Columbia, Bain (1967) reported the following effects of kindergarten education on children's social, emotional, intellectual and language development. First, social, emotional and language development appear to be highly interrelated. Kindergartens are dedicated to the provision of experiences which promote this development. Second, learning proceeds more efficiently when the child's experiences are structured. The kindergarten environment is structured to provide for this learning. Third, learning is more efficient when the goals and activities are child centered. A child centered kindergarten program which does not push children into activities beyond their abilities services children from various socioeconomic backgrounds. Fourth, kindergartens provide experience for positive living. Through active living experiences the children develop attitudes towards others which will serve as part of their foundation for generalizable attitudes towards others later in life. Fifth, kindergartens provide a setting

for an essential process at a critical time in the developing lives of children. The kindergarten is an ideal setting which provides for many of these affective, cognitive and linguistic needs. For not only is the kindergarten better equipped than most homes but there is an experienced teacher to plan instructional activities. Further, kindergarten is a prime time for a young child to be creative and explore prior to his introduction to the rather formal education procedures of grade one.

In a major report calling for the establishment of publicly supported kindergartens in Saskatchewan (1972) the problems of setting goal priorities and the integration of the kindergarten program into the elementary school were apparent. They concluded that it was unrealistic to dictate at the provincial level that the emphasis of the kindergarten program should be one of cognitive development, skill development or social development. They stated that this would depend on the children in the class and the ability of the teacher to individualize the program, thus recognizing that some children may benefit most from their social experiences while others are ready for a more cognitively oriented program. The development of an appropriate relationship between kindergarten and grade one was seen as an important goal but a problem complicated by the following factors: (a) many grade one programs place a great deal of emphasis on reading and language skills; (b) some grade one programs are similar to an ideal kindergarten and place relatively little pressure on the child to succeed academically; (c) some parents see the major value of kindergarten as the preparation for structured learning experiences; and, (d) some parents are

reluctant to expose their children to formal schooling too early. While the report encouraged a moderate position and the avoiding of extremes such as a totally play oriented or a highly cognitive, or academic type program, it was generally agreed that the kindergarten should not be considered a downward extension of grade one.

But what do reports such as the one issued in Saskatchewan tell about group priorities with regard to kindergarten goals? Is there significant agreement within and between parent and teacher groups with regard to the goals of the kindergarten program? Do priorities lie in the cognitive, affective or physical domain? How important is it for children to learn traditional school subjects? How important is it for children to learn interpersonal skills? How important is it for the kindergarten to be a setting to provide emotional prophylaxis? How important is it for the kindergarten to serve as a vestibule for the grades? How important is it for children to develop a love for learning? How important is it for children to learn to accept the responsibilities of everyday life? With parents sending their young children to kindergarten in increasing numbers, it seems reasonable to ask, what do most parents expect their children to gain from this experience? What do most kindergarten teachers expect the children to gain from this experience? In addition, what learning experiences do the grade one teachers feel the children should have in the kindergarten? These kindergarten goals and their relative importance have been debated by early childhood educators for the past one hundred years (Spodek, 1973). Nevertheless the question remains, what do parents want for their children and how do their priorities compare

with those of their children's kindergarten and grade one teachers.

In a very general statement of kindergarten aims for British Columbia the Department of Education (1973) recommended the adoption of an integrated curriculum which provided the child with informal concrete experiences so that he might learn by doing, experiencing, observing, imitating, exploring, evaluating, trying and handling. The Department of Education did not recommend formal or abstract work for five year olds attending school. Neither did they elaborate on specific cognitive, affective or physical goals.

Thus the problem remains, how does one increase the interaction among those concerned with the kindergarten program and lay the foundation for the development of an appropriate relationship among kindergartners' parents, kindergarten teachers and grade one teachers? How much do these groups in British Columbia agree or disagree with regard to their most important kindergarten goals? Parents participate and express their opinions with regard to parent participation preschool programs, community based education programs, volunteer programs throughout the community and school board elections and programs. While early childhood educators have written goals for the kindergarten and developed appropriate curriculum materials, they have given little attention to the domain of parent attitudes in British Columbia concerning kindergarten goals.

Purpose of the Study

It was the purpose of this study to compare the kindergarten goals ascribed to by parents of kindergartners and those of kindergarten

teachers and grade one teachers in North Vancouver, British Columbia. This study further compared the kindergarten goals ascribed to by high, middle and low socioeconomic level parents of kindergartners.

Objectives of the Study

The major objectives of this study were to answer the following questions:

1. Do the attitudes of kindergarten teachers, grade one teachers and kindergartners' parents differ with respect to the following intellectual goals of the kindergarten?
 - a. Desire for knowledge: Values a love for learning
 - b. Communication of knowledge: Developing the skills of communication
 - c. Use of knowledge: Creative thinking and problem solving
 - d. Knowledge of intellectual processes: Factual information
2. Do the attitudes of kindergarten teachers, grade one teachers and kindergartners' parents differ with respect to the following social goals of the kindergarten?
 - a. Child:Child--Learning to work with peers
 - b. Child:Group--Responsibilities as a group member
 - c. Child:Adult--Relations with adults
 - d. Child:Society--Responsible citizenship
3. Do the attitudes of kindergarten teachers, grade one teachers and kindergartners' parents differ with respect to the following personal development goals of the kindergarten?
 - a. Physical: Development of physical skills and coordination

- b. Emotional: Mental and emotional stability
 - c. Self concept: Positive values of self
 - d. Aesthetic: Appreciation of art, music and beauty in the environment
4. Do the attitudes of kindergartners' parents of different socio-economic levels differ with respect to the following intellectual goals of the kindergarten?
- a. Desire for knowledge: Values a love for learning
 - b. Communication of knowledge: Developing the skills of communication
 - c. Use of knowledge: Creative thinking and problem solving
 - d. Knowledge of intellectual processes: Factual information
5. Do the attitudes of kindergartners' parents of different socio-economic levels differ with respect to the following social goals of the kindergarten?
- a. Child:Child--Learning to work with peers
 - b. Child:Group--Responsibilities as a group member
 - c. Child:Adult--Relations with adults
 - d. Child:Society--Responsible citizenship
6. Do the attitudes of kindergartners' parents of different socio-economic levels differ with respect to the following personal development goals of the kindergarten?
- a. Physical: Development of physical skills and coordination
 - b. Emotional: Mental and emotional stability
 - c. Self concept: Positive values of self
 - d. Aesthetic: Appreciation of art, music and beauty in the environment (Downey, 1960; Cabler, 1974).

Assumptions of the Study

Throughout this study the following assumptions were made:

1. Continuous appraisal of educational goals is necessary if schools are to meet societal needs.
2. Curriculum planning should incorporate the ideas and preferences of the most interested and affected groups.
3. Opinions of parents as well as those of professional educators are important in the development of a relevant curriculum.
4. Even though parents may not be familiar with educational research and trends they do have ideas and values about what they expect their children to learn in the kindergarten.

Limitations of the Study

In interpreting the results of this investigation it is necessary to consider the following limitations:

1. The population in this study is limited to kindergartners' parents, kindergarten teachers, and grade one teachers, during the 1976-1977 school year, in North Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.
2. All parent opinionnaires were distributed by the kindergarten teachers and thus the researcher was not immediately available to respond to questions.

C H A P T E R I I

JUSTIFICATION THROUGH A REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to review some of the more significant theories and research in the area of kindergarten goals in order to justify the need for this particular investigation. The first section of this chapter will present some of the more relevant theoretical goals which have guided the kindergarten. The second section will present research studies relating to parent attitudes toward kindergarten goals. The third section will review relevant research on the kindergarten in British Columbia. The final section of this chapter will review the history of the opinionnaire used in this study.

Theoretical Goals of the Kindergarten

According to Lazerson (1972) the kindergarten is the institution which gave legitimacy to the inclusion of affection and physical activities in teaching. He credits Froebel, the founder of the kindergarten, with encouraging teachers to pay careful attention to how children grow, cautioning against the overuse of books and emphasizing the need for early socialization with peers.

Froebel created the kindergarten to allow for the natural unfolding of the inner drives and tendencies of the child with regard to the continual development of the child's inborn capacities (Froebel, 1895; Lilley, 1967). He saw the need for the establishment of an

institution whose purpose it was to enhance the young child's experiences and to support the child in his effort to achieve peace with himself and with nature. Like Pestalozzi with whom he had lived at Yverdon, Froebel placed a great deal of value in the development of the capacity to participate in tasks requiring social cooperation (Lazerson, 1972). The kindergarten was thus to be structured in such a manner as to encourage motor activities, learning by doing, self-motivated activities and social participation. It was most important for the child to develop his sense perceptions as well as for the child to see himself as an instrument for rational purposes. The child's school experience was to provide him with an opportunity to be in harmony with nature.

Spodek (1973) in his examination of the past one hundred years of kindergarten in the United States identified seven major goals as having dominated the kindergarten program. These were: (a) to teach philosophic ideals; (b) Americanize children; (c) build proper habits; (d) provide emotional prophylaxis; (e) serve as a vestibule for the grades; (f) present content of school subjects; and, (g) develop learning to learn skills (p. 191). Of these he believes that the building of proper habits and acculturation through Americanization are no longer acceptable in the rigid sense they were once applied. Spodek called for a thorough examination of kindergarten goals so that the kindergarten program can be revised to reflect what is known about human behavior and what one feels should be happening in the kindergarten.

According to James Hymes (1970) the getting ready, or preparation

for first grade attitude about the kindergarten, is a needless and indecent way to think about a year of life. Hymes advocates the teaching of all areas of human knowledge as they relate to children. Thus the kindergarten should teach: science, not science readiness; math, not math readiness; social studies, not social studies readiness; art, not art readiness; and reading, rather than reading readiness. He also expresses concern that the worst of the first grade is often that which seeps down to the kindergarten. These unworthy goals are: be obedient, be conforming, don't feel emotion and if you do, don't show it, follow the crowd and stay in line (Hymes, 1968). Hymes stresses that the kindergarten must recognize the inevitable integration of human behavior and consequently the goals must be cognitive, physical and social.

Contrast Hymes' goals with those of the United States philanthropic kindergartens of the late 1800's. Their goals were often a combination of socializing the child to middle class norms and a policy of broad social reform. Often these kindergartens were founded expressly to inculcate the children and their families with the values of industriousness, cleanliness, self-discipline and cooperation. Further, through parent education and the anticipated impact of the new values the children would bring home from school, life in the slum was to be vastly improved (Lazerson, 1971; Weber, 1969).

Reading readiness as the foremost kindergarten goal and its academic connotation has caused more conflict among kindergarten educators than any other issue bearing on kindergarten education (Headly, 1958). When Gray (1927) called for a sharing of early reading responsibility between the kindergarten and grade one he contended that some pupils who were

prepared for reading made satisfactory progress in reading; therefore, it should be a prime aim of the kindergarten to help the child develop the attitudes and habits that would help him learn to read. Since the chief purpose of the kindergarten was adjustment to school life, and since reading is an important part of the curriculum, this position was seen as consistent with the basic kindergarten mandate. As Weber (1969) points out, the kindergarten as a preparatory institution was welcomed by many. They apparently found kindergarten aims too broad and ambiguous and welcomed the opportunity to plan for something specific, in this case, reading readiness and preparation for grade one. However, others disagreed. Stendler (1949) argued that a five year old who goes through a program reflecting the above and does his readiness book, his eye exercises, colors within the lines, and learns to share and sit still will have experienced a sterile introduction to school. Further, the teacher will not have seen the child in all his developmental aspects.

In their call for New Directions in the Kindergarten Robison and Spodek (1965) urge educators to plan a program that takes into account all that we know about child development, the value of early nurturance, and the experiences and needs of children growing up in a modern society. They contend that the emerging curriculum has become difficult to defend and that it is in part responsible for the lack of continuity and haphazardness typical in many kindergarten programs. Robison and Spodek suggest that:

the learning of key concepts could become the intellectual goals of the grade, supplementing physical, social and emotional goals. The content would be developed through instructional materials

and experiences from which young children could be expected to gather information, ideas, skills and attitudes (p. 11).

This view gains additional support from Rogers (1974) who agrees that the Kamii-Piagetian framework for cognitive goals is a useful conception for teachers and curriculum workers. However, he warns that Spodek's analytic scheme could lead to compartmentalized learning.

Foerster (1975) states that most early childhood educators agree that getting ready for grade one should not be the goal of the kindergarten year. Rather than a year of preparation Foerster suggests that the basic kindergarten goals should be sorted into four major categories of equal importance: cognitive, affective, psychomotor and linguistic goals. The kindergarten should be a learning laboratory with unlimited opportunities for language development and usage; and, filled with stimuli and planned settings to encourage cognitive, affective and physical-motor growth. Yawkey and Silvern (1974) take a similar position and urge educators to reexamine their goals in order to guard against one dimensional planning in kindergarten programs.

A report by the Education Commission of the States (1971) stated that several approaches could be implemented at substantially less cost than conventional kindergartens and preschools. They asserted that state programs for children under six should have the following major goals: (a) strengthen the family role and involve parents in the education of their young; (b) provide for the health, safety and psychological needs of their young children; and, (c) provide remedial health and educational programs where necessary.

Many educators continue to stress that what is needed is a broad

all encompassing curriculum (Wills and Lindberg, 1967; Heffernan, 1970; Gardner and Berson, 1966). They highlight the need for the kindergarten to provide the children with the stimuli and opportunities they need to succeed in school and may not have received at home. They encourage contact with the home so that the parents can be educated and enlightened but the researcher has not found educators seeking parents' input with regard to the formulation of kindergarten goals.

Research Studies Relating Parent Attitudes

Toward Kindergarten Goals

The researcher anticipated that parent attitudes toward kindergarten goals would vary depending upon their occupation, level of education and cultural heritage. As expected, Rowland (1960) found that parental disagreement with professional educators regarding goals of the school can be related to a number of variables. He found significant difference between parents and professional educators when the variables of sex, age, race, education, occupation, religion and size of community were considered. Harding (1968) discovered significant difference in the way parents and professional educators ranked the objectives of mathematics education.

In a study of desirable kindergarten goals as perceived by parents, teachers and principals participating in Kentucky's 1973-1974 pilot kindergarten program, Cabler (1974) collected data through questionnaires and analyzed it with respect to several personal and demographic characteristics of the respondents as independent variables. Since the program was new, he believed that there would be considerable

discussion concerning goals and objectives, and further, he believed that those professionals who had conflicting goals would achieve different results. Therefore Cabler concluded that an organization establishing a new program may do a great deal to ensure success if it can gain a consensus of opinion regarding goals and objectives. The questionnaire, similar to the one used in this study, had three main categorical divisions: intellectual development, social development and personal development, and fifteen statements that did not fit into any of these categories. In analyzing the data Cabler found that parents placed a higher value on the task items in the intellectual dimension than did teachers and principals. Parents ranked each of the four intellectual goals higher than or equal to the rating assigned it by the teacher. This makes it fairly clear as to what these kindergarten parents in Kentucky saw as the primary concern of the kindergarten. Items in the realm of social development received approximately equal support from each of the groups with all groups ranking group responsibility high and adult relations low. Items in the personal dimension received little support from any of the groups, although teachers tended to place a higher priority here than did parents. This section included the development of physical skills, cultivation of aesthetic awareness, development of a positive self concept and development of emotional stability and maturity. All groups placed low value on the item labeled aesthetics. Cabler found that there were significant differences in parents' perceptions of the task of the kindergarten when categorized according to the occupational level of the respondents. These differences were generally found

between the low occupational group and the other groups. For example, the low occupational group ranked knowledge of fundamental processes significantly higher than did each of the other groups. He concluded that it is necessary for educators who desire to plan appropriate programs, develop good community relations and serve the public at large, to learn more about parent attitudes toward kindergarten goals.

In a similar study of parent and teacher attitudes toward kindergarten goals in Florida, Goulet (1975) asked kindergartners' parents, kindergarten teachers and grade one teachers to select the twenty-five most important goals from among seventy-five presented to them. Each statement was primarily promoting one of eight major classifications: academic, emotional, language, other intellectual, physical, self concept, sensory perceptual and social development. He found broad areas of general agreement, but each group selected different items as most important. Parents in this study selected social development as their most important goal while kindergarten teachers selected other intellectual development as their most important goals. This finding was significantly different from what Cabler (1974) found in Kentucky. Grade one teachers selected development of self concept as their most important kindergarten goal. Goulet found that parents and teachers agreed more in ranking physical and social items than in ranking language and academic items.

Taylor (1965) provided further evidence that attitudes toward a kindergarten program would vary depending on the parents' occupation and the number of years they had attended school. In this study the attitudes of parents of children in elementary school and private

kindergartens toward a public kindergarten program were determined. A questionnaire was developed and distributed in the schools to children of 878 families. A related finding stated that differences occurred in opinions regarding the value of kindergartens according to such factors as parents' education, having children who attended kindergarten, parents' occupations and the type of school attended by the children. Further, parents employed in the professions and parents employed in unskilled work were more willing to vote for establishing public kindergartens than were parents employed in business or skilled work.

Among the hypotheses tested by Roberts (1971) was: what is the relationship between principals and parents, and teachers and parents in their perception of elementary school goals? His findings reveal that there is a significant difference in the perception of elementary school goals between school employees and parents. Roberts calls for more research in this area so that one can communicate effectively and plan more appropriately. He concludes by warning of the possible loss of parental support of schools if these differences are not resolved.

