



University of Nebraska at Omaha
DigitalCommons@UNO

Student Work

5-1-1974

Analyzing the Effectiveness of a Pre-Kindergarten Testing Program Designed to Determine the Readiness of Children for Kindergarten

Clayton B. Dobbins

University of Nebraska at Omaha

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork>

Recommended Citation

Dobbins, Clayton B., "Analyzing the Effectiveness of a Pre-Kindergarten Testing Program Designed to Determine the Readiness of Children for Kindergarten" (1974). *Student Work*. 2412.

<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/2412>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.



ANALYZING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF A PRE-KINDERGARTEN
TESTING PROGRAM DESIGNED TO DETERMINE THE
READINESS OF CHILDREN FOR KINDERGARTEN

A Field Project
Presented to the
Department of Educational Administration
and the
Faculty of the Graduate College
University of Nebraska at Omaha

by
Clayton B. Dobbins

May, 1974

8588/107

UMI Number: EP73957

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP73957

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

FIELD PROJECT ACCEPTANCE

Accepted for the faculty of the Graduate College of the University of Nebraska at Omaha, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Specialist in Education.

Graduate Committee

Kenneth Burpholde Ed. Ad.
Name Department

Joseph G. Dwan 7 Ed

Darrell Keenan Ed Ad
Chairman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACCEPTANCE PAGE	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	v
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
The Problem	2
Statement of the Problem	2
Delimitation of the Study	2
Procedure of the Study	3
Assumptions of the Study	3
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	6
Current Preliminary Screening Programs	9
Home Prereading Experiences	18
III. PROCEDURE OF THE STUDY	22
IV. PRESENTATION OF THE STUDY	25
Presentation and Discussion of the Test	25
Physical Development	26
Sensory-Motor Development	27
Auditory and Visual Development	28
Visual Perception	30
Language Development	31
Psycho-Social Development	32
Speech Development	33

CHAPTER	PAGE
Evaluation and Suggestions for Improvement	33
Parent Comments	34
Teacher Comments	38
V. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	42
The Purpose	42
Objectives of the Study	42
Procedure of the Study	42
Over-all evaluation and Recommendations . .	43
BIBLIOGRAPHY	47
APPENDIX	50

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Characteristics of Parent Questionnaire	36

ii

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

For the past several years parents of pre-kindergarten children have shown more and more anxiety when considering whether or not children are mentally, physically and emotionally ready for kindergarten.

Although the intensity of concern varies from parent to parent, most educators will agree that there have been some questionable practices in determining the readiness of children for kindergarten. More and more questions are being asked of kindergarten teachers and administrators concerning readiness for kindergarten.

Tradition and state law have been the influencing factors as to when children begin kindergarten. Parents are prone to think only in terms of chronological age, thus disregarding the many factors of growth that are an integral part of human development. State laws have contributed to the misconception that parents have, that all children are ready for kindergarten at age five. Most states have laws that require children to be five years of age by October fifteenth of the current year before they may enter kindergarten. However, children who are not five years of age by October fifteenth may be tested by a qualified psychologist in order to determine readiness for kindergarten.

The board in all classes of school districts shall not admit any child into the kindergarten or beginner grade of any school of such district unless (a) such

child has reached the age of five years or will reach such age on or before October 15 of the current year or (b) such child has demonstrated through recognized testing procedures approved by the State Board of Education that he is capable of carrying the work of those grades.¹

The above stated factors are not sufficient to determine the readiness of any child to enter kindergarten. Because of these conditions a pre-entrance testing program has been developed by the Millard Public Schools that will help eliminate guess work.

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of the pre-kindergarten testing program developed by the Millard Public Schools designed to determine the readiness of children to enter kindergarten.

DELIMITATIONS

This study was limited to eight elementary schools in the Millard Public School System. Comparisons were made between the four elementary schools that participated in the pre-kindergarten testing program and the four elementary schools that did not participate in the testing program.

¹School Laws of Nebraska, Fifteenth Unicameral Edition (Lincoln, Neb., 1971), 230.

PROCEDURE

In order to keep this study in a sequential pattern, the following steps were followed:

- (1) Opinions from teachers who participated in the program were obtained.
- (2) Opinions from parents who had children in the program were obtained.
- (3) Comparison of reading readiness tests were made of children in the program and those who were not.
- (4) Generalizations from the opinions received from the expertise of educators were developed.

ASSUMPTIONS

At the outset of this investigation, it was assumed that the following statements would be valid:

- (1) That the program selected is a valid one.
- (2) That reading readiness tests would show positive re-enforcement for the use of the program.

This study determined the validity of tests developed by the guidance department of the Millard Public Schools. Many of the ideas used in these tests were adapted from the Defabro Scale of Cognitive and Affectual Development by Glenna Debrotta and Jack Fadely.

Teachers, counselors, and administrators determined the readiness of children for kindergarten through the use of information gained from the tests. Following this staffing,

home visits were made to the home of every child tested. At that time the test results were explained and interpreted to parents. With the concurrence of the parents, the readiness of a child for kindergarten was determined. One is reminded that any child who was five years of age by October fifteenth of the current year must be allowed to enter kindergarten regardless of test results if the parents demanded that the child enter. Since in most cases this was a value judgment of teachers and parents and there was no guaranteed accuracy regarding the decision reached.

In those cases when the child was not mentally ready for kindergarten, and the home environment was not conducive to further development, it became the responsibility of the school to design and develop a program that met the needs of this type of child. Specialists, tutors, and reading teachers developed individualized programs to meet the child's needs.

Sighting another example, under the right conditions a child could mature and develop extensively by staying out of school for another year. That is to say, a parent who has the right attitude and background will, without much extra effort, help this child grow and mature to the point where he could fully meet the challenge of school.

Since the program has been in effect for one year in four of the eight elementary schools in Millard, a comparison was made from the reading readiness tests to see

if there was any concrete evidence of academic growth by those children who had been through the testing program compared to those who had not been through the testing program.

As a final step in determining the value of the testing program an opinionnaire was developed to review the overall reaction of parents and teachers of children who had been tested. This opinionnaire became a part of the formal paper.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

There was an abundance of literature supporting the need for a pre-kindergarten testing program which would adequately assess the readiness of the child. The concept of readiness has probably caused more controversy than any other concept in education. A vital issue to educators was the question of the child being ready to learn and be taught new things in the cognitive, social and emotional realm. Rousseau's viewpoint of two centuries ago has continued to the present day. His concept of readiness was a concept of maturation. He criticized educators because they did not wait for children to be ready. He advised educators to use sensory-motor functions which were well developed and suggested activities to use to prepare the child for complete intellectual activities.²

Pestalozzi³ and Montezorri⁴ formalized Rousseau's ideas into pedagogic systems. Two centuries later Piaget elaborated on Rousseau's ideas of a sensory-motor phase of

²Elmer H. Wilds, The Foundations of Modern Education, Rinehart and Co., Inc., New York, 1958, pp. 454-455.

³Ibid., pp. 469-470.

⁴Luella Cole, A History of Education, Rinehart and Co., New York, 1956, pp. 568-569.

development and developed the cognitive specifications.⁵

Gesell and associates were more interested in biological speculations about developmental changes of behavior than the interaction of organism environment and experiences and the effects of this interaction on development. Gesell considered maturation as a basic principle of developmental change due to inner biological forces and due to environmental factors which may influence developmental sequences.⁶

Newell C. Kephart identified the development of the child as a series of stages with each stage emerging as a more complex method by which the child is able to process data. Because these stages vary not only quantitatively in the number of data which can be handled, but qualitatively as well, the processing procedure changes. Kephart combined the views of Gesell and Amatrula with those of Piaget and conceived development as a step-like process. The Gesell and Amatrula development was seen as the ability to solve increasingly difficult problems. As the child grew chronologically he could solve more complex problems. Little attention was paid to the method used to get a solution; only the correctness or error of the final answer was considered. Piaget stressed the method of attacking the problem changes as the child developed. Different children used different

⁵Floyd L. Ruch, Psychology and Life, Scott, Foresman and Co., Chicago, 1963, pp. 327-330.

⁶Ibid., p. 59.

procedures to get the same final answer. Kephart explained development as quantitative and gradual within stages and between stages it was qualitative and precipitative.⁷

Norman A. Buktenica at the American Psychological Convention in August, 1970, stated that it seemed imperative that we learn to identify a child's potential or actual reading failure at the earliest possible time in life because there are some 8,000,000 children in America's Elementary and Secondary Schools who would not learn to read adequately. This means that one out of seven, or about fifteen percent, are handicapped in the area of reading.⁸ It is generally agreed that we must work toward reducing the incidence of school failures. The combination of early screening and matching the learning ability of children with instructional progress seems to hold promise. Osgood (1957), Mysman (1960), Kirk and McCarthy (1961) simply implied that learners have a natural inclination for dealing with information in one of the modalities of the primary senses of vision, audition, or tactual/haptic. "...there are five elements of perception that can be superimposed on the modality concept of

⁷Newell C. Kephart, The Slow Learner in the Classroom, Charles Merrill Publishing Co., Columbus, 1971, p. 38.