Dearden and Valotto (1968) established a pilot kindergarten program in Fairfax, Virginia in order to obtain information and make recommendations for implementing the program on a countrywide basis during 1968-1969. In the course of their study Dearden and Valotto emphasized the need for parent cooperation; although, the thrust was to elicit parent support for goals already decided rather than any attempt to establish two-way communication and mutual decision making. They asked teachers and principals how they perceived kindergarten goals and many differences between the groups were found. It should be noted that parents

were not asked to respond in this area.

While the specific goals and expectations for the kindergarten will vary within and between communities depending on the background of the parents and the philosophy of the school (Mindess and Mindess, 1972), the question uppermost in parents' minds is: how much of the kindergarten program should resemble that of the nursery school and in what ways should it be similar to first grade? While it is important for a teacher to understand that a program should be catered to a child's abilities, it must also be understood that expectations are a powerful force and must be understood and considered when one is planning a kindergarten program. As Garrison (1937) suggested, the home is the first and most significant factor in the education of the child. The school as a contributor to this education must develop a spirit of cooperation and seek the guidance of parents when anticipating changes or making modifications in the educational program.

British Columbia Kindergartens

Since education in Canada is under the jurisdiction of the province, it is necessary to examine the kindergarten research conducted in British Columbia. A search of the literature uncovered only two major studies in British Columbia, one by Bain (1967) and one by Conway (1968). No research related to parent attitudes toward kindergarten goals in the province was found. At the University of British Columbia Bain (1967) researched the kindergarten teacher, the kindergarten environment, the kindergarten pupils' experiences and the relationship between kindergarten attendance and the pupils' subsequent elementary school

performance. In his reporting Bain analyzed the existing literature and tried to place the kindergarten in contemporary perspective. Bain's report stated five broad generalizations: (a) social, emotional and language development appear to be highly interrelated and that kindergartens are dedicated to the provision of experiences which promote development in these areas; (b) learning proceeds more efficiently when the experiences of the child are structured, and that the kindergarten environment is consistently structured to provide for optimum growth and learning; (c) learning is more efficient when the goals and activity are child centered, and when children in a kindergarten are not pushed into adult oriented formal reading situations; (d) kindergartens provide experience for positive living, thus through his participation in living experiences with other children the child is developing confidence in himself, in his relations with other children and in his relations with adults; and, (e) kindergartens provide an essential setting for an essential process at an essential period in the developing lives of children. The well equipped and well staffed kindergarten is an important opportunity for growth for every child prior to his exposure to formal schooling. As Bain said:

Language development, the level of creative thinking and doing, the emotional patterns, and the social patterns of children are nearly crystallized by age seven, a time when most children have had rather haphazard training in these processes, and are already well into the rather formal educative procedures of grade one (p. 27).

The other major British Columbia study (Conway, 1968) focused on the comparative performance of public and private kindergarten children and non-kindergarten children in the primary grades. Although

this was not a study of espoused goals and priorities for kindergarten programs, it did ascertain some of the real effects of kindergarten programs in Vancouver and Victoria. The study involved 22,000 public school children in the primary grades who had, or had not, attended public or private kindergarten previously. The study was conducted in the two metropolitan centers of the province which are Vancouver and Victoria. Conway reported five major findings. First, report card ratings in work habits, general behavior and health habits were generally higher for children who had attended private kindergarten and for girls. Second, adaptation to school appeared to be related to kindergarten attendance. In ten out of twelve groups of both sexes the children who had attended public or private kindergarten were reported as being better adapted to school than those who had not. Third, all groups were found to have approximately the same mental age, with the exception being those girls who had attended private kindergarten. Girls who had attended private kindergarten showed a slight superiority. Fourth, standardized achievement tests were administered to all grade two children in Victoria where it was found that kindergarten attendance was related to higher average scores in reading comprehension, word meaning, spelling and arithmetic. Also, in most comparisons girls exceeded boys of a similar mental age. Fifth, little acceleration was found in grades one to three, but when it was in evidence it was related primarily to private kindergarten experience. Retardation in grades one to three was found to be considerably lower for children who had attended kindergarten. In this study no attempt was made to investigate environmental factors, home background, parent attitudes or parents' socioeconomic

level. Each of these may have affected the children's kindergarten attendance, their report card ratings and their achievement levels.

In their general statement of kindergarten goals and objectives the British Columbia Department of Education (1973) stated that:

The basic objective of the education for young children is to enable each child in his beginning years of school to become deeply involved and self-directive in his learning. This requires first a positive image of himself as a learner and as a person, since there is a "circular process" of interaction between learning and personality development. Each child's growth is judged by his intellectual functioning, his ego strength, his inventiveness, his relatedness to peers and adults, and his capacity to cope with events of each day within his social group.

The kindergarten learning environment which is conducive to such growth offers the child a variety of vital, constructive, challenging, and pleasurable experiences in which he participates by his own choice. Concrete sensory and motor activities suitable to the child's learning mode are easily interrelated with opportunities for functional and expressive use of language (p. 7).

Further, they ask the teacher to provide the child with informal concrete experiences so that he may learn by doing, experiencing, observing, imitating, exploring, evaluating, trying and handling. They also request that the teacher give the children time, love, encouragement, approval, sympathy, opportunity and consistent direction.

The Opinionnaire

Downey (1960), Seager (1959) and Slagle (1959) collaborated to conceptualize and develop the Task of Public Education Opinionnaire (to be referred to as TPE: see Appendix A for opinionnaire in its entirety). In so doing they reviewed previous attempts at measuring the degree of public acceptance of school programs and general statements of public opinion with regard to what the public schools should teach. As many statements were repetitious only those which expressed new ideas were

added. These were then summarized in sixteen statements: (a) four in the intellectual dimension; (b) four in the social dimension; (c) four in the personal dimension; and, (d) four in the productive dimension. This left two major items still to be resolved: (a) the language barrier; and, (b) the selection of a response technique. Downey, Seager and Slagle altered the vocabulary in the TPE Opinionnaire so that lay people could express their opinions about education. Most of this was done in trial and error fashion through interviews. A forced choice technique was selected as the response format and respondents were provided with a hypothetical yet realistic frame of reference. Downey, Seager and Slagle considered several forced choice formats such as rank ordering, intensity of feeling measured and the Q-sort technique. They selected the Q-sort technique as most appropriate. This technique was also utilized by Cabler (1974).

The opinionnaire used in this study, an outgrowth of the TPE Opinionnaire and a modification of the instrument used by Cabler (1974), is a comprehensive instrument which attempted to elicit opinions from both the lay public and professionals in the field. Some of the concepts represented may have been too abstract, the wording of some items may have been too difficult and the forced choice technique may not have achieved the desired results. However, the researcher believed that the goals should not be too specific so that the respondents would give their response to a curriculum goal rather than to a particular activity. The wording of some statements may have created problems for some respondents, but Cabler did not experience difficulty with these items and the researcher believed that the explanatory statements

with each item were ample. In order to simplify the filling out of the opinionnaire, the researcher chose to use the rank order technique rather than the Q-sort technique used by both Downey and Cabler. The researcher believed the Q-sort technique was too cumbersome to be used without the presence of the researcher.

Downey (1960) recommended use of the Task of Public Education Opinionnaire (TPE) by others who wished to identify, order and categorize the elements of the task of public education. To date the TPE Opinionnaire on which this opinionnaire is based has been used in five major research studies (Andrews, 1959; Cabler, 1974; Downey, 1959; Seager, 1959; Slagle, 1959). A sixth study which utilized this instrument was a section of a very large study of school community relationships conducted by the Institute for Communications Research, Stanford University, sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education.

John Andrews (1959) in his use of an expanded form of the TPE Opinionnaire in Alberta and the Midwestern States found differences in American and Canadian perceptions of what elementary school goals should be. Canadian educators surveyed ranked a desire for knowledge as a high priority and Canadian non-educators included ethical, aesthetic and consumer goals as priorities. American educators surveyed rated physical well being and home and family education as major concerns; and, educators and non-educators ranked patriotism as a major goal.

In his use of an instrument created from the TPE Opinionnaire, Cabler (1974) found that parents placed greater emphasis on intellectual goals than did teachers. Social development goals received approximately equal support from both parents and teachers with each group

ranking group responsibilities high and adult relations low. Items in the personal dimension were a low priority to both teachers and parents although they were somewhat more important to teachers.

Summary

From a review of the literature and related research in the United States and Canada it appears that little attention has been paid to parent attitudes toward kindergarten goals in British Columbia and specifically with how these compare with those of kindergarten and grade one teachers. Equally little attention has been given to the areas of differing attitudes toward kindergarten goals as related to parents' socioeconomic level. Although the research that has been conducted on this topic is minimal, that which has been conducted indicates that differences in attitude toward school goals among these groups may be found. This study was an attempt to provide descriptive data which might aid educational planners in British Columbia in identifying and giving consideration to the views of parents regarding the relative importance of kindergarten goals.

C H A P T E R I I I

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This chapter describes the hypotheses, subjects, opinionnaire, procedures and analysis of data for the study. The study was designed as a survey of the attitudes and opinions of parents, kindergarten teachers and grade one teachers in North Vancouver with regard to the intellectual, social, and personal development goals of the kindergarten. The survey approach was used to ascertain the opinions of those adults with the most direct contact with the kindergarten program: parents of kindergartners, kindergarten teachers and grade one teachers.

Hypotheses

For parents of kindergartners, kindergarten teachers, and grade one teachers in North Vancouver, the following hypotheses were tested:

1. The writer hypothesized that parents of kindergartners would show significantly more preference for developing a love for learning, developing communication skills, creative thinking and problem solving, and acquisition of the tools for learning the 3 R's, than either kindergarten teachers or grade one teachers. These represent all the goals in the intellectual domain.

In Cabler's (1974) study of kindergartners' parents and teachers and their priorities with regard to kindergarten goals in Kentucky, it was found that parents placed a value equal to or higher than that

of kindergarten teachers on each of the items in the intellectual dimension. In this 1974 study the major areas of disagreement within the intellectual domain were developing communication skills and the tools for learning the 3 R's. Both parents and teachers ranked developing a love for learning first and creative thinking and problem solving fifth.

In Goulet's (1975) study of kindergartners' parents, kindergarten teachers and grade one teachers priorities with regard to kindergarten goals in Florida, it was found that kindergarten teachers placed the highest priority on intellectual goals while parents placed slightly less importance here and grade one teachers ranked these lowest of the three groups.

2. The writer hypothesized that parents of kindergartners, kindergarten teachers and grade one teachers would value learning to work with peers, working cooperatively in groups, developing relations with adults and accepting the responsibilities of everyday life, the social goals of the kindergarten, similarly. However, some parent preferences were expected in the areas of developing relations with adults and accepting the responsibilities of everyday life.

In his study, Cabler (1974) found that items in the social dimension received almost equal support from both parents and kindergarten teachers. However, within this classification it was found that parents placed slightly greater importance on the items referring to relations with adults and accepting responsibilities of everyday life. Goulet (1975) had one category in his study relating to the kindergarten child's social development as a goal of the kindergarten

program. In his study parents placed greater importance on this goal than did either kindergarten teachers or grade one teachers.

3. The writer hypothesized that the goals in the personal domain, physical development, emotional stability, positive self concept and appreciation of the arts, would receive the least support from all three groups. Further, it was hypothesized that parents would rate each of these goals equal to or lower than kindergarten teachers and grade one teachers.

In Goulet's (1975) study the parents, kindergarten teachers and grade one teachers were in general agreement with regard to physical and sensory perceptual goals for the kindergarten, with all three groups ranking these goals next to last and last respectively. On the statement referring to emotional stability as a goal the grade one teachers ranked it highest, parents next and kindergarten teachers ranked this goal lowest of the three groups. The goal entitled self concept was ranked first by grade one teachers, second by kindergarten teachers and third by parents.

Cabler (1974) found these goals to be a relatively low priority for both parents and kindergarten teachers with parents ranking each item somewhat lower than the kindergarten teachers. Two of the more significant differences were in the areas of emotional stability and self concept. Kindergarten teachers ranked emotional stability as their fourth most important goal while parents ranked it sixth. Developing a positive self concept was considered the third most important goal by kindergarten teachers and seventh by parents.

4. The writer hypothesized that high and medium socioeconomic level parents of kindergartners would show significantly more preference for developing a love for learning, developing communication skills, and creative thinking and problem solving as intellectual goals of the kindergarten than would low socioeconomic level parents. Further, it was hypothesized that low socioeconomic level parents would show significantly higher priority than high or middle socioeconomic level parents with regard to the acquisition of the tools for learning the 3 R's as a goal of the kindergarten.

In Downey's (1960) report on the Task of Public Education it was reported that parents' ranking of items such as a desire to learn and use of knowledge, decreased systematically down the occupational scale. Thus Downey found professionals ranking these items highest and laborers giving them their lowest ranking. Cabler (1974) in his study of parent priorities for the kindergarten found that the low occupation level parents ranked the learning of the 3 R's significantly higher than did the high or middle occupation level groups.

5. The writer hypothesized that high middle and low socioeconomic level parents of kindergartners would value learning to work with peers and working cooperatively in groups, two of the social goals, similarly. In the two remaining areas, relations with adults and accepting the responsibilities of everyday life, the writer hypothesized that significant differences would be in evidence between the high and middle socioeconomic level group. It was hypothesized that the low socioeconomic

level group would rank relations with adults as a significantly more important kindergarten goal than the high and middle socioeconomic level groups. It was also hypothesized that the high and middle socioeconomic level groups would place a significantly higher priority on responsible citizenship than would low socioeconomic level parents.

Both Cabler (1974) and Downey (1960) found that the higher occupation group ranked responsible citizenship significantly higher than did the low occupation group. Further, Downey found that there was a systematic decrease in the ranking of this goal as one proceeded down the occupational scale from professional to laborer. Cabler also found that relations with adults was a significantly more important kindergarten goal to low occupation level parents than it was to high occupation level parents.

6. The writer hypothesized that high and middle socioeconomic level parents would show a significantly higher priority than low socioeconomic level parents with regard to emotional stability and appreciation of the arts as personal development goals of the kindergarten. Also, it was hypothesized that the development of physical skills would be significantly more important to low socioeconomic level parents than to high and middle socioeconomic level parents. Then it was hypothesized that high, middle and low socioeconomic level parents would rank positive values of self similarly, with no significant difference between the groups.

Downey (1960) reported that the priority ranking assigned to both

mental and emotional stability and appreciation of the arts decreased systematically as one proceeded down the occupational scale from professional to laborer. Conversely, the ranking afforded physical training decreased systematically as one ascended the occupational scale. Both Downey and Cabler (1974) reported that the ranking given to self concept did not differ significantly between occupational groups.

Subjects

North Vancouver is located on the lower mainland of British Columbia, Canada, bordering the major industrial and cultural center of Vancouver and 150 miles north of Seattle, Washington. The terrain is mountainous and most sections suitable for residential development have one family homes. North Vancouver has both light and heavy industry and many of the residents work within the city, while the remainder commute to downtown Vancouver. Its inhabitants are employed in a wide range of occupations as shown in the occupation distribution profile (Appendix B) compiled from 1976 census figures. The greatest percentage are employed in clerical (18.95%) and sales (15.91%) occupations while there are very few employed in farming, fishing, mining, logging and related occupations (1.67%).

The teaching staff in North Vancouver is comprised primarily of British Columbians although there are some teachers from other provinces in Canada, the Commonwealth and the United States. The teaching population has relatively little turnover. Most teachers received their training at one of the three British Columbia

universities, Simon Fraser University, the University of Victoria, or the University of British Columbia.

The population involved in this study was all the kindergarten teachers (to be referred to as group T-K), all grade one teachers (to be referred to as group T-1), and one half the parents (to be referred to as group P) of kindergarten children in North Vancouver. As of January, 1977, there were 1,156 children enrolled in kindergarten in North Vancouver, 33 kindergarten teachers and 78 grade one teachers. Included in this survey were 621 parents of kindergartners from 16 elementary schools in North Vancouver as well as all 33 kindergarten and 78 grade one teachers.

There were 621 parents surveyed and a total of 212 responded (34.6%). Of these a total of 170 were judged to be useable, 27.4% of those distributed. There were 45 returns (7.2%) which were not able to be used. Thirty-two of the 33 kindergarten teachers in North Vancouver were surveyed and a total of 24 responded (75%). Of these a total of 14 were judged to be useable (43.8%) while 10 returns (31.2%) were not able to be used. Seventy-six of the 78 grade one teachers in North Vancouver were surveyed and a total of 36 responded (47.4%). Of these a total of 32 were judged to be useable (42.1%) while 4 returns (5.3%) were not able to be used. It should be noted that one elementary school with one kindergarten teacher as well as two grade one teachers refused to participate in the study.