⁸Norman A. Buktenica, An Early Screening and Task-Learning Characteristic Model of Prevention Symposium, "Psycho-Educational Diagnosis of Children with Learning Disorders," American Psychological Convention, Miami, 1970, p. 1.

separate, or relatively independent, perceptual modalities. The elements which could be prefaced either by auditory, visual, tactual or haptic, are as follows: discrimination, motor, figure-ground, spatial relationships and memory."⁹

The concept of readiness has evolved from the belief that maturation was all that was necessary for reading success to the concept that reading readiness can be developed, that nature and nurture and their interaction are essential ingredients for learning.¹⁰ Bilka presented a paper at the meeting of the International Reading Association, Atlantic City, N.J., April, 1971, which evaluated the predictive value of certain readiness measures. Murphy-Durrell Readiness Test and Metropolitan Readiness Test were the strongest predictors of academic success.¹¹

CURRENT PRELIMINARY SCREENING PROGRAMS

Marion Amundson's graduate thesis compared two instruments to screen pre-school children for potential learning problems. Children were observed and screened

⁹Ibid., p. 4

¹⁰Loisanna P. Bilka, "An Evaluation of the Predictive Value of Certain Readiness Measures." (Paper presented at the meeting of the International Reading Association), Atlantic City, N.J., April, 1971, p. 2

¹¹Ibid., P 8

through play activities. Thus, preventative therapy and educational programming were done to circumvent failure and frustration in school experience. Those children falling below recommended scores were referred for further evaluation. Enjoyable experiences were provided through inexpensive materials and a non-technical procedure. Large numbers of children were screened quickly by people with minimal training. When high risk children were recognized they were referred at once to diagnosticians and therapists.¹²

As the child was identified it became necessary to set up a compensatory curriculum rather than to spend valuable time studying the sophisticated details of the test. Amundson referred to Menskoff who identified the handicapped as any student who exhibits a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or using spoken or written language. These could be manifested in disorders of listening, thinking, talking, reading, writing, spelling and arithmetic. Amundson identified functioning and weaknesses in children by including any conditions which have been referred to as perceptual handicaps, brain injury, minimal brain dysfunction, dyslexia and

¹²Marion S. Amundson, "A Preliminary Screening Program to Identify Functioning Strengths and Weakness in Pre-School Children." (Educational Thesis), Moorhead State College, Minnesota, August, 1972, pp. 2-7.

developmental aphasia. They do not include learning problems which are primarily due to visual, hearing or motor handicaps, to mental retardation, emotional disturbance or to environmental disadvantages. The Metropolitan Reading Test and the Wizard of Oz Preschool Preliminary Screening were both used in self-contained areas with a teacher, two trained volunteers and the author. Children were screened for motor, visual, auditory and language competencies.¹³

Meyer made a clear case of the fact that the affective domain of pre-school children's behaviors have been generally ignored in program assessments. Meyer developed a scale to identify important behaviors in pre-school children in which ratings were related to more traditional indices of development and academic readiness. Sixty-two specific behaviors relating to maximally adapted and maximally maladapted kindergarten children was discovered through interviews with kindergarten teachers. These behaviors were incorporated into a five point rating scale consisting of all positive statements which were used by Meyer in his study, The Adoptive Behavior Rating Scale. The resulting scores were compared with the results of Stanford-Binet and Draw-A-Line Child Assessment measures. The study found a significant but not high relationship indicating that social

¹³Ibid., pp. 1-2.

competency provides some evidence about a child's intellectual functioning.¹⁴

Hanson made note of the fact that for years it has been known that experienced teachers who have taught in a particular school for several years could predict later reading success or failure in first grade for their pupils with 90% accuracy, often without the aid of any standardized tests. When kindergarten became mandatory in Maryland in 1970, the Hanson Study used two language tests, the Golman-Frostic Test of Articulation and the Northwestern Syntax Screening Test to determine the readiness of children for kindergarten. The statistics of the test are as follows:

- (1) Two hundred thirty-two children from 4½-5 years of age were tested.
- (2) Eight percent of the children had consonant misarticulation.
- (3) Thirty-four percent of the children had 12 or more different consonant errors which speech specialists consider severe enough for therapy.
- (4) Eight percent of the children fell below the tenth percentile on general expressive language ability.
- (5) Twenty-seven percent of the children scored below the tenth percentile on expressive and receptive parts of the Northwestern Syntax Screening test.