A large number of parents were surveyed so that a sizeable sample would still be obtained even if many parents chose not to return the opinionnaire. Two of the schools sampled have large Native Indian

populations and the researcher realized it would be difficult to get any returns from these schools. Still 34.6% of the parents did return the opinionnaires with 7.2% judged unuseable. These opinionnaires were rejected because the parents did not rank order the twelve statements presented. While 75% of the kindergarten teachers returned their opinionnaires, 31.2% of these were unuseable. In every case the cause for rejection was due to the refusal of the kindergarten teacher to rank order her kindergarten goals. Comments indicating equal importance for all goals were common. A sizeable number of grade one teachers returned the opinionnaires (47.4%) and only 5.3% were rejected because the goal statements were not rank ordered.

Grouping of subjects. The parents included in this study represented a cross section of the North Vancouver population (Table 1). The writer needed to define high, middle and low socioeconomic level and divide the population into these groups for comparative analysis. In order to define high, middle and low socioeconomic levels, the seven levels of the revised Blishen Scale (1962), a Canadian index of occupations ranked and grouped according to combined standard scores for income and years of schooling, by sex, were collapsed into three levels. In this study, the father's occupation was used when it was given, if just the mother's occupation was provided it was assumed she was head of the household and her socioeconomic level was used. An outline of the modification illustrating exactly how the scale was collapsed is presented below (Appendix C).

Table 1
 Parents: High, Middle and Low
 SES Number and Percent

Occupation Level		N	%
high	judges, lawyers, physicians, teachers, engineers, actuaries and social workers	68	40.0
middle	technicians, secretaries, retail trade managers, bookkeepers, firemen, telephone operators, bus drivers, postmen	74	43.5
low	sales clerks, service station attendants, bakers, waiters, truck drivers, lumbermen, fishermen, hunters and trappers	28	16.5

High Socioeconomic Level (to be referred to as high SES)

- Level 1: judges, lawyers, dentists, physicians, engineers, architects and actuaries
 Level 2: business managers, other professionals, authors, armed forces officers, social workers, teachers, clergymen and lesser professionals

Middle Socioeconomic Level (to be referred to as middle SES)

- Level 3: actors, technicians, secretaries, brokers, and retail trade managers
 Level 4: bookkeepers, manufacturing foremen, doctor and dentist attendants, and photographers
 Level 5: firemen, telephone operators, farmers, jewelers, bus drivers, and postmen

Low Socioeconomic Level (to be referred to as low SES)

- Level 6: sales clerks, service station attendants, tailors, bakers, truck drivers, carpenters, and waiters
 Level 7: cooks, janitors, longshoremen, waitresses, shoemakers, lumbermen, fishermen and hunters and trappers

With the hope of being able to analyze the data by ethnic groups, the writer ascertained the identities of the major ethnic groups in North Vancouver and listed these in the opinionnaire. The respondents were then asked to ✓ where appropriate; however, the responses were inadequate for analysis.

Opinionnaire

The opinionnaire used reflected the major task areas of the kindergarten as classified by Downey (1960) in his study of the task of public education. The major classifications identified by Downey were the intellectual, social, personal and productive. The last classification, productive, was concerned primarily with career and vocational education and was thus not included. Since Downey's opinionnaire was carefully derived from more than one hundred goal

statements and then broadened to represent intellectual development, social development and personal development, no difficulties were encountered due to the broadness of the questions.

The researcher's opinionnaires (Table 2; Appendix D) closely resemble Cabler's (1974) adaptation of the TPE Opinionnaire. The response format was similar to that used by both Downey (1960) and Cabler in that a specific introduction was used to provide a setting for the respondent's decision making and a forced choice technique was used to help the respondent's prioritize their goals. While both Cabler and Downey used the Q-sort technique this researcher chose the rank ordering technique. The researcher believed that the Q-sort technique was too difficult to complete without the guidance of the researcher. The researcher realized that the rank ordering technique creates a situation in which there is non-independence of all items. For as a respondent ranks a goal number one, only ranking two through twelve are left. Thus conservatism was exercised in interpreting these results. A Likert type scale was also used, asking the respondents to indicate whether or not a goal was very important, somewhat important, or not important. Almost all respondents indicated that all goals were most important and so these responses yielded no useable results. This further supports the use of the forced choice technique.

Table 2
Parent Opinionnaire

Please answer the following questions:

Occupation of father: _____

Occupation of mother: _____

Check one:

Native Indian
 Chinese-Canadian
 East Indian-Canadian
 German-Canadian
 Italian-Canadian
 Japanese-Canadian
 Other

It would be appreciated if you would take some time to complete the following opinionnaire so that a better understanding of parent views on the kindergarten program might be gathered. Consider this problem: If kindergarten teachers were to find it necessary to eliminate some areas of the curriculum

- a. which program areas should remain?
- b. which program areas should be eliminated?

Directions:

Below are twelve statements each representing a goal and partial focus of the kindergarten program. Please read each of the twelve statements and circle whether you believe each of these is very important, somewhat important or not important. Once you have read all twelve statements and indicated how important you believe they are, consider which ones are most important and which are least important. When you have decided which goal statement is most important please place the #1 in the box to the right of the statement. When you have decided which goal is second in importance please place the #2 in the box to the right of the statement. Continue to do this with each statement until you have completed all twelve and placed the #12 in the box to the right of your least preferred goal.

Table 2--continued

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|---------------|--|--------------------------|
| 1. Desire for knowledge: A desire to learn and a love for learning. | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| very important | somewhat important | not important | | |
| 2. Communication of knowledge: Listening, speaking and sharing ideas with others. | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| very important | somewhat important | not important | | |
| 3. Use of knowledge: Helping the child learn to figure out things for himself. | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| very important | somewhat important | not important | | |
| 4. Knowledge of fundamental processes: The basic tools for future learning of the 3 R's. | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| very important | somewhat important | not important | | |
| 5. Child to Child: Learning to work with, understand and appreciate individuals of all kinds. | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| very important | somewhat important | not important | | |
| 6. Child to Group: Sharing, playing and working cooperatively in groups. | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| very important | somewhat important | not important | | |
| 7. Child to Adult: Helping the child to understand and work with the adults in his life. | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| very important | somewhat important | not important | | |
| 8. Child to Society: Learning to accept the responsibilities of everyday life. | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| very important | somewhat important | not important | | |
| 9. Physical: Appreciation of good health habits and caring for one's body. | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| very important | somewhat important | not important | | |

Table 2--continued

10. Emotional Stability: Able to cope with the problems of everyday life.

very important somewhat important not important

11. Self-Concept: Pride in one's self and his accomplishments.

very important somewhat important not important

12. Aesthetics: Enjoyment of the finer things of life, art, music, etc.

very important somewhat important not important

Comments:

Procedure

Distribution and collection of data. Prior to commencing this research, the writer received permission and support from the assistant superintendent of schools in North Vancouver. The opinionnaire was to be distributed to 649 parents of kindergartners from 17 of the 33 elementary schools in North Vancouver. An alphabetical list of the 33 elementary schools was compiled and every other school beginning with the first was to be included in the survey. This provided a sample of 50% of the schools with kindergartens and approximately 50% of the kindergarten families. The researcher visited each school where the parents were to be surveyed and spoke with each principal, explained the study and requested his or her cooperation in the distribution and collection of the parent opinionnaires. The principals were very interested in the survey and anxious to see the responses of both the parents and the teachers. All but one agreed to have the opinionnaire distributed and collected in their schools. The exception was a principal who stated that he believed it was his responsibility to protect the parents in his school from any invasion of their privacy. He also requested that the writer not poll the teachers in his school. The writer honored this request and thus 1 kindergarten teacher, 2 grade one teachers and 28 parents are not included in this survey. The opinionnaire was thus distributed to a total of 621 parents from 16 elementary schools and all the kindergarten and grade one teachers in 32 North Vancouver elementary schools.

The parent opinionnaire and letter of transmittal (Appendix E) were delivered and explained to each classroom teacher by the writer and

distributed to the parents through their children's kindergarten. The opinionnaire was sent home with each kindergartner on May 9, 10 or 11, 1977 and was to be returned to the kindergarten teacher by May 20. On May 19, each school was called, encouraging participation, requesting that the writer be contacted if there were any questions and told that the opinionnaires would be collected in another week. The opinionnaires were collected on May 31, June 1 and 2, 1977.

The teacher opinionnaire and letter of transmittal (Appendix F) were delivered to each school on May 9, 10 or 11, 1977. On May 19 each school was called to stimulate the teachers' participation, encourage any questions teachers had about the opinionnaire and inform them that they might have until June 1 to complete the opinionnaire.

After the opinionnaires were collected they were hand sorted by the writer into categories: parents, kindergarten teachers and grade one teachers. The parent opinionnaires were then classified into occupation levels I to VII according to the Blishen Scale.

The rank orderings of the twelve kindergarten goal statements of kindergarten teachers, grade one teachers, and high, middle and low socioeconomic status parents were transferred to Fortran coding forms, key punched, and then run on the computer.

Analysis of Data

The responses of the parents, kindergarten teachers and grade one teachers to the twelve statements in the researcher's opinionnaire have been rank ordered according to their means. The parents' responses have also been rank ordered by high, middle and low socioeconomic status

groups. A frequency distribution profile of the total population's responses (N=216) to each of the twelve statements has also been prepared: showing (a) absolute frequency; (b) relative frequency; (c) mean; (d) median; (e) mode; and, (f) standard deviation. Only rank order responses were analyzed, since the request for Likert type responses (very important, somewhat important, not important) yielded synonymous responses from almost everyone. Most respondents indicated that all the goals presented are very important for the kindergarten program. The data were not analyzed according to ethnic group responses due to insufficient diversity among those responding.

The researcher used the analysis of variance and the chi square test to compare the mean responses of parents, kindergarten teachers and grade one teachers as well as high, middle and low socioeconomic status parents to the twelve opinionnaire statements presented. The chi square test was used since the population distribution was not equal. For the chi square test the group responses were divided into the following categories: (a) most important; (b) average importance; and, (c) least important. Those goals ranked one through four by a respondent were classified as most important, while those ranked five through eight were classified as being of average importance and those ranked nine through twelve were classified as being least important. Both statistical techniques are based on rank order data and hence fail to meet the strict criteria of independence. Thus caution was observed in the interpretation of the results. Generally, a strict, conservative level of significance was used. The statistical analysis of the data was completed with the use of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, version H, release 7.01.

C H A P T E R I V
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Intellectual Goals

In this chapter the researcher will present and discuss the responses of parents of kindergartners, kindergarten teachers and grade one teachers to the researcher's opinionnaire. Kindergarten teachers, grade one teachers and parents of all socioeconomic levels responded to each of the twelve statements, representing intellectual, social and personal development goals for the kindergarten, and rank ordered them according to their own priorities. Each of the statements presented is described in terms of expected outcomes as stated earlier as the hypotheses guiding this research.

Love of Learning. It has been predicted that parents of kindergartners would show significantly more preference for developing a love for learning as a kindergarten goal than kindergarten teachers or grade one teachers. This hypothesis was tested by statement one on the researcher's opinionnaire and the difference between the groups was not significant. However, parents ranked this goal as their most important (M=3.4, standard deviation=2.7) while kindergarten teachers (M=4.9, standard deviation=2.6) and grade one teachers (M=3.9, standard deviation=2.8) ranked it second (Table 3; Table 4). Overall this goal was ranked highest (M=3.5; Md.=2.6; Mo=1) of the twelve statements

Table 3
 Mean Rankings of Educational Goals for Parents,
 Kindergarten Teachers and Grade 1 Teachers

	Parents	T-K	T-1	Total	Max. Diff.
<u>Intellectual</u>					
1. love of learning	3.4	4.9	3.9	3.5	1.5
2. communication skills	4.6	5.6	4.6	4.7	1.0
3. creative thinking	4.8	6.5	5.9	5.1	1.7
4. factual knowledge	6.7	7.6	8.5	7.0	1.8
<u>Social</u>					
1. child	5.8	5.1	5.7	5.7	.7
2. group	5.9	5.4	4.2	5.6	1.7
3. adult	8.9	7.2	8.3	8.7	1.7
4. citizenship	7.1	7.9	6.9	7.1	1.0
<u>Personal</u>					
1. physical development	8.3	9.6	9.0	8.5	1.3
2. emotional stability	6.7	5.4	6.8	6.7	1.4
3. value, self	5.2	2.1	3.6	4.7	3.1
4. appreciation, art	10.5	10.6	10.5	10.5	.1

Table 4

Mean Rank Order of Educational Goals for Parents,
Kindergarten Teachers and Grade 1 Teachers

	Parent	Kindergarten	Grade 1
1			
2		*values self(P)	
3	love of learning(I)		*values self(P)
4			love of learning(I)
	communication(I)		*work with group(S)
	*creative thinking(I)	love of learning(I)	communication(I)
5	*values self(P)	work with peers(S)	
	work with peers(S)	emotional stability(P)	work with peers(S)
6	*work with group(S)	*work with group(S)	*creative thinking(I)
		communication(I)	
	*factual knowledge(I)	*creative thinking(I)	emotional stability(P)
7	emotional stability(P)	*work with adults(S)	citizenship(S)
	citizenship(S)	*factual knowledge(I)	
		citizenship(S)	
8	physical skills(P)		*work with adults(S)
			*factual knowledge(I)
9	*work with adults(S)		physical skills(P)
		physical skills(P)	
10			
	appreciation, art(P)	appreciation, art(P)	appreciation, art(P)
11			
12			
	N=170	N=14	N=32

*significant differences, $p < .05$

I=Intellectual Goals S=Social Goals P=Personal Development Goals

presented with 31.5% of the population selecting it first (mode=1) and 62.5% ranking it either first, second or third (Table 5). While this difference between parents, kindergarten teachers and grade one teachers is noteworthy, $F(2,213)=2.5$, significance=.08, it was not significant at the .05 level.

This finding is consistent with Cabler's (1974) study in Kentucky in that parents ranked love for learning as their highest priority. However in Cabler's study kindergarten teachers and grade one teachers also ranked love for learning as their highest priority whereas in this study both groups ranked it second.

Communication Skills. It had been predicted that parents of kindergartners would show significantly more preference for developing communication skills as a kindergarten goal than kindergarten teachers or grade one teachers. This hypothesis was tested by statement two on the researcher's opinionnaire and the difference between the groups was not significant. This goal was ranked second highest ($M=4.7$; $Md.=4.5$; $Mo=2$) of the twelve statements presented with parents and grade one teachers ranking it equally ($M=4.6$). Kindergarten teachers saw this goal as somewhat less important and accorded this goal an average score, $M=5.6$ (Table 3; Table 4; Table 6).

Creative Thinking. It was predicted that parents of kindergartners would show significantly more preference for creative thinking and problem solving as a kindergarten goal than kindergarten teachers or grade one teachers. This hypothesis was tested by statement three on the researcher's opinionnaire and the difference between the groups

Table 5

Frequency Distribution--Total Population
Statement Number 1--Love of Learning

Ranking	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (percent)	Cumulative Frequency (percent)
1	68	31.5	31.5
2	36	16.7	48.1
3	31	14.4	62.5
4	15	6.9	69.4
5	14	6.5	75.9
6	12	5.6	81.5
7	14	6.5	88.0
8	9	4.2	92.1
9	11	5.1	97.2
10	5	2.3	99.5
11	<u>1</u>	<u>.5</u>	100.0
Total	216	100.0	

Mean = 3.5 standard deviation = 2.7
 Median = 2.6
 Mode = 1

Table 6

Significant Differences Between Parents, Kindergarten Teachers and Grade 1 Teachers and Their Perceptions of the Purpose of the Kindergarten

Source of Variance	F Value	Significance
creative thinking	5.59	.004
factual knowledge	3.50	.03
group responsibility	5.70	.003
working with adults	3.78	.02
self concept	7.81	.0005

was significant. The total population ranked this goal fourth ($M=5.1$; $Md=4.8$; $Mo=3$) with parents ($M=4.8$; standard deviation= 2.4) placing more importance on this goal than did either kindergarten teachers ($M=6.5$; standard deviation= 2.0) or grade one teachers ($M=5.9$; standard deviation= 2.4 ; Table 3; Table 4). This difference was significant, $F(2,213)=5.59$, $p=.004$ (Table 7; Table 8).

The group responses were also divided into the following categories: most important, average importance and least important (with most important including rankings one through four, average importance including rankings five through eight and least important including rankings nine through twelve) and analyzed with a chi square test. The pattern was found to be the same with parents placing extra importance on this goal and kindergarten teachers ranking it the lowest. While kindergarten teachers comprised 6.5% of the total population surveyed, only 2.9% of those ranking creative thinking and problem solving as most important were kindergarten teachers. This figure may be contrasted with the category entitled, least important. Here the kindergarten teachers represented 14.3% of those in this category, more than twice their percent of the population. Parents comprised 78.7% of the population surveyed and 86.3% of those ranking this goal most important. More than half of the parents considered this goal most important (51.8%) and only 8.8% thought it least important. A less significant number of kindergarten teachers thought it was most important (21.4%) and 21.4% thought it least important. The chi square test was not significant at $p < .05$, $X^2(d.f.4)=8.41$, $p=.07$. (The critical value for X^2 at the .05 level of significance is 9.49;

Table 7

Frequency Distribution--Total Population
Statement Number 2--Communication Skills

Ranking	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (percent)	Cumulative Frequency (percent)
1	15	6.9	6.9
2	37	17.1	24.1
3	30	13.9	38.0
4	25	11.6	49.5
5	29	13.4	63.0
6	28	13.0	75.9
7	22	10.2	86.1
8	16	7.4	93.5
9	5	2.3	95.8
10	6	2.8	98.6
11	1	.5	99.1
12	<u>2</u>	<u>.9</u>	100.0
Total	216	100.0	

Mean = 4.7

Median = 4.5

Mode = 2

standard deviation = 2.5

Table 8

Frequency Distribution--Total Population
Statement Number 3--Creative Thinking

Ranking	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (percent)	Cumulative Frequency (percent)
1	7	3.2	3.2
2	26	12.0	15.3
3	37	17.1	32.4
4	32	14.8	47.2
5	22	10.2	57.4
6	28	13.0	70.4
7	22	10.2	80.6
8	21	9.7	90.3
9	13	6.0	96.3
10	6	2.8	99.1
11	<u>2</u>	<u>.9</u>	100.0
Total	216	100.0	

Mean = 5.1

Median = 4.8

Mode = 3

standard deviation = 2.4

Appendix G; Table 23).

In his 1974 study Cabler found that parents and kindergarten teachers ranked creative thinking and problem solving fifth. That finding differs considerably from the finding in this study with parents ranking it third, grade one teachers ranking it sixth and kindergarten teachers ranking this goal seventh. However, in both cases parents ranked each intellectual goal equal to or higher than professional educators.

Factual Information. It was hypothesized that parents of kindergartners would show significantly more preference for acquisition of the tools for future learning of the 3 R's as a kindergarten goal than kindergarten teachers or grade one teachers. This hypothesis was tested by statement four on the researcher's opinionnaire and the difference between the groups was significant, $F(2,213)=3.50$, $p=.03$ (Table 7). The total population ranked this goal eighth ($M=7.0$; $Md=7.5$; $Mo=11$) with parents ($M=6.7$; standard deviation=3.6) placing more importance on this goal than did either kindergarten teachers ($M=7.6$; standard deviation=3.6) or grade one teachers ($M=8.5$; standard deviation=3.0; Table 3; Table 4). Parents ranked this goal as their seventh priority while kindergarten teachers ranked it ninth and grade one teachers ranked it tenth (Table 9).

The group responses were also divided into the following categories, most important, average importance and least important and analyzed with a chi square test. The pattern was found to be the same with the major difference between the parents and the grade one teachers. Parents rated this goal of average importance while 62.5% of the grade

Table 9

Frequency Distribution--Total Population
Statement Number 4--Factual Information

Ranking	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (percent)	Cumulative Frequency (percent)
1	18	8.3	8.3
2	13	6.0	14.4
3	12	5.6	19.9
4	20	9.3	29.2
5	18	8.3	37.5
6	13	6.0	43.5
7	14	6.5	50.0
8	16	7.4	57.4
9	21	9.7	67.1
10	23	10.6	77.8
11	24	11.1	88.9
12	<u>24</u>	<u>11.1</u>	100.0
Total	216	100.0	

Mean = 7.0

Median = 7.5

Mode = 11

standard deviation = 3.6

one teachers ranked this goal among their least important, choices 9-12 on the opinionnaire. While the chi square test did show the same pattern of response as the analysis of variance it was not significant at $p < .05$, $X^2(d.f.4)=8.10$, $p=.08$ (Appendix G; Table 24).

As was the case in Cabler's (1974) study, the acquisition of the tools for future learning of the 3 R's was a major area of disagreement. In both of these studies parents considered the acquiring of these skills more important than did teachers.

In examining the responses to the four task items labeled intellectual goals, one finds that parents consistently ranked these tasks higher than did kindergarten teachers or grade one teachers. This was even true with regard to the acquisition of the basic tools for learning the 3 R's, the task item which received the lowest ranking within this domain from all three groups. This item it may be noted was also the only one on which kindergarten teachers ($M=7.6$) ranked an intellectual goal higher than grade one teachers ($M=8.5$). There was also a sizeable difference between the mean ranking accorded this intellectual goal and the previously ranked intellectual goal for all three groups ($P=1.9$; $T-K=1.1$; $T-1=2.6$). This seems to indicate that grade one teachers generally support intellectual goals for the kindergarten program but differentiate among these goals substantially, with acquiring the basic tools for learning the 3 R's not necessarily a high priority. These findings are consistent with Cabler's (1974) in that he found that parents of kindergartners in Kentucky placed a value equal to or higher than that of kindergarten teachers on each of the items on the intellectual dimension. These findings along with

Cabler's differ substantially from those of Goulet (1975) who found that kindergarten teachers placed the highest priority on intellectual goals, while parents placed slightly less importance here and grade one teachers ranked these goals lowest of all.

Social Goals

Peer Relations. It was hypothesized that parents of kindergartners, kindergarten teachers and grade one teachers would value learning to work with peers similarly, with no significant difference between the groups. This hypothesis was tested by statement five on the researcher's opinionnaire and the difference between the groups was not significant (Table 10). This goal was ranked sixth highest (M=5.7; Md=5.6; Mo=6) of the twelve statements presented with kindergarten teachers ranking it highest (M=5.1; standard deviation=3.0), grade one teachers ranking it second (M=5.7; standard deviation=3.0), and parents ranking it lowest (M=5.8; standard deviation=3.0; Table 3; Table 4).

Group Responsibility. It was hypothesized that parents of kindergartners, kindergarten teachers and grade one teachers would value working cooperatively in groups similarly, with no significant difference between the groups (Table 11). This hypothesis was tested by statement six on the researcher's opinionnaire and the difference between the groups was significant $F(2,213)=5.70$, $p=.003$ (Table 7). The total population ranked this goal fifth (M=5.6; Md=5.8; Mo=7) with grade one teachers (M=4.2; standard deviation=2.4) placing more importance on this goal than did either kindergarten teachers (M=5.4;

Table 10

Frequency Distribution--Total Population
Statement Number 5--Working with Peers

Ranking	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (percent)	Cumulative Frequency (percent)
1	16	7.4	7.4
2	24	11.1	18.5
3	20	9.3	27.8
4	18	8.3	36.1
5	26	12.0	48.1
6	28	13.0	61.1
7	18	8.3	69.4
8	26	12.0	81.5
9	13	6.0	87.5
10	16	7.4	94.9
11	6	2.8	97.7
12	<u>5</u>	<u>2.3</u>	100.0
Total	216	100.0	

Mean = 5.7 standard deviation = 2.9
 Median = 5.6
 Mode = 6

Table 11

Frequency Distribution--Total Population
Statement Number 6--Group Responsibility

Ranking	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (percent)	Cumulative Frequency (percent)
1	14	6.5	6.5
2	22	10.2	16.7
3	28	13.0	29.6
4	17	7.9	37.5
5	21	9.7	47.2
6	22	10.2	57.4
7	32	14.8	72.2
8	21	9.7	81.9
9	22	10.2	92.1
10	12	5.6	97.7
11	4	1.9	99.5
12	<u>1</u>	<u>.5</u>	100.0
Total	216	100.0	

Mean = 5.6

standard deviation = 2.8

Median = 5.8

Mode = 7

standard deviation=2.7) or parents (M=5.9; standard deviation=2.8). Grade one teachers ranked this goal as their third priority while kindergarten teachers ranked it fifth and parents ranked it sixth (Table 3; Table 4).

The group responses were also divided into the following categories, most important, average importance and least important; and, analyzed with a chi square test. The pattern was found to be the same with grade one teachers placing extra importance on this goal and parents ranking it lowest. Grade one teachers comprised 14.8% of the total population surveyed; however, 25.9% of those ranking working cooperatively in groups as most important were grade one teachers. Of those ranking this goal among the least important grade one teachers amounted to only 2.6%, far less than their percent of the population surveyed. Also, 65.6% of grade one teachers saw this as a most important goal while only 31.8% of the parents classified it this way. These figures may be compared with the category entitled, least important, where one finds only 3.1% of the grade one teachers and 21.2% of the parent population. The difference between these rankings was significant, $X^2(d.f.4)=14.84$, $p=.005$ (Appendix G; Table 26).

These findings show that parents', kindergarten teachers' and grade one teachers' priorities in the area of group responsibilities differ significantly. Neither Cabler (1974) nor Goulet (1975) can be used for direct comparison since Cabler did not include grade one teachers in his study (they were a significantly different group in this study); and, since Goulet did not have a specific classification entitled group responsibility. However, it should be noted that Goulet found

parents placing greater importance on goals relating to social development than either kindergarten or grade one teachers.

Relations with adults. It was hypothesized that parents of kindergartners would show greater preference for developing relations with adults as a kindergarten goal than kindergarten teachers or grade one teachers. This hypothesis was tested by statement seven on the researcher's opinionnaire and the difference between the groups was significant $F(2,213)=3.78$, $p=.02$ (Table 12; Table 7). However, the parents ($M=8.9$; standard deviation= 2.3) did not show the expected preference for this goal, instead they ranked this goal lower than either the kindergarten teachers ($M=7.2$; standard deviation= 2.7) or the grade one teachers ($M=8.3$; standard deviation= 2.9). This goal was ranked eleventh ($M=8.7$; $Md=9.2$; $Mo=10$) of the twelve statements presented to the total population ($N=216$; Table 3; Table 4). Further illustrating this unexpected response, kindergarten teachers ranked this goal as their eighth priority while grade one teachers ranked it ninth and parents ranked it eleventh.

While similarity in response was expected in all areas of the social domain, in no case was it expected that parents would rate a social goal lower than both kindergarten teachers and grade one teachers. These findings differ from both Cabler (1974) and Goulet (1975). Cabler found parents placing slightly more importance on this goal than kindergarten teachers and Goulet reported that parents generally placed more importance on social development goals than either kindergarten or grade one teachers.

Table 12

Frequency Distribution--Total Population
Statement Number 7--Working with Adults

Ranking	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (percent)	Cumulative Frequency (percent)
1	1	.5	.5
2	2	.9	1.4
3	4	1.9	3.2
4	12	5.6	8.8
5	8	3.7	12.5
6	9	4.2	16.7
7	21	9.7	26.4
8	27	12.5	38.9
9	35	16.2	55.1
10	38	17.6	72.7
11	37	17.1	89.8
12	<u>22</u>	<u>10.2</u>	100.0
Total	216	100.0	

Mean = 8.7

Median = 9.2

Mode = 10

standard deviation = 2.5

Citizenship. It was hypothesized that parents of kindergartners would show greater preference for accepting the responsibilities of everyday life as a kindergarten goal than kindergarten teachers or grade one teachers. This hypothesis was tested by statement eight on the researcher's opinionnaire and the difference between the groups was not significant (Table 13). This goal was ranked ninth ($M=7.1$; $Md=7.4$; $Mo=9$) of the twelve statements presented with grade one teachers ranking it highest ($M=6.9$; standard deviation=2.9), parents ranking it second ($M=7.1$; standard deviation=3.0), and kindergarten teachers ranking it lowest ($M=7.9$; standard deviation=2.7). Grade one teachers ranked citizenship as their eighth priority while parents ranked it ninth and kindergarten teachers ranked it tenth (Table 3; Table 4). The similarity found among the groups was expected; however, some priority ranking by parents as was found by both Cabler (1974) and Goulet (1975) was expected but not found.

As one looks at the four goals in the social dimension one finds that the predicted parent preference for these goals did not occur. In contrast to Goulet's (1975) findings where parents ranked goals in the social dimension higher than kindergarten and grade one teachers, in this study parents did not rank any of the four social goals higher than both kindergarten and grade one teachers. Further, unlike Cabler's (1974) study where parents placed greater emphasis on relations with adults and citizenship, this researcher found parents ranking relations with adults lowest of the three groups and citizenship second.

Table 13

Frequency Distribution--Total Population
Statement Number 8--Citizenship

Ranking	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (percent)	Cumulative Frequency (percent)
1	7	3.2	3.2
2	6	2.8	6.0
3	13	6.0	12.0
4	21	9.7	21.8
5	24	10.6	32.4
6	21	9.7	42.1
7	20	9.3	51.4
8	26	12.0	63.4
9	27	12.5	75.9
10	17	7.9	83.8
11	22	10.2	94.0
12	<u>13</u>	<u>6.0</u>	100.0
Total	216	100.0	

Mean = 7.1
Median = 7.4
Mode = 9

standard deviation = 3.0

Personal Development Goals

Physical Development. It was hypothesized that physical development as a goal of the kindergarten would receive little support from kindergartners' parents, kindergarten teachers or grade one teachers and that parents of kindergartners would rank this goal equal to or lower than kindergarten teachers and grade one teachers. This hypothesis was tested by statement nine on the researcher's opinionnaire and the difference between the groups was not significant (Table 14). Parents (M=8.3; standard deviation=3.0), contrary to the writer's hypothesis, ranked this goal higher than grade one teachers (M=9.0; standard deviation=2.8) or kindergarten teachers (M=9.6; standard deviation=2.3). This goal, ranked tenth (M=8.5; Md=9.3; Mo=11) of the twelve statements presented, was ranked relatively low by both parents and teachers. Parents ranked this goal tenth while kindergarten and grade one teachers ranked it eleventh (Table 3; Table 4).

This finding is not inconsistent with Goulet's (1975) study in which he found parents, kindergarten teachers and grade one teachers in general agreement with regard to physical development as a kindergarten goal. Goulet found that when all three groups had prioritized their goals they ranked physical development next to last. As was found in Cabler's (1974) study, physical development was a relatively low priority to all groups; however, in this study parents did not rank physical development lower than the kindergarten or grade one teachers.

Emotional Stability. It was hypothesized that emotional stability as a goal of the kindergarten would receive little support from

Table 14

Frequency Distribution--Total Population
Statement Number 9--Physical Development

Ranking	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (percent)	Cumulative Frequency (percent)
1	5	2.3	2.3
2	2	.9	3.2
3	6	2.8	6.0
4	13	6.0	12.0
5	17	7.9	19.9
6	16	7.4	27.3
7	11	5.1	32.4
8	16	7.4	39.8
9	27	12.5	52.3
10	28	13.0	65.3
11	45	20.8	86.1
12	<u>30</u>	<u>13.9</u>	100.0
Total	216	100.0	

Mean = 8.5

standard deviation = 2.9

Median = 9.3

Mode = 11

kindergartners' parents, kindergarten teachers or grade one teachers and that parents of kindergartners would rank this goal equal to or lower than kindergarten teachers and grade one teachers. This hypothesis was tested by statement ten on the researcher's opinionnaire and the difference between the groups was not significant (Table 15).

This goal was ranked seventh ($M=6.7$; $Md=6.8$; $Mo=10$) of the twelve statements presented with kindergarten teachers ranking it highest ($M=5.4$; standard deviation= 3.8), while parents ($M=6.7$; standard deviation= 3.3) and grade one teachers ($M=6.8$; standard deviation= 3.1) gave it almost identical rankings. Kindergarten teachers ranked this goal as their fourth priority while grade one teachers ranked it seventh and parents eighth (Table 3; Table 4).

Self Concept. It was hypothesized that self concept as a goal of the kindergarten would receive little support from kindergartners' parents, kindergarten teachers or grade one teachers and that parents of kindergartners would rank this goal equal to or lower than kindergarten teachers and grade one teachers. This hypothesis was tested by statement eleven on the researcher's opinionnaire and the difference between the groups was highly significant, $F(2,213)=7.81$, $p=.0005$ (Table 16; Table 7). The total population ranked this goal second highest ($M=4.7$; $Md=4.0$; $Mo=1$) with kindergarten teachers ($M=2.1$; standard deviation= 3.0) placing more importance on this goal than did either grade one teachers ($M=3.6$; standard deviation= 3.0) or parents ($M=5.2$; standard deviation= 3.4). Kindergarten teachers and grade one teachers ranked this goal as their first priority while parents of kindergartners ranked it fourth (Table 3; Table 4). These results support the

Table 15

Frequency Distribution--Total Population
Statement Number 10--Emotional Stability

Ranking	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (percent)	Cumulative Frequency (percent)
1	12	5.6	5.6
2	23	10.6	16.2
3	14	6.5	22.7
4	14	6.5	29.2
5	17	7.9	37.0
6	20	9.3	46.3
7	24	11.1	57.4
8	15	6.9	64.4
9	19	8.8	73.1
10	30	13.9	87.0
11	19	8.8	95.8
12	<u>9</u>	<u>4.2</u>	100.0
Total	216	100.0	

Mean = 6.7 standard deviation=3.3
 Median = 6.8
 Mode = 10

Table 16

Frequency Distribution--Total Population
Statement Number 11--Positive Values
of Self

Ranking	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (percent)	Cumulative Frequency (percent)
1	53	24.5	24.5
2	25	11.6	36.1
3	18	8.3	44.4
4	23	10.6	55.1
5	18	8.3	63.4
6	14	6.5	69.9
7	11	5.1	75.0
8	14	6.5	81.5
9	11	5.1	86.6
10	12	5.6	92.1
11	12	5.6	97.7
12	<u>5</u>	<u>2.3</u>	100.0
Total	216	100.0	

Mean = 4.7

Median = 4.0

Mode = 1

standard deviation = 3.4

hypothesis that parents would rank this goal lower than teachers; however, the data does not support the hypothesis that self concept as a goal of the kindergarten program would be a low priority.