¹⁴William J. Meyer, "The Adaptive Behavior Rating Scale," Syracuse Center for Research and Development in Early Childhood Education, Syracuse University, New York, 1972, p. 2.

- (6) Individual test was found to be more accurate with this age child than group tests.¹⁵

Roger Reger believed the philosophy of a program is of primary importance because unless one knows why the program is established it is difficult to know what program to undertake. The prevention concept has been widely used to justify all manner of educational problems. It was not enough to bring children together because someone thought it was good to have a program or because pre-school programs were "in" or of the naive belief that pre-school programs "present" all kinds of problems later. Pre-school education is important because there is so much for children to learn and because there are so many chances for errors or mistakes on the part of parents who mean well but simply cannot understand the full range of principles of growth and development. Children need specialized assistance from the earliest age.¹⁶

In the Illinois pre-screening program children were tested and then entered into a suitable program. According to Reger, Kippmann defined an effective program as one with ample information about children. This information was used for

¹⁵Irene Hanson, "The Use of Two Language Screening Tests with Kindergarten Children," Elementary English, November, 1972, pp. 1102-1105.

¹⁶Roger Reger, (Ed.) Pre-School Programming of Children with Disabilities, Charles C. Thomas, Springfield, 1970, pp. 1-7.

long-range and daily planning. The child level of functioning in a particular area plus an observation of the process used by the child is beneficial to creating a successful program. When the tests are given teachers observed children to gain insights about children.¹⁷

The Erie County pilot summer program was given to aid pre-school children who might have difficulties when they entered school. Administrators viewed the program as a way to gain experiences in dealing with pre-school programs. Three things studied mainly were the type of child, effect of the program and parents' reactions. Families were made an active part of the program. Telephone calls, home visits, referrals all were an integral part of the program. Observations were that the program was beneficial to help develop ideas, goals and expectations for organizing the pre-school program. Handicap labels were limited. The program was broadened to include more children and adults.¹⁸

In 1968 the survey observation showed that more consideration was being given to the kindergarten child and what he needed. The instruction was tailored to environmental, developmental and ability level of the child. The Cheyenne, Wyoming three year study showed that teacher prediction of achievement survived as a significant variable

¹⁷Ibid., pp. 29-34.

¹⁸Ibid., pp. 11-16.

through second grade. There was no significant relationship between the kindergarten teacher's prediction of the child's success and his age. Hirst reported that Hymes supported the idea of a program fitting the requirements of the child while Hall presented a review of writers who believed that a child needs to be a chronological age of six and have a mental age of six years and six months to be successful in first grade reading.¹⁹

According to the Gesell Institute study two out of every five kindergarten children start out as potential failures. Forty percent of all children begin school before they are ready, physically or emotionally. At the end of the kindergarten year only one-fourth of the unready group will have matured enough to do reasonably well. That means thirty percent of the total group will be subject to failure and forced to develop protective behavior because they cannot cope successfully. Greene County and Dallas County, Iowa started a pre-school testing program which is voluntary. Parents were enthusiastically supportive. At the end of the first five years most of the children were enrolled in the program. Five areas of mature functioning were examined. Also, of significance was the development in the visual perception, motor skills and oral communication. The visual

¹⁹Wilma E. Hirst, "Entrance Age A Predictor Variable for Academic Success?" The Reading Teacher, March, 1970, pp. 547-554.

motor and communication skills were determined by the Gesell Developmental Designs and the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test. This was not for an I.Q. figure but was used to observe total functioning such as the following:

- (1) Clinical observation determined emotional control and social adaptability.
- (2) All results were discussed with the parents with fifteen percent accepting the recommendation of refraining to start the child until further maturity.
- (3) Some were counseled about the needs of the child.
- (4) Suggestions were given for developing the areas of weakness.
- (5) Parents need more education in accepting the recommendations of pre-school evaluation.
- (6) Teachers need to be alerted and planning needs to be done for a flexible program geared to the children's functioning levels.