The group responses were also divided into the following categories, most important, average importance and least important and analyzed with a chi square test. The pattern was found to be the same with the major difference between the kindergarten teachers and the parents. Most kindergarten teachers surveyed ranked this goal as most important (92.9%), while only 50% of the parents ranked it as most important. While kindergarten teachers comprised 6.5% of the total population surveyed, only 2.5% of those ranking self concept as least important were kindergarten teachers, while parents, comprising 78.7% of the population, accounted for 90.0% of those who considered this goal least important. This represents 21.2% of the parents surveyed and only 7.1% of the kindergarten teachers. The X^2 test was significant at $p < .05$, $X^2(d.f.4)=12.23$, $p=.01$ (Appendix G; Table 31).

These findings are consistent with those of Cabler (1974) and Goulet (1975) in that parents continue to see self concept as a significantly less important kindergarten goal than do teachers. In Goulet's study he found that grade one teachers rated self concept highest, followed by kindergarten teachers and then by parents. Cabler found a significant difference between kindergarten teachers and parents, with kindergarten teachers ranking self concept third and parents ranking it seventh.

Aesthetics. It was hypothesized that aesthetics as a goal of the kindergarten would receive little support from kindergartners' parents,

kindergarten teachers or grade one teachers and that parents of kindergartners would rank this goal equal to or lower than kindergarten teachers and grade one teachers. This hypothesis was tested by statement twelve on the researcher's opinionnaire and the difference between the groups was not significant. This goal was ranked twelfth ($M=10.5$; $Md=11$; $Mo=12$) of the twelve statements presented. The parents ($M=10.5$; standard deviation=2.3), grade one teachers ($M=10.5$; standard deviation=2.0) and kindergarten teachers ($M=10.6$; standard deviation=2.2) were in complete agreement in their ranking this goal lowest (Table 3; Table 4). This is also indicated by the fact that 48.6% of the total population ($N=216$) ranked this goal twelfth, and 78.7% ranked it tenth, eleventh or twelfth (Table 17). It should also be noted that the mean ranking accorded statement twelve, $M=10.5$, is 1.8 points from the eleventh ranked goal, $M=8.7$. This difference is greater than between any other two goals, further indicating the degree of agreement present in the ranking of this goal.

The prediction that parents would rank all personal development goals equal to or lower than kindergarten teachers or grade one teachers was not borne out in this study. The second prediction, that personal development goals would receive the least support was supported. The mean ranking for personal development goals was $M=7.6$, while social goals attained $M=6.7$ and intellectual goals attained $M=5.0$. The most significant finding was a confirmation of Cabler's (1974) and Goulet's (1975) findings in the area of self concept. As was the case in both of their studies, parents placed significantly less importance on the development of a positive self concept as a kindergarten goal than did

Table 17

Frequency Distribution--Total Population
Statement Number 12--Appreciation, Art

Ranking	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (percent)	Cumulative Frequency (percent)
1	0	0	0
2	0	0	0
3	3	1.4	1.4
4	6	2.8	4.2
5	5	2.3	6.5
6	5	2.3	8.8
7	7	3.2	12.0
8	8	3.7	15.7
9	12	5.6	21.3
10	22	10.2	31.5
11	43	19.9	51.4
12	<u>105</u>	<u>48.6</u>	100.0
Total	216	100.0	

Mean = 10.5 standard deviation = 2.3
Median = 11.4
Mode = 12

teachers.

Intellectual Goals of Parents--by Socioeconomic Level

It was hypothesized that high and medium socioeconomic level parents of kindergartners would show significantly more preference for developing a love for learning, developing communication skills, and creative thinking and problem solving as intellectual goals of the kindergarten program than would low socioeconomic level parents. Further, it was hypothesized that low socioeconomic level parents would show significantly higher priority than high or middle socioeconomic level parents with regard to the acquisition of the tools for learning the 3 R's as a goal of the kindergarten. The difference in the rankings between the high, middle and low socioeconomic level parents with reference to developing a love for learning, creative thinking and problem solving, and the acquisition of the tools for learning the 3 R's was not significant at the .05 level.

Parents of different socioeconomic levels did respond differently with regard to developing the skills of communication as an intellectual goal of the kindergarten. However, the significant difference between these groups, $F(2,167)=4.11$, $p=.01$, did not support the researcher's hypothesis (Table 18). The researcher had predicted that high SES ($M=4.9$; standard deviation=2.5) and middle SES ($M=4.8$, standard deviation=2.6) parents would show significantly more preference for this goal. It was found that low SES parents ($M=3.4$; standard deviation=2.1) placed significantly more importance on this goal than did the high or middle SES groups (Table 19; Table 20). A

Table 18

Significant Differences Between High, Middle and
 Low Socioeconomic Parents and Their
 Perceptions of the Purpose
 of the Kindergarten

Source of Variance	F Value	Significance
communication skills	4.11	.01
physical development	4.70	.01
emotional stability	3.46	.03
value, self	6.85	.001
appreciation, art	5.29	.005

Table 19

Mean Rankings of Educational Goals for High,
Middle and Low Socioeconomic Level Parents

	High	Middle	Low	Max. Diff.
<u>Intellectual</u>				
1. love of learning	3.3	3.5	3.0	.5
2. communication skills	4.9	4.8	3.4	1.5
3. creative thinking	4.5	4.8	5.5	1.0
4. factual knowledge	6.4	7.3	6.2	1.1
<u>Social</u>				
1. child	5.8	6.1	4.7	1.4
2. group	6.0	5.8	6.1	.3
3. adult	9.4	8.6	8.9	.8
4. citizenship	7.5	7.0	6.8	.7
<u>Personal</u>				
1. physical development	9.1	8.1	7.1	2.0
2. emotional stability	6.8	6.2	8.1	1.9
3. value, self	4.7	4.8	7.3	2.6
4. appreciation, art	9.8	10.9	11.0	1.2
	N = 68	74	28	

Table 20

Mean Rank Order of Educational Goals for High,
Middle and Low Socioeconomic Level Parents

	High	Middle	Low
1			
2			
3	love of learning(I)	love of learning(I)	love of learning(I) *communication(I)
4	creative thinking(I) *values self(P)	creative thinking(I) *communication(I)	work with peers(S)
5	*communication(I)	*values self(P)	
6	work with peers(S) work with group (S)	work with group()S work with peers(S)	creative thinking(I) work with group(S)
7	factual knowledge(I) *emotional stability(P)	*emotional stability(P) citizenship(S)	factual knowledge(I) citizenship(S) *physical skills(P)
8		factual knowledge(I)	*values self(P)
9	*physical skills(P) work with adults(S)	*physical skills(P) work with adults(S)	*emotional stability(P) work with adults(S)
10	*appreciation, art(P)		
11		*appreciation, art(P)	*appreciation, art(P)
12	N=68	N=74	N=28

*significant differences, $p < .05$

I=Intellectual Goals S=Social Goals P=Personal Developmental Goals

chi square test (Appendix H; Table 34) also showed the low socioeconomic status parents ranking this goal higher than other parent groups; however, the rankings between these groups was not significant, $X^2(d.f.4)=5.50$, $p=.23$.

Social Goals of Parents--by Socioeconomic Level

It was hypothesized that high, middle and low socioeconomic level parents of kindergartners would value learning to work with peers and working cooperatively in groups similarly. No significant differences were found between these groups.

It was hypothesized that the low socioeconomic level group would rank relations with adults as a significantly more important kindergarten goal than the high and middle socioeconomic level groups. The data did not support this hypothesis. The low SES parents were found to fit in between the high and middle SES groups in their rating of this item, with the middle SES group ranking it most important and the high SES group ranking it least important.

It was also hypothesized that the high and middle socioeconomic level groups would place a significantly higher priority on responsible citizenship than would low socioeconomic level parents. This study failed to support this hypothesis and the difference between the groups was not significant. However, it should be noted that the pattern of response was the antithesis of what Cabler (1974) and Downey (1960) found. Cabler and Downey reported that the higher occupation group ranked responsible citizenship significantly higher than did the low occupation group. Downey also found that there was a systematic decrease in

the ranking of this goal as one proceeded down the occupational scale from professional to laborer. In this study the low SES ranked responsible citizenship as a more important goal than did the middle SES who in turn ranked it as a more important goal than did the high SES group.

Personal Development Goals of Parents--by Socioeconomic Level

It was hypothesized that high and middle socioeconomic level parents would show a significantly higher priority than low socioeconomic level parents with regard to emotional stability and appreciation of the arts as personal development goals of the kindergarten. A significant difference between parents of different socioeconomic levels was found in both cases. The middle socioeconomic level parents ranked mental and emotional stability highest ($M=6.2$; standard deviation= 2.8) and the low socioeconomic level parents ranked it lowest ($M=8.1$; standard deviation= 3.3). The high socioeconomic level parents gave it a mean score of $M=6.8$ (standard deviation= 3.3) which is in close proximity (.6 points) to the middle SES ranking and substantially higher (1.3 points) than the low SES ranking (Table 19; Table 20). The difference between these groups was significant, $F(2,167)=3.46$, $p=.03$ (Table 18). The high, middle and low SES responses were also divided into the following categories, most important, average importance and least important and analyzed with a chi square test. The pattern was found to be the same, with the greatest disparity between the middle SES and the low SES groups. Less than half of the middle SES parents ranked this goal most important (35.1%), while 26.5% of the high SES

parents did so and only 14.3% of the low SES parents ranked this goal as most important. Low SES parents comprised 16.5% of the parent population surveyed but only 8.3% of those ranking this goal most important. These figures may be compared with the category entitled, least important, where one finds that low SES parents comprised 29.0% of those ranking this goal least important, this represents 64.3% of the low SES parents. Only 24.3% of the middle SES parents rated this goal least important. The difference between these rankings was highly significant, $X^2(d.f.4)=14.34, p=.006$. (The critical value for X^2 at the .05 level of significance is 9.49; Appendix H; Table 42.)

Downey (1960) reported that the priority ranking assigned to mental and emotional stability decreased as one proceeded down the occupational scale from professional to laborer. While this study did not find this systematic decrease, it did find both the high and middle SES groups ranking mental and emotional stability higher than did the low SES group.

High SES parents ($M=9.8$; standard deviation= 2.8) placed significantly more importance on appreciation of art, music and beauty in the environment than did middle SES parents ($M=10.9$; standard deviation= 1.7) or low SES parents ($M=11.0$; standard deviation= 2.0 ; Table 19; Table 20). The difference between these rankings was significant, $F(2,167)=5.29, p=.005$ (Table 18). The high, middle and low SES responses were also divided into the following categories, most important, average importance and least important and analyzed with a chi square test. The pattern was found to be the same, with a disproportionate percentage of high SES parents ranking this goal as most

important or of average importance, while a very small percentage of the middle and low SES parents ranked this goal in these categories. This may be seen in the figures for the category entitled, least important. More than half of the high SES parents saw this goal as least important (72.1%), while 91.9% of the middle SES and 92.9% of the low SES parents saw this goal as least important. The difference between these rankings was significant, $X^2(d.f.4)=12.83, p=.01$ (Appendix H; Table 44).

Downey (1960) reported that the priority ranking assigned to the appreciation of art, music and beauty in the environment decreased as one proceeded down the occupational scale from professional to laborer. This study confirms this finding, with the high and low SES groups demonstrating the greatest difference in their ranking of this item.

It was hypothesized that physical skills would be significantly more important to low socioeconomic parents than to high and middle socioeconomic level parents. The difference between these rankings was significant, $F(2,167)=4.70, p=.01$ (Table 18). As predicted, the low SES group ranked this goal highest ($M=7.1$; standard deviation= 3.1) of the three groups. The middle SES parents ranked it as somewhat less important ($M=8.1$; standard deviation= 2.8), and the high SES ranked it as being less important than either of the other groups ($M=9.1$; standard deviation= 2.9 ; Table 19; Table 20). The high, middle and low SES responses were also divided into the following categories, most important, average importance and least important and analyzed with a chi square test. The pattern was found to be the same, with a disproportionate percentage of low SES parents ranking this goal

most important. While the low SES parents represented 16.5% of the parent population surveyed they constituted 38.1% of the parents ranking physical development as a most important kindergarten goal. At the same time 66.2% of the high SES parents ranked this goal least important compared with 52.7% of the middle SES parents and 39.3% of the low SES parents. The difference between these rankings was significant, $\chi^2(d.f.4)=11.79$, $p=.01$ (Appendix H; Table 41).

A clear pattern emerged on both the analysis of variance and the chi square test, indicating that as one ascends the socioeconomic ladder the importance he places on the development of physical skills and coordination as a goal of the kindergarten, decreases. This finding corresponds to that reported by Downey (1960). He stated that the ranking afforded physical training decreased systematically as one ascended the occupational scale.

It was hypothesized that high, middle and low socioeconomic level parents would rank positive values of self similarly, with no significant difference between the groups. The results with regard to this goal were contrary to the writer's hypothesis. While the writer hypothesized no significant difference between the groups there was a spread of 2.6 points between the high SES ($M=4.7$; standard deviation=3.3) and the low SES ($M=7.3$; standard deviation=3.4) groups (Table 19; Table 20). The middle SES ($M=4.8$; standard deviation=3.2) group assigned this goal almost the same value as did the high SES. The difference between these groups was significant, $F(2,167)=6.85$, $p=.001$ (Table 18). The high, middle and low SES responses were also divided into the following categories, most important, average importance and

least important and analyzed with a chi square test. The pattern was found to be the same, with 57.4% of the high SES group and 52.7% of the middle SES group ranking positive values of self as most important, while only 25.0% of the low SES parents ranked this goal as most important. Less than half of the low SES parents ranked positive self concepts as one of the least important kindergarten goals (42.9%) while only 17.6% of the middle SES group and 16.2% of the high SES group ranked this goal least important. The difference between these rankings was significant, $X^2(d.f.4)=12.07$, $p=.02$ (Appendix H; Table 43).

The findings indicate that high and middle SES parents consider positive values of self a significantly more important kindergarten goal than do low SES parents. This finding is not consistent with those reported by Downey (1960) and Cabler (1974). They reported that the ranking given to self concept did not differ significantly between occupation groups.

As one examines the responses of the high, middle and low socioeconomic level parents with regard to intellectual and social goals for the kindergarten, one finds a very high level of agreement among the groups. On seven of the eight items in the intellectual and social domains there were no significant differences between the groups. Only on the item referring to communication skills was there a significant difference between the groups. Contrary to the writer's hypothesis, the low socioeconomic status parents placed significantly more importance on this goal than did either high or middle socioeconomic status parents. The personal development goals were the most controversial within the parent population, with significant differences

between the groups on each of the four items. As hypothesized, the high and middle socioeconomic status parents placed a significantly higher priority on emotional stability as a kindergarten goal than did low socioeconomic status parents. Again as hypothesized, the high socioeconomic status parents placed a significantly higher priority on appreciation of the arts as a kindergarten goal than did low socioeconomic status parents. The middle socioeconomic status parents' responses were similar to those of the low socioeconomic status parents. As hypothesized the low socioeconomic status parents ($M=7.1$) ranked the development of physical skills as a higher priority for the kindergarten program than both the middle ($M=8.1$) and the high ($M=9.1$) socioeconomic status parents. Contrary to the writer's hypothesis, there was a significant difference ($F=6.85$, $p=.001$) between socioeconomic groups with regard to the development of positive values of self as a kindergarten goal. The researcher found that high ($M=4.7$) and middle ($M=4.8$) socioeconomic status parents placed much greater emphasis on positive values of self as a kindergarten goal than did low socioeconomic status parents ($M=7.3$).

C H A P T E R V

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this investigation was to gather data concerning the relationship between the kindergarten goals ascribed to by parents, kindergarten teachers and grade one teachers in North Vancouver, British Columbia; and, ascertain whether or not there is a relationship between the socioeconomic status of the parents and the goals to which they ascribe. While the media and some school boards suggest that there are areas of disagreement, a review of the literature and related research in the United States and Canada, suggests that relatively little attention has been paid to parent attitudes toward kindergarten goals in British Columbia and how these compare with those of kindergarten and grade one teachers. Equally little attention has been given to the areas of differing attitudes toward kindergarten goals as related to parents' socioeconomic level. In this study the researcher attempted to examine and analyze the attitudes of kindergartners' parents, kindergarten teachers and grade one teachers in British Columbia regarding the kindergarten goals they believed were most important. As predicted, there were goals which evoked little disagreement among groups while other goals represented areas of potential controversy.

The high percentage of kindergarten teachers responding to the researcher's opinionnaire may be attributable to the personal contact

each of them had with the researcher. The researcher met individually with each kindergarten teacher and discussed the opinionnaire; however, this did not seem to influence how they filled it out. A very high percentage refused to rank order the goals; and therefore, their opinionnaires were unuseable. This high number of unuseable returns may be attributable to the kindergarten teachers': (a) teacher preparation programs; (b) historical precedent; and, (c) traditional early childhood education values. The kindergarten teachers' comments reflected the above indicating a strong belief in the interrelatedness of all kindergarten goals as well as the education of the whole child. Consequently they were unwilling to commit themselves to any rank ordering of the goals presented. The researcher believes that it may be possible to get more kindergarten teachers to respond appropriately in the future if the opinionnaire is presented and explained by the researcher at a meeting of kindergarten teachers. It is further suggested that the opinionnaire be completed at this meeting. With someone present to give instructions the Q-sort technique may be seen as a less threatening exercise and thus may be an alternative to the rank order technique.

An important pattern that emerged in an analysis of the responses to the opinionnaire revealed that intellectual goals for the kindergarten were consistently more important to parents than they were to teachers. As predicted, parents ranked each intellectual goal higher than kindergarten teachers and grade one teachers. In addition, low socioeconomic status parents ranked three of the four intellectual goals represented in the opinionnaire higher than the high and middle

socioeconomic status parents. Kindergarten teachers ranked three of the four intellectual goals for the kindergarten lower than both parent and grade one teachers. Only the acquisition of the tools for future learning of the 3 R's was ranked higher by kindergarten teachers than by grade one teachers. Low socioeconomic status parents ranked this goal higher than any other group and the potential difference between an average grade one teacher and an average low socioeconomic status parent with regard to this basic component of the school program is very large. It appears as if kindergarten teachers see the kindergarten year as more of a socialization experience than do their teaching colleagues in grade one or the parents of the children in their classrooms. Low socioeconomic status parents in their ranking may be reflecting a Headstart philosophy. Being retained in a grade and the fear of failure are realities in British Columbia schools; therefore, these parents may well be asking for the kindergarten experience to help their children get a head start on the learning they will be expected to do in the primary grades; and, in that way, reduce the likelihood of future academic failure. Increased communication between home and school and within the school may sensitize both parents and teachers to this educational issue. The establishment of alternative four year primary programs, where the traditional three years primary program is extended over four years, is needed to decrease the fear of failure that parents feel. The writer would also encourage the development of parent education programs which might increase the parents' understanding of (a) child development; (b) language development; and, (c) early learning.

Goals in the social dimension appeared to evoke general agreement from the respondents regarding children learning to work with peers as well as responsible citizenship. The more controversial areas between parents, kindergarten teachers and grade one teachers appeared to be responsibilities as a group member and relations with adults. Grade one teachers ranked group responsibility significantly higher than did parents, while kindergarten teachers ranked relations with adults as significantly more important than did parents. Even these two areas were not very contentious within the parent group. They ranked three of the four social goals lower than both kindergarten teachers and grade one teachers. Parents ranked the social goals lower than anyone else in all areas except responsible citizenship. Thus it seems reasonable to conclude that parents are generally less concerned with these areas as goals for the kindergarten program than are professional educators. This conclusion is consistent with the finding in the intellectual dimension where parents placed their highest priority. If parents wish the kindergarten to be primarily an institution promoting intellectual goals then they must place less importance on social goals for the kindergarten program than do kindergarten teachers and grade one teachers. This may well be attributable to greater child attendance at preschools and day care centers where this is undeniably a major goal. Consequently when their child completes this experience and comes to the elementary school, the parents may believe that the schools should attend to the intellectual tasks. The problem that remains for kindergarten teachers is one of communication. The job is to communicate to parents that some children come to kindergarten

competent and comfortable with their social skills and more than ready to commence the cognitive and academic programs offered in the kindergarten, while other children may need to work more intensively on their social skills with less attention being paid to the cognitive and academic dimensions of the classroom.

All four goals presented within the personal development dimension were of significantly different importance to the high, middle and low socioeconomic parent groups. However, when these three groups were combined into the parent group only one goal showed a significant difference with the kindergarten and grade one teachers, this was the goal of positive values of self. This goal elicited the greatest difference among the high, middle and low socioeconomic status parent groups as well as among the parents, kindergarten teachers and grade one teachers. This goal was most important to kindergarten teachers and least important to low socioeconomic status parents. The difference in rankings between these two groups on this item was far greater than between any two groups on any other item presented. This represents an area of potential controversy between the low socioeconomic status parent and the kindergarten teachers. Kindergarten teachers ranked this goal so highly that it is possible that they would not be sensitive to those low socioeconomic status parents whose views differ so widely from their own. The researcher urges kindergarten teachers to be receptive and responsive to the parents in their community and in turn encourage a spirit of compromise and cooperation. The other three personal development goals: (a) the development of physical skills and coordination; (b) mental and emotional stability; and,

(c) appreciation of art, music and beauty in the environment, brought significantly different responses from the different socioeconomic groups. The goal labeled aesthetics: appreciation of art, music and beauty in the environment, was ranked low although the high socioeconomic group gave it significantly higher placement than did anyone else. The high socioeconomic status parents tended to rank those goals in the affective domain high and physical skills and coordination low in relation to the low socioeconomic status parents. Conversely the low socioeconomic status parents ranked goals in the affective domain low and physical skills and coordination high in relation to the high socioeconomic status parents. There is sufficient difference between socioeconomic groups with regard to personal development goals for the kindergarten to suggest caution when interpreting results for the total groups.

One may conclude that there are significant differences between kindergarten teachers, grade one teachers and parents with regard to their attitudes toward kindergarten goals and that if the schools are to be institutions of the people they must improve communications between home and school. This may ultimately lead to major curriculum revision or diversity in curriculum from one neighborhood to the next, but it is a necessary step if schools wish to be responsive to the communities they serve. Professional educators have spent a great deal of time attempting to define the role of the school in society; yet, in the final analysis schools are responsible to the public they serve. The competent professional educator can only be an effective leader if he is aware of the attitudes of the public he serves. With

this information the educational leader can discuss, debate and compromise with the public in his community as views on the purpose of education change in our ever changing society.

This investigation has provided partial answers to some of the problems under study. The writer encourages further study in this area. Some suggestions are: (a) replication of this study of kindergarten goals in varied geographical locations; (b) replication of this study of kindergarten goals in private schools; (c) replication of this study of kindergarten goals with an analysis of ethnic group responses; (d) replication of this study of kindergarten goals analyzing the responses of parents of children who have attended pre-school and parents of children who have had no previous school experience; and, (e) the conducting of a similar study of attitudes toward school goals with parents of grade three children, analyzing the data as was done in this study.

REFERENCES

- Andrews, J. H. M. The tasks of the Alberta schools: public and professional opinion. Edmonton, Alberta: The University of Alberta, 1959.
- Bain, D. A. The kindergarten in our modern society. Unpublished government document, Vancouver, 1967.
- Best, J. W. Research in Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1977.
- Blishen, B. R., Jones, F. E., Naegele, K. D., & Porter, J. (Eds.). Sociological Perspectives. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1965.
- British Columbia Kindergarten Curriculum Guide. Victoria, B.C.: Ministry of Education, 1973.
- Cabler, J. K. Two studies in early childhood education. ERIC, ED 101845, 1974.
- Caldwell, B. M. Components of a good kindergarten program. Instructor, 1974, 84, 82-83.
- Canadian Education Association. Kindergartens in Canada. Toronto, Ontario, CEA, 1972.
- Conway, C. B. A study of public and private kindergarten and non-kindergarten children in the primary grades. Unpublished government document, Victoria, 1968.
- Dearden, R. A., & Valotto, E. The change process in action: Kindergarten. ERIC, ED 027949, 1968.
- Department of Elementary-Kindergarten-Nursery Education. Kindergarten Education. Washington, D.C., 1968.
- Downey, L. W. The task of the public schools as perceived by regional sub-publics. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959.
- Educational Commission of the States. Early childhood development: alternatives for implementation in the States. ERIC, ED 051436, 1971.
- Edwards, A. L. Experimental Design in Psychological Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968.
- Edwards, A. L. Statistical Analysis. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.

- Foerster, L. M. Kindergarten--What can it be? what should it be? Elementary English, 1975, 52, 81-83.
- Forebel, F. Pedagogics of the kindergarten trans. by Jarvis, J. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1895.
- Garrison, C. G., Sheehy, E., & Dalgliesh, A. The Horace Mann kindergarten. New York: Teachers College Press, 1937.
- Graham, W. Toward better kindergartens. Association for Childhood Educational International. Washington, D.C., 1966.
- Gray, W. S. Training and experiences that prepare for reading. Childhood Education, 1927.
- Headley, N. Foundation learnings in the kindergarten. Washington, D.C.: Department of Kindergarten-Primary Education, NEA, 1958.
- Heffernan, H. Influence on the elementary school. Today's Education, 1970, 59, 41-42.
- Heffernan, H., & Todd, V. E. The kindergarten teacher. Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., 1960.
- Hill, P. S. Kindergarten. Washington, D.C.: Association for Childhood Education, 1942.
- Hymes, J. Goals for good kindergarten education. Virginia Journal of Education, 1966, 60, 30.
- Hymes, J. Why programs for young children? Today's Education, 1970, 59, 34-36.
- King, E. W. Coffee hour for kindergarten parents. Instructor, 1969, 78, 110.
- King, H. B. British Columbia Public Schools Report, 1944-1945. Victoria: Department of Education, 1945.
- Lambert, H. M. Teaching the kindergarten child. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1958.
- Lazerson, M. Historical antecedents of early childhood education. Educational Digest, 1972, 38, 20-23.
- Lazerson, M. Origins of the urban school. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1971.

- Lilley, I. M. Friedrich Froebel. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.
- Province of Manitoba. Kindergarten. Department of Education, 1968.
- Metalitz, B. R. Instant law and order. Childhood Education, 1972, 48, 354-355.
- Mindess, D., & Mindess, M. Guide to an effective kindergarten program. New York: Parker Publishing Co., 1972.
- Moore, E. H. Fives at school. New York: G. P. Putnam's and Sons, 1959.
- Nehrt, R. C., & Hurd, G. E. Preprimary enrollment of children under six. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1969.
- Ontario Department of Education. Kindergarten. Province of Ontario, 1966.
- Ream, M. A. Nursery school education, 1966-1967. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1968.
- Roberts, J. G. An analysis of elementary school problems and goals in a large urban area as perceived by principals, teachers and parents. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, 1971.
- Robison, H. F., & Spodek, B. New directions in the kindergarten. New York: Teachers College Press, 1965.
- Rogers, V. Social studies for young children: Identifying goals--reaction II. Social Education, 1974, 38, 45-46.
- Ross, E. D. The kindergarten crusade: The establishment of preschool education in the United States. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1976.
- Province of Saskatchewan. Children first. Guide for kindergarten teachers. Department of Education, 1974.
- Report of the minister's committee on kindergarten education. Province of Saskatchewan, 1971.
- Seager, R. C. The task of the public schools as perceived by proximity sub-publics. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, 1959.
- Slagle, A. T. The task of the public schools as perceived by occupation and age sub-publics. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, 1959.

- Spodek, B. Needed: A new view of kindergarten education. Childhood Education, 1973, 49, 191-197.
- Stendler, C. B. Let them be five. Illinois Education, 1949, 37.
- Taylor, B. W. A comparative study of adult attitudes toward the organization and function of public kindergarten in a small southern city. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, 1969.
- Weber, E. The kindergarten. New York: Teachers College Press, 1969.
- Wills, C. D., & Lindberg, L. Kindergarten for todays children. Chicago: Follett Educational Corporation, 1967.
- Yawkey, T. D., & Silvern, S. B. Kindergarten goals for the seventies. ERIC, ED 103116, 1974.

APPENDIX A

THE T.P.E. OPINIONNAIRE

THE T.P.E. OPINIONNAIRE

An Instrument for Obtaining Opinions
Regarding

The Task of Public Education

Developed by: L. W. Downey, R. C. Seager, and A. T. Slagle

You are participating in a nationwide survey of the TASK OF PUBLIC EDUCATION, a project sponsored by the Midwest Administration Center, The University of Chicago.

The T.P.E. Opinionnaire is not a test of your knowledge or skill. It is simply a device to record your opinions about the job of the public school.

In the first section, you are asked to provide certain information about yourself--but, you will note, we do not require your name. Information and opinions will not be identified with individuals.

Now please turn to section one and answer all questions to the best of your ability, being assured that your anonymity will be carefully protected.

SECTION ONE

1. Occupational designation: Please answer in terms of the head of the family.
 - A. Occupation _____
 - B. Industry, Business, or Place _____
2. Please circle the category which contains the annual income of the head of the family.

1	less than \$2,000	5	\$ 8,000- 9,999
2	\$2,000-3,999	6	10,000-11,999
3	4,000-5,999	7	12,000-13,999
4	6,000-7,999	8	14,000 and over
3. Age _____
4. Sex _____
5. Race _____
6. Religious preference: Catholic __, Protestant __, Jewish __, Other __, None __
7. Years of education (circle the highest grade completed):

												College				Graduate			
												1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
8. Have you ever been a teacher in a public school? _____

The T.P.E. Opinionnaire--continued

9. A. How many children do you have: None __, below school age __, in school __, out of school __.
- B. Have any of your children attended private or parochial school? (or will any attend?) Yes __ No __
- C. Please check (✓) any of the following statements which describe your present or past contacts with the public school.
- | | | | |
|-------|---------|-------|--|
| | Present | Past | |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | Member of the Board of Education |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | Member of citizens planning or advisory committee |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | Elected officer in a school-parents organization |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | Attend meetings of a school-parents organization |
| | | | Usually __, Occasionally __, Rarely __. |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | Attend most school affairs which involve my child |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | Make it a practice to meet my child's teacher |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | Visit school occasionally and talk with teachers about my child's progress |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | Talk with each of my children about his activities and progress at school |
- D. Briefly describe any other contact or association you now have or have had with the public school _____

SECTION TWO

If you attended a public school or have children attending public school, you will naturally have some feelings about the job of the public school. Even if you feel no direct tie to the public school, as might be the case if you send your children to private schools, you pay taxes to support public schools, and you are called upon to vote on issues about the public schools. It is clear, then, that every adult has an opinion that counts about the relative importance of the various elements of the task of the public school.



Please assume for the next twenty or thirty minutes that you have a youngster in a public school. Assume, too, that this school, for financial reasons, finds it necessary to decrease the number of functions or services that it can perform. The Board of Education faces the problem of deciding which functions to drop and which to retain. As a parent, your opinion is sought by the Board.

You realize that children and young adults must learn many things-- some from their homes, some from their church, and some from the public school. You must decide now which functions belong to the school and which are most important.



The T.P.E. Opinionnaire--continued

THE TASK OF THE PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

The services or functions your elementary school now performs are listed on the blue cards attached to this page. Please indicate your opinion of their importance as tasks of the elementary school in the following way:

First, read them carefully and sort them into three piles on the desk before you. On the left, place the three or four which you regard as most important. On the right, place the three or four which are least important. Place the remainder in a pile in the middle.

Now, sort them further into seven piles--the one most important in the first pile, the two next important in the second pile, three next important in the third pile, four in the fourth, three in the fifth, two in the sixth, and the one least important in the seventh. When you have finished, your sort will look like this:



Remember, you are not ranking these items simply in terms of their importance--but in terms of their importance as tasks of the public elementary school. When you are satisfied with your sort, place the cards in the slots below, as you have sorted them--one in slot 1, two in 2, and so on.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
One Most Important	Two Next Important	Three Next Important	Four Next Important	Three Next Important	Two Next Important	One Next Important

1. A fund of information about many things
2. The basic tools for acquiring and communicating knowledge--the 3 R's
3. The habit of figuring things out for one's self
4. A desire to learn more--the inquiring mind
5. The ability to live and work with others
6. Understanding rights and duties of citizenship and acceptance of reasonable regulations
7. Loyalty to America and the American way of life
8. Knowledge of and appreciation for the peoples of other lands

The T.P.E. Opinionnaire--continued

9. A well cared for, well developed body
10. An emotionally stable person, able to cope with new situations
11. A sense of right and wrong--a moral standard of behavior
12. Enjoyment of cultural activities--the finer things of life
13. General awareness of occupational opportunities and how people prepare for them
14. Classification and training for a specific kind of high school program--academic, technical, etc
15. Understanding the role of various family members
16. An introduction to budgeting and effective use of money and property

APPENDIX B

OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION PROFILE

OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION PROFILE

	Total	%
Managerial, administrative & related occ.	2,640	6.92
Teaching & Medicine	3,135	8.22
Professional Occupations in: natural sciences, engineering & math; social sciences & related fields; religion; artistic, literary, recreational & related occupa- tions	2,470	6.47
Clerical & related occupations	7,235	18.95
Sales occupations	6,070	15.91
Service occupations	3,975	10.42
Farming, horticulture & animal husbandry occu- pations; fishing, hunting, trapping & related occupations; forestry & logging occupations; mining & quarrying including oil & gas field occupations	640	1.67
Processing occupations	3,400	8.91
Construction trades occupations	2,360	6.18
Transport equipment operating occupations	2,040	5.34
Materials handling & other occupations not classified elsewhere	<u>4,170</u>	<u>10.93</u>
	38,135	99.94

APPENDIX C

BLISHEN SCALE

BLISHEN SCALE

Socio-Economic Index for 320 Occupations
in 1961 Census of Canada

Occupation	Socio-Economic Index
I	
Chemical Engineers	76.69
Dentists	76.44
Professors and College Principals	76.01
Physicians and Surgeons	75.57
Geologists	75.49
Mining Engineers	75.42
Lawyers and Notaries	75.41
Civil Engineers	75.16
Architects	74.52
Veterinarians	74.46
Electrical Engineers	74.34
Professional Engineers, n.e.s.	74.27
Physicists	73.81
Optometrists	73.77
Biological Scientists	73.22
II	
Physical Scientists, n.e.s.	72.94
Pharmacists	72.87
Mechanical Engineers	72.78
Judges and Magistrates	72.24
Economists	71.90
Chemists	70.94
Industrial Engineers	70.43
Osteopaths and Chiropractors	70.25
School Teachers	70.14
Accountants and Auditors	68.80
Owners and Managers, Education and Related Services	68.32
Actuaries and Statisticians	67.78
Computer Programmers	67.50
Owners and Managers, Services to Business Management	67.28
Agricultural Professionals, n.e.s.	66.96
Owners and Managers, Chemical and Chemical Products Industries	66.79
Advertising Managers	66.05
Air Pilots, Navigators and Flight Engineers	66.04
Owners and Managers, Electrical Products Industries	65.78

Blishen Scale-continued

Occupation	Socio-Economic Index
Owners and Managers, Primary Metal Industries	65.29
Owners and Managers, Paper and Allied Industries	64.78
Owners and Managers, Finance, Insurance, Real Estate	64.52
Authors, Editors, Journalists	64.23
Owners and Managers, Rubber Industries	64.09
Owners and Managers, Machinery Industries	63.76
Librarians	63.75
Owners and Managers, Petroleum and Coal Products Industries	63.02
Sales Managers	62.04
Owners and Managers, Mines, Quarries, and Oil Wells	61.99
Owners and Managers, Textile Industries	61.96
Owners and Managers, Transportation Equipment Industries	61.75
Professional Occupations, n.e.s.	60.93
Credit Managers	60.81
Office Managers	60.42
Owners and Managers, Health and Welfare Services	60.07
 III	
Security Salesmen and Brokers	59.91
Radio and Television Announcers	59.81
Owners and Managers, Printing, Publishing and Allied Industries	59.69
Owners and Managers, Federal Administration	59.60
Owners and Managers, Knitting Mills	59.28
Clergymen and Priests	59.20
Owners and Managers, Miscellaneous Manufacturing Industries	58.29
Other Health Professionals	58.27
Artists (except commercial), Art Teachers	58.21
Inspectors and Foremen, Communication	58.17
Draughtsmen	57.82
Owners and Managers, Metal Fabricating Industries	57.60
Owners and Managers, Leather Industries	57.23
Social Welfare Workers	55.62
Owners and Managers, Non-metallic Mineral Prod. Industries	55.41
Advertising Salesmen and Agents	55.37
Purchasing Agents and Buyers	55.22
Insurance Salesmen and Agents	55.19
Owners and Managers, Clothing Industries	54.77
Science and Engineering Technicians, n.e.s.	54.75

Blishen Scale-continued

Occupation	Socio-Economic Index
Brokers, Agents and Appraisers	54.74
Owners and Managers, Provincial Administration	54.54
Artists, Commercial	54.06
Owners and Managers, Transportation, Communication, and other Utilities	53.85
Owners and Managers, Wholesale Trade	53.80
Owners and Managers, Local Administration	53.29
Surveyors	53.25
Commercial Travellers	52.68
Owners and Managers, Furniture and Fixtures Industries	52.11
Teachers and Instructors, n.e.s.	52.07
Stenographers	51.96
Owners and Managers, Food and Beverage Industries	51.70
Radio and Television Equipment Operators	51.51
Physical and Occupational Therapists	51.11
Athletes and Sports Officials	51.11
Musicians and Music Teachers	50.93
Nurses-in-training	49.91
IV	
Bookkeepers and Cashiers	49.55
Funeral Directors and Embalmers	49.47
Foremen, Transportation Equipment Industries	49.21
Foremen, Primary Metals Industries	49.11
Real Estate Salesmen and Agents	48.74
Medical and Dental Technicians	48.56
Photoengravers	48.26
Photographers	48.07
Engravers, except Photoengravers	47.95
Ticket, Station and Express Agents, Transport	47.61
Batch and Continuous Still Operators	47.60
Office Appliance Operators	47.12
Owners and Managers, Construction Industries	46.95
Foremen, Electric Power, Gas and Water Utilities	46.75
Power Station Operators	46.20
Locomotive Engineers	45.99
Conductors, Railroad	45.68
Owners and Managers, Wood Industries	45.52
Owners and Managers, Miscellaneous Services	45.48
Foremen, Paper and Allied Industries	45.36
Owners and Managers, Motion Picture and Recreational Services	45.19

Blishen Scale-continued

Occupation	Socio-Economic Index
Linemen and Servicemen--Telephone, Telegraph and Power	45.05
Foremen, Other Manufacturing Industries	45.01
Lithographic and Photo-offset Occupations	45.00
Toolmakers, Diemakers	44.82
Inspectors, Construction	44.76
Interior Decorators and Window Dressers	44.37
Foremen, Trade	44.32
Foremen, Mine, Quarry, Petroleum Well	44.27
Telephone Operators	44.20
Owners and Managers, Forestry, Logging	44.00
Actors, Entertainers, and Showmen	43.85
Owners and Managers, Retail Trade	43.69
Mechanics and Repairmen, Office Machines	43.05
Clerical Occupations, n.e.s.	42.98
Mechanics and Repairmen, Aircraft	42.76
Nurses, Graduate	42.57
Compositors and Type-Setters	42.30
Deck Officers, Ship	42.13
Religious Workers	41.84
Members of Armed Forces	41.43
Locomotive Firemen	40.92
Electricians, Wiremen, and Electrical Repairmen	40.68
Auctioneers	40.48
Canvassers and Other Door-to-Door Salesmen	40.23
Brakemen, Railroad	40.22
Paper Makers	40.17
Owners and Managers, Personal Services	40.14
Printing Workers, n.e.s.	40.13
Mechanics and Repairmen, Radio and T.V. Receivers	40.12
Photographic Processing Occupations	40.05
V	
Engineering Officers, Ship	39.86
Millwrights	39.83
Inspectors, Graders and Samplers, n.e.s.	39.82
Inspectors, Examiners, Gaugers--Metal	39.76
Patternmakers (except paper)	39.75
Typists and clerk typists	39.66
Postmasters	39.65
Well-Drillers and Related Workers	39.55
Foremen, All Other Industries	39.54
Pressmen, Printing	39.49

Blishen Scale-continued

Occupation	Socio-Economic Index
Telegraph Operators	39.47
Inspectors and Foremen, Transport	39.21
Projectionists, Motion Picture	39.15
Foremen, Textile and Clothing Industries	39.03
Lens Grinders and Polishers; Opticians	38.82
Bookbinders	38.54
Foremen, Food and Beverage Industries	38.21
General Foremen, Construction	37.90
Operators, Electric Street Railway	37.80
Stationary Enginemen	37.79
Rolling Mill Operators	37.76
Chemical and Related Process Workers	37.75
Prospectors	37.73
Foremen, Wood and Furniture Industries	37.63
Sales Clerks	37.14
Machinists and Machine Tool Setters	36.90
Jewellers and Watchmakers	36.55
Civilian Protective Service Occupations	35.80
Stewards	35.32
Farm Managers and Foremen	35.05
VI	
Other Occupations in Bookbinding	34.97
Baggagemen and Expressmen, Transport	34.85
Metal Treating Occupations, n.e.s.	34.79
Mechanics and Repairmen, n.e.s.	34.77
Riggers and Cable Splicers, except Telephone and Telegraph and Power	34.77
Furnacemen and Heaters--Metal	34.75
Cellulose Pulp Preparers	34.69
Stock Clerks and Storekeepers	34.63
Logging Foremen	34.61
Beverage Processors	34.44
Plumbers and Pipefitters	34.38
Heat Treaters, Annealers, Temperers	34.09
Paper Making Occupations, n.e.s.	34.07
Hoistmen, Cranemen, Derrickmen	34.06
Inspectors, Graders, Scalers--Log and Lumber	33.80
Electrical and Electronics Workers, n.e.s.	33.80
Switchmen and Signalmen	33.76
Fitters and Assemblers--Electrical and Electronics Equipment	33.57

Blishen Scale--continued

Occupation	Socio-Economic Index
Sheet Metal Workers	33.49
Metal Drawers and Extruders	33.40
Miners	33.38
Bartenders	33.29
Insulation Appliers	33.22
Roasters, Cookers and Other Heat Treaters, Chemical Furriers	33.14
Boilermakers, Platers and Structural Metal Workers	33.03
Welders and Flame Cutters	32.93
Timbermen	32.79
Tire and Tube Builders	32.61
Fillers, Grinders, Sharpeners	32.34
Service Workers, n.e.s.	32.18
Nursing Assistants and Aides	32.17
Shipping and Receiving Clerks	32.14
Millmen	32.14
Bus Drivers	32.13
Forest Rangers and Cruisers	31.86
Metal Working Machine Operators	31.85
Quarriers and Related Workers	31.67
Moulders	31.61
Porters, Baggage and Pullman	31.32
Mechanics and Repairmen, Motor Vehicle	31.30
Mechanics and Repairmen, Railroad Equipment	31.30
Fitters and Assemblers--Metal	31.29
Crushers, Millers, Calenderers--Chemical	31.28
Electroplaters, Dip Platers and Related Workers	31.12
Cutters, Markers--Textiles; Garment and Glove Leather	31.07
Production Process and Related Workers, n.e.s.	31.06
Lodging and Boarding Housekeepers	31.00
Barbers, Hairdressers, and Manicurists	30.94
Cabinet and Furniture Makers, Wood	30.94
Driver--Salesmen	30.88
Labourers, Primary Metal Industries	30.74
Metalworking Occupations, n.e.s.	30.68
Deck Ratings (ship), Barge Crews and Boatmen	30.60
Paper Products Makers	30.56
Postmen and Mail Carriers	30.53
Service Station Attendants	30.52
Butchers and Meat-cutters	30.48
Meat Canners, Curers, Packers	30.48
Motormen (vehicle) (except railway)	30.48
Waiters	30.47

Blisshen Scale--continued

Occupation	Socio-Economic Index
Hawkers and Peddlars	30.43
Oilers and Greasers--Machinery and Vehicles (except ship)	30.43
Tobacco Preparers and Products Makers	30.39
Upholsterers	30.27
Tailors	30.26
Labourers, Trade	30.19
Bleachers and Dyers--Textiles	30.18
Painters (Construction and Maintenance), Paperhangers and Glaziers	30.08
Taxi Drivers and Chauffeurs	30.07
Operators of Earth-Moving and Other Construction Machinery	30.03
Painters (except Construction and Maintenance)	30.00
Coremakers	30.00
VII	
Baby Sitters	29.99
Labourers, Mine	29.96
Blacksmiths, Hammermen, Forgemen	29.93
Bricklayers, Stonemasons, Tilesetters	29.93
Attendants, Recreation and Amusement	29.92
Plasterers and Lathers	29.90
Other Food Processing Occupations	29.89
Bottlers, Wrappers, Labellers	29.80
Clay, Glass and Stone Workers, n.e.s.	29.77
Materials--Handling Equipment Operators	29.76
Labourers, Paper and Allied Industries	29.73
Carpenters	29.71
Vulcanizers	29.62
Fruit and Vegetable Canners and Packers	29.60
Other Rubber Workers	29.51
Labourers, Communication and Storage	29.51
Milk Processors	29.49
Cooks	29.43
Construction Workers, n.e.s.	29.43
Longshoremen and Stevedores	29.41
Truck Drivers	29.31
Gardeners (except farm) and Groundskeepers	29.27
Bakers	29.26
Labourers, Electric Power, Gas and Water Utilities	29.26
Messengers	29.23

Blisshen Scale--continued

Occupation	Socio-Economic Index
Warehousemen and Freight Handlers	29.18
Polishers and Buffers--Metal	29.12
Boiler Firemen (except ship)	29.10
Labourers, All Other Industries	28.96
Launderers and Dry Cleaners	28.93
Other Agricultural Occupations	28.93
Dressmakers and Seamstresses	28.77
Riveters and Rivet-Heaters	28.76
Millers and Flour and Grain	28.75
Furnacemen and Kilnmen, Ceramics and Glass	28.69
Knitters	28.68
Transport Occupations, n.e.s.	28.63
Labourers, Other Public Administration and Defence	28.61
Woodworking Occupations, n.e.s.	28.56
Stone Cutters and Dressers	28.52
Apparel and Related Products Makers	28.44
Tanners and Tannery Operatives	28.42
Sawyers	28.29
Woodworking Machine Operators	28.29
Labourers, Other Manufacturing Industries	28.22
Janitors and Cleaners, Building	28.22
Labourers, Food and Beverage Industries	28.12
Kitchen Helpers and Related Service Workers	28.11
Engine-room Ratings, Firemen and Oilers, Ship	28.11
Newsvendors	28.08
Labourers, Railway Transport	28.03
Finishers and Calenderers	27.97
Elevator Tenders, Building	27.96
Shoemakers and Repairers, Not in Factory	27.87
Sewers and Sewing Machine Operators	27.87
Cement and Concrete Finishers	27.86
Guides	27.79
Farm Labourers	27.77
Labourers, Transportation, except Railway	27.72
Labourers, Wood Industries	27.57
Labourers, Transportation Equipment Industries	27.49
Other Textile Occupations	27.44
Carders, Combers and Other Fibre Preparers	27.37
Labourers, Construction	27.25
Other Leather Products Makers	27.19
Fishermen	27.17
Leather Cutters	27.10
Loom Fixers and Loom Preparers	27.09

Blishen Scale--continued

Occupation	Socio-Economic Index
Lumbermen, including Labourers in Logging	27.01
Spinners and Twisters	26.94
Weavers	26.77
Teamsters	26.71
Labourers, Local Administration	26.71
Winders and Reelers	26.63
Sectionmen and Trackmen	26.57
Labourers, Textile and Clothing Industries	26.56
Shoemakers and Repairers--In Factory	26.56
Fish Cannerymen, Curers, and Packers	26.09
Trappers and Hunters	25.36

APPENDIX D

TEACHER OPINIONNAIRE

TEACHER OPINIONNAIRE

Check one:

Kindergarten teacher

Grade 1 teacher

It would be appreciated if you would take some time to complete the following opinionnaire so that a better understanding of teachers' views on the kindergarten program might be gathered. Consider this problem: If kindergarten teachers were to find it necessary to eliminate some areas of the curriculum

- a. which program areas should remain?
- b. which program areas should be eliminated?

Directions:

Below are twelve statements each representing a goal and partial focus of the kindergarten program. Please read each of the twelve statements and circle whether you believe each of these is very important, somewhat important or not important. Once you have read all twelve statements and indicated how important you believe they are, consider which ones are most important and which are least important. When you have decided which goal statement is most important please place the #1 in the box to the right of the statement. When you have decided which goal is second in importance please place the #2 in the box to the right of the statement. Continue to do this with each statement until you have completed all twelve and placed the #12 in the box to the right of your least preferred goal.

1. Desire for knowledge: A desire to learn and a love for learning.
 very important somewhat important not important
2. Communication of knowledge: Listening, speaking and sharing ideas with others.
 very important somewhat important not important
3. Use of knowledge: Helping the child learn to figure out things for himself.
 very important somewhat important not important
4. Knowledge of fundamental processes: The basic tools for future learning of the 3 R's.
 very important somewhat important not important

5. Child to Child: Learning to work with, understand and appreciate individuals of all kinds.

very important somewhat important not important

6. Child to Group: Sharing, playing and work cooperatively in groups.

very important somewhat important not important

7. Child to Adult: Helping the child to understand and work with the adults in his life.

very important somewhat important not important

8. Child to Society: Learning to accept the responsibilities of everyday life.

very important somewhat important not important

9. Physical: Appreciation of good health habits and caring for one's body.

very important somewhat important not important

10. Emotional Stability: Able to cope with the problems of everyday life.

very important somewhat important not important

11. Self-Concept: Pride in one's self and his accomplishments.

very important somewhat important not important

12. Aesthetics: Enjoyment of the finer things of life, art, music, etc.

very important somewhat important not important

Comments:

APPENDIX E

PARENT LETTER

PARENT LETTER

May 9, 1977

Dear Parent:

As part of my doctoral program and in cooperation with the North Vancouver School District, I am endeavoring to conduct a study with respect to attitudes toward kindergarten goals. Thus this study focuses upon you, the parents of kindergarten children.

The enclosed opinionnaire was developed to collect the information and your responses are greatly appreciated. Would it be possible to complete the opinionnaire and return it to me through your children's kindergarten teacher by May 20, 1977? Please DO NOT put your name on the opinionnaire.

A summary of the results of the survey will gladly be sent to you upon request.

I thank you for your consideration and cooperation in completing the opinionnaire.

Yours sincerely,

Herb Dank

APPENDIX F

TEACHER LETTER

TEACHER LETTER

May 9, 1977

Dear Teacher:

As part of my doctoral program and in cooperation with the North Vancouver School District, I am endeavoring to conduct a study with respect to attitudes toward kindergarten goals. Thus this study focuses upon you, the educators of young children.

The enclosed opinionnaire was developed to collect the information and your responses are greatly appreciated. Would it be possible to complete the opinionnaire and return it to me by May 27, 1977? Please DO NOT put your name on the opinionnaire.

A summary of the results of the survey will gladly be sent to you upon request.

I thank you for your consideration and cooperation in completing the opinionnaire.

Yours sincerely,

Herb Dank

APPENDIX G

CHI SQUARE BY GROUP

TABLE 21

Chi Square - By Group
Statement Number 1--Love of Learning

	count row % column % total %	T-K	T-1	P	Row Total
Most Important		7	20	123	150
		4.7	13.3	82.0	
		50.0	62.5	72.4	
		3.2	9.3	56.9	69.4
Average Importance		6	8	35	49
		12.2	16.3	71.4	
		42.9	25.0	20.6	
		2.8	3.7	16.2	22.7
Least Important		1	4	12	17
		5.9	23.5	70.6	
		7.1	12.5	7.1	
		0.5	1.9	5.6	7.9
Column		14	32	170	216
Total		6.5	14.8	78.7	100.0

$X^2 = 5.13$ degrees of freedom = 4 significance = .27

TABLE 22

Chi Square - By Group
Statement Number 2--Communication Skills

count				
row %				
column %				
total %	T-K	T-1	P	Row Total
	3	17	87	107
Most Important	2.8	15.9	81.3	
	21.4	53.1	51.2	
	1.4	7.9	40.3	49.5
	10	12	73	95
Average Importance	10.5	12.6	76.8	
	71.4	37.5	42.9	
	4.6	5.6	33.8	44.0
	1	3	10	14
Least Important	7.1	21.4	71.4	
	7.1	9.4	5.9	
	0.5	1.4	4.6	6.5
Column	14	32	170	216
Total	6.5	14.8	78.7	100.0

$\chi^2 = 5.67$ degrees of freedom = 4 significance = .22

TABLE 23

Chi Square - By Group
Statement Number 3--Creative Thinking

	count				
	row %				
	column %				
	total %	T-K	T-1	P	
				Row Total	
Most Important		3	11	88	102
		2.9	10.8	86.3	
		21.4	34.4	51.8	
		1.4	5.1	40.7	47.2
Average Importance		8	18	67	93
		8.6	19.4	72.0	
		57.1	56.3	39.4	
		1.4	8.3	31.0	43.1
Least Important		3	3	15	21
		14.3	14.3	71.4	
		21.4	9.4	8.8	
		1.4	1.4	6.9	9.7
Column		14	32	170	216
Total		6.5	14.8	78.7	100.0

$\chi^2 = 8.41$ degrees of freedom = 4 significance = .07

TABLE 24

Chi Square - By Group
Statement Number 4--Factual Information

	count				
	row %				
	column %				
	total %	T-K	T-1	P	Row Total
Most Important		3	4	56	63
		4.8	6.3	88.9	
		21.4	12.5	32.9	
		1.4	1.9	25.9	29.2
Average Importance		5	8	48	61
		8.2	13.1	78.7	
		35.7	25.0	28.2	
		2.3	3.7	22.2	28.2
Least Important		6	20	66	92
		6.5	21.7	71.7	
		42.9	62.5	38.8	
		2.8	9.3	30.6	42.6
Column		14	32	170	216
Total		6.5	14.8	78.7	100.0

$X^2 = 8.10$ degrees of freedom = 4 significance = .08

TABLE 25

Chi Square - By Group
Statement Number 5--Working with Peers

count row % column % total %	T-K	T-1	P	Row Total
	7	12	59	78
Most Important	9.0	15.4	75.6	
	50.0	37.5	34.7	
	3.2	5.6	27.3	36.1
	4	16	78	98
Average Importance	4.1	16.3	79.6	
	28.6	50.0	45.9	
	1.9	7.4	36.1	45.4
	3	4	33	40
Least Important	7.5	10.0	82.5	
	21.4	12.5	19.4	
	1.4	1.9	15.3	18.5
Column	14	32	170	216
Total	6.5	14.8	78.7	100.0

$X^2 = 2.65$ degrees of freedom = 4 significance = .61

TABLE 26

Chi Square - By Group
Statement Number 6--Group Responsibility

count row % column % total %	T-K	T-1	P	Row Total
Most Important	6 7.4 42.9 2.8	21 25.9 65.6 9.7	54 66.7 31.8 25.0	81 37.5
Average Importance	6 6.3 42.9 2.8	10 10.4 31.3 4.6	80 83.3 47.1 37.0	96 44.4
Least Important	2 5.1 14.3 0.9	1 2.6 3.1 0.5	36 92.3 21.2 16.7	39 18.1
Column	14	32	170	216
Total	6.5	14.8	78.7	100.0

$X^2 = 14.84$ degrees of freedom = 4 significance = .005

TABLE 27

Chi Square - By Group
Statement Number 7--Working with Adults

count row % column % total %	T-K	T-1	P	Row Total
	3	4	12	19
Most Important	15.8	21.1	63.2	
	21.4	12.5	7.1	
	1.4	1.9	5.6	8.8
	6	9	50	65
Average Importance	9.2	13.8	76.9	
	42.9	28.1	29.4	
	2.8	4.2	23.1	30.1
	5	19	108	132
Least Important	3.8	14.4	81.8	
	35.7	59.4	63.5	
	2.3	8.8	50.0	61.1
Column	14	32	170	216
Total	6.5	14.8	78.7	100.0

$X^2 = 6.10$ degrees of freedom = 4 significance = .19

TABLE 28

Chi Square - By Group
Statement Number 8--Citizenship

	count				
	row %				
	column %				
	total %	T-K	T-1	P	
				Row Total	
Most Important		2	6	39	47
		4.3	12.8	83.0	
		14.3	18.8	22.9	
		0.9	2.8	18.1	
Average Importance		6	16	68	90
		6.7	17.8	75.6	
		42.9	50.0	40.0	
		2.8	7.4	31.5	
Least Important		6	10	63	79
		7.6	12.7	79.7	
		42.9	31.3	37.1	
		2.8	4.6	29.2	
Column		14	32	170	216
Total		6.5	14.8	78.7	100.0

$X^2 = 1.66$ degrees of freedom = 4 significance = .79

TABLE 29

Chi Square - By Group
Statement Number 9--Physical Development

count row % column % total %	T-K	T-1	P	Row Total
	1	4	21	26
Most Important	3.8	15.4	80.8	
	7.1	12.5	12.4	
	0.5	1.9	9.7	12.0
	2	4	54	60
Average Importance	3.3	6.7	90.0	
	14.3	12.5	31.8	
	0.9	1.9	25.0	27.8
	11	24	95	130
Least Important	8.5	18.5	73.1	
	78.6	75.0	55.9	
	5.1	11.1	44.0	60.2
Column	14	32	170	216
Total	6.5	14.8	78.7	100.0

$X^2 = 7.35$ degrees of freedom = 4 significance = .11

TABLE 30

Chi Square - By Group
Statement Number 10--Emotional Stability

count row % column % total %	T-K	T-1	P	Row Total
	7	8	48	63
Most Important	11.1	12.7	76.2	
	50.0	25.0	28.2	
	3.2	3.7	22.2	29.2
	3	13	60	76
Average Importance	3.9	17.1	78.9	
	21.4	40.6	35.3	
	1.4	6.0	27.8	35.2
	4	11	62	77
Least Important	5.2	14.3	80.5	
	28.6	34.4	36.5	
	1.9	5.1	28.7	35.6
Column	14	32	170	216
Total	6.5	14.8	78.7	100.0

$X^2 = 3.59$ degrees of freedom = 4 significance = .46

TABLE 31

Chi Square - By Group
Statement Number 11--Positive Values of Self

count row % column % total %	T-K	T-1	P	Row Total
	13	21	85	119
Most Important	10.9	17.6	71.4	
	92.9	65.6	50.0	
	6.0	9.7	39.4	55.1
	0	8	49	57
Average Importance	0.0	14.0	86.0	
	0.0	25.0	28.8	
	0.0	3.7	22.7	26.4
	1	3	36	30
Least Important	2.5	7.5	90.0	
	7.1	9.4	21.2	
	0.5	1.4	16.7	18.5
Column	14	32	170	216
Total	6.5	14.8	78.7	100.0

$X^2 = 12.23$ degrees of freedom = 4 significance = .01

TABLE 32

Chi Square - By Group
Statement Number 12--Appreciation, Art

	count				
	row %				
	column %				
	total %	T-K	T-1	P	Row Total
		1	0	8	9
Most Important	11.1	0.0	88.9		
	7.1	0.0	4.7		
	0.5	0.0	3.7	4.2	
		0	6	19	25
Average Importance	0.0	24.0	76.0		
	0.0	18.8	11.2		
	0.0	2.8	8.8	11.6	
		13	26	143	182
Least Important	7.1	14.3	78.6		
	92.9	81.3	84.1		
	6.0	12.0	66.2	84.3	
Column	14	32	170	216	
Total	6.5	14.8	78.7	100.0	

$\chi^2 = 4.97$ degrees of freedom = 4 significance = .28

APPENDIX

CHI SQUARE BY SES

TABLE 33

Chi Square - By SES
Statement Number 1--Love of Learning

count row % column % total %	High SES	Middle SES	Low SES	Row Total
Most Important	48	53	22	123
	39.0	43.1	17.9	
	70.6	71.6	78.6	
	28.2	31.2	12.9	72.4
Average Importance	16	13	6	35
	45.7	37.1	17.1	
	23.5	17.6	21.4	
	9.4	7.6	3.5	20.6
Least Important	4	8	0	12
	33.3	66.7	0.0	
	5.9	10.8	0.0	
	2.4	4.7	0.0	7.1
Column	68	74	28	170
Total	40.0	43.5	16.5	100.0

$X^2 = 4.39$ degrees of freedom = 4 significance = .35

TABLE 34

Chi Square - By SES
Statement Number 2--Communication Skills

count row % column % total %	High SES	Middle SES	Low SES	Row Total
Most Important	31	37	19	87
	35.6	42.5	21.8	
	45.6	50.0	67.9	
	18.2	21.8	11.2	51.2
Average Importance	33	31	9	73
	45.2	42.5	12.3	
	48.5	41.9	32.1	
	19.4	18.2	5.3	42.9
Least Important	4	6	0	10
	40.0	60.0	0.0	
	5.9	8.1	0.0	
	2.4	3.5	0.0	5.9
Column	68	74	28	170
Total	40.0	43.5	16.5	100.0

$X^2 = 5.50$ degrees of freedom = 4 significance = .23

TABLE 35

Chi Square - By SES
Statement Number 3--Creative Thinking

count row % column % total %	High SES	Middle SES	Low SES	Row Total
Most Important	38	40	10	88
	43.2	45.4	11.4	
	55.9	54.1	35.7	
	22.4	23.5	5.9	51.8
Average Importance	27	25	15	67
	40.3	37.3	22.4	
	39.7	33.8	53.6	
	15.9	14.7	8.8	39.4
Least Important	3	9	3	15
	20.0	60.0	20.0	
	4.4	12.2	10.7	
	1.8	5.3	1.8	8.8
Column	68	74	28	170
Total	40.0	43.5	16.5	100.0

$X^2 = 6.26$ degrees of freedom = 4 significance = .18

TABLE 36

Chi Square - By SES
Statement Number 4--Factual Information

count row % column % total %	High SES	Middle SES	Low SES	Row Total
Most Important	23	22	11	56
	41.1	39.3	19.6	
	33.8	29.7	39.3	
	13.5	12.9	6.5	32.9
Average Importance	25	16	7	48
	52.1	33.3	14.6	
	36.8	21.6	25.0	
	14.7	9.4	4.1	28.2
Least Important	20	36	10	66
	30.3	54.5	15.2	
	29.4	48.6	35.7	
	11.8	21.2	5.9	38.8
Column	68	74	28	170
Total	40.0	43.5	16.5	100.0

$X^2 = 7.05$ degrees of freedom = 4 significance = .13

TABLE 37

Chi Square - By SES
Statement Number 5--Working with Peers

	count				
	row %				
	column %	High	Middle	Low	
	total %	SES	SES	SES	
				Row Total	
Most Important		23	20	16	59
		39.0	33.9	27.1	
		33.8	27.0	57.1	
		13.5	11.8	9.4	34.7
Average Importance		31	39	8	78
		39.7	50.0	10.3	
		45.6	52.7	28.6	
		18.2	22.9	4.7	45.9
Least Important		14	15	4	33
		42.4	45.5	12.1	
		20.6	20.3	14.3	
		8.2	8.8	2.4	19.4
Column		68	74	28	170
Total		40.0	43.5	16.5	100.0

$\chi^2 = 8.36$ degrees of freedom = 4 significance = .07

TABLE 38

Chi Square - By SES
Statement Number 6--Group Responsibility

count row % column % total %	High SES	Middle SES	Low SES	Row Total
Most Important	22	25	7	54
	40.7	46.3	13.0	
	32.4	33.8	25.0	
	12.9	14.7	4.1	31.8
Average Importance	30	34	16	80
	37.5	42.5	20.0	
	44.1	45.9	57.1	
	17.6	20.0	9.4	47.1
Least Important	16	15	5	36
	44.4	41.7	13.9	
	23.5	20.3	17.9	
	9.4	8.8	2.9	21.2
Column	68	74	28	170
Total	40.0	43.5	16.5	100.0

$\chi^2 = 1.60$ degrees of freedom = 4 significance = .80

TABLE 39

Chi Square - By SES
Statement Number 7--Working with Adults

	count				
	row %				
	column %	High	Middle	Low	
	total %	SES	SES	SES	
				Row	
				Total	
Most Important		3	7	2	12
		25.0	58.3	16.7	
		4.4	9.5	7.1	
		1.8	4.1	1.2	7.1
Average Importance		12	29	9	50
		24.0	58.0	18.0	
		17.6	39.2	32.1	
		7.1	17.1	5.3	29.4
Least Important		53	38	17	108
		49.1	35.2	15.7	
		77.9	51.4	60.7	
		31.2	22.4	10.0	63.5
Column		68	74	28	170
Total		40.0	43.5	16.5	100.0

$X^2 = 10.94$ degrees of freedom = 4 significance = .02

TABLE 40

Chi Square - By SES
Statement Number 8--Citizenship

count row % column % total. %	High SES	Middle SES	Low SES	Row Total
	15	19	5	39
Most Important	38.5	48.7	12.8	
	22.1	25.7	17.9	
	8.8	11.2	2.9	22.9
	26	25	17	68
Average Importance	38.2	36.8	25.0	
	38.2	33.8	60.7	
	15.3	14.7	10.0	40.0
	27	30	6	63
Least Important	42.9	47.6	9.5	
	39.7	40.5	21.4	
	15.9	17.6	3.5	37.1
Column	68	74	28	170
Total	40.0	43.5	16.5	100.0

$\chi^2 = 6.56$ degrees of freedom = 4 significance = .16

TABLE 41

Chi Square - By SES
Statement Number 9--Physical Development

count row % column % total %	High SES	Middle SES	Low SES	Row Total
	6	7	8	21
Most Important	28.6	33.3	38.1	
	8.8	9.5	28.6	
	3.5	4.1	4.7	12.4
	17	28	9	54
Average Importance	31.5	51.9	16.7	
	25.0	37.8	32.1	
	10.0	16.5	5.3	31.8
	45	39	11	95
Least Important	47.4	41.1	11.6	
	66.2	52.7	39.3	
	26.5	22.9	6.5	55.9
Column	68	74	28	170
Total	40.0	43.5	16.5	100.0

$X^2 = 11.79$ degrees of freedom = 4 significance = .01

TABLE 42

Chi Square - By SES
Statement Number 10--Emotional Stability

count row % column % total %	High SES	Middle SES	Low SES	Row Total
Most Important	18	26	4	48
	37.5	54.2	8.3	
	26.5	35.1	14.3	
	10.6	15.3	2.4	28.2
Average Importance	24	30	6	60
	40.0	50.0	10.0	
	35.3	40.5	21.4	
	14.1	17.6	3.5	35.3
Least Important	26	18	18	62
	41.9	29.0	29.0	
	83.2	24.3	64.3	
	15.3	10.6	10.6	36.5
Column	68	74	28	170
Total	40.0	43.5	16.5	100.0

$X^2 = 14.34$ degrees of freedom = 4 significance = .006

TABLE 43

Chi Square - By SES
Statement Number 11--Positive Values of Self

count row % column % total %	High SES	Middle SES	Low SES	Row Total
Most Important	39 45.9 57.4 22.9	39 45.9 52.7 22.9	7 8.2 25.0 4.1	85 50.0
Average Importance	18 36.7 26.5 10.6	22 44.9 29.7 12.9	9 18.4 32.1 5.3	49 28.8
Least Important	11 30.6 16.2 6.5	13 36.1 17.6 7.6	12 33.3 42.9 7.1	36 21.2
Column	68	74	28	170
Total	40.0	43.5	16.5	100.0

$\chi^2 = 12.07$ degrees of freedom = 4 significance = .02

TABLE 44

Chi Square - By SES
Statement Number 12--Appreciation, Art

count row % column % total %	High SES	Middle SES	Low SES	Row Total
Most Important	6 75.0 8.8 3.5	1 12.5 1.4 .6	1 12.5 3.6 .6	8 4.7
Average Importance	13 68.4 19.1 7.6	5 26.3 6.8 2.9	1 5.3 3.6 .6	19 11.2
Least Important	49 34.3 72.1 28.8	68 47.6 91.9 40.0	26 18.2 92.9 15.3	143 84.1
Column Total	68 40.0	74 43.5	28 16.5	170 100.0

$X^2 = 12.83$ degrees of freedom = 4 significance = .01