Zike recommends a three-phase program. Education must help parents do a more effective job in the first five years. Pre-school evaluations must properly place and provide adequate experiences for each child. The high school needs a better program for educating the senior for parenthood.²⁰

The Flagstaff, Arizona kindergarten pre-assessment program was started with federal funds. Now it is financed by district and federal funds. Eventually it will be funded by the district without any federal aid. Newspapers, radio and

²⁰Victor M Zike, "Not All Five Year Olds are Ready for School, "Nations Schools, June, 1968, pp. 39-41.

television publicized the clinic to get a high rate of participation. Counselors talked at programs to orient the public. In the Spring of 1974 an evaluation will be made on how the parent sees the program. For personnel there were five certified elementary school counselors, a school nurse and an aide. The nurse and aide screened for visual and auditory problems and made referrals. Motor abilities were also noted. Parents came to a conference after the screening to make a decision about keeping the child out one more year or for help in getting ready for kindergarten. Further evaluation was also available. The program was initiated because early years are important and parents could help if the child needs skill development.²¹

Jenkins described the five year old as a conforming individual who was learning to take some responsibility. Because the child was interested in conforming, he could be taught to be a part of group needs and accept authority in necessary situations. The ideal kindergarten would have a balance of individual and group activities, active play and fun and rest, sharing and building, dramatic play, stories, songs and records.²²

²¹William B. Kephart, "Pre-Kindergarten Screening Clinics," Phi Delta Kappan, March, 1974, p. 459.

²²Gladys G. Jenkins, These are Your Children, Scott, Foresman and Co., Chicago, 1963, p. 96.

Ethel King summarized the prereading needs of children by saying that planning was necessary because of specific skills needed. Research suggested that learning is not adding to the program. Instead educators need to select activities which will contribute to success in acquiring the reading skills. Kindergarteners need to see letter differences in written words and be able to hear sounds in spoken words. Children will differ in their needs for the preparatory program.²³

At the preparatory level, pictures, stories and experiences are used to develop comprehension. The thinking processes and language abilities must be developed if the kindergarten child has the ability to use and interpret oral language which is a prerequisite in preparing for reading and interpreting printed language. Until parents and educators alike become more aware and accept more responsibility toward preparing the kindergarten child for school, the lack of readiness and preparedness of the kindergarten child will continue unchecked.

HOME PREREADING EXPERIENCES

A number of research studies evaluating home prereading experiences have been conducted. Significant

²³Ethel M. King, "Beginning Reading: When and How?" The Reading Teacher, March, 1969, pp. 550-553.

relationships between children's home prereading experiences and success in first grade reading as measured by standardized reading tests and teacher rating in the Plessas study reported by Miller who concluded that home prereading experiences were related to children's reading readiness success but not to first grade reading achievement, possibly because of the intervening factors of teacher competence and personality.²⁴

In the study which Miller did using the three social groups: middle, upper-lower, and lower-lower, the incidence of having books and being read to was generally less in the two lower groups. In the two upper groups the children had taken more family trips. All three groups had used manipulative materials but the upper group had experienced more contact with them. Few children in the three groups had gone to the public library. Most of the children of the middle group had done dramatization of stories. Few children had made up stories. Most children from the middle group recognized letters of the alphabet. The two lower groups had little knowledge of the letters. In the two upper groups children had pretended to read and could interpret pictures in books of appropriate content. In the two upper groups most children used left to right progression and could discriminate

²⁴Wilma H. Miller, "Home Pre-Reading Experiences and First Grade Reading Achievement," The Reading Teacher, April, 1969, pp. 641-645.

objects similar in size and shape. Most of the children in the middle group could rhyme words. The two lower groups were less proficient in visual perception and auditory discrimination.²⁵

²⁵Ibid., p. 641.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

This study was in keeping with the recommendations of educators that an intensified testing program is needed to better identify the educational and physical needs of children coming into kindergarten. For too long, children of kindergarten age were thrust into a kindergarten environment without the teacher having any previous knowledge of their mental or physical ability. The professional classroom teachers and elementary guidance counselors were convinced of the need for better preparation of teachers before receiving children into kindergarten classes. Thus, came the development of this kindergarten testing instrument. Following many hours of research, a testing instrument was developed by the Millard Public Schools utilizing information and ideas gleaned from other test instruments.

The preliminary step for the implementation of this project was to obtain permission from the superintendent of the Millard Public Schools to use information gathered from several elementary schools that used the testing process and compare the results with schools that did not use the testing process. Following the granting of permission by the superintendent came the implementation of the testing program. The first steps of implementation

were to determine when the testing should be done and how many staff members would be needed. It was determined that in order to examine disruptive factors during the school day that three schools would test during the school year and one school would test after school was dismissed in the spring.

Parents of children entering kindergarten in the fall were notified by letter that there would be evening orientation meetings. At these meetings parents registered their child for kindergarten and were told about the testing program. A great deal of discussion centered around the different patterns of physical and mental development in children. It was explained that the testing program was not designed to eliminate children; but rather it was designed so teachers could learn what experiences a child had encountered in order to better assess his needs. The principal and teachers of the school explained how the growth and maturity of children vary. Parents were helped to understand that just because a child is five years old does not necessarily mean that he is ready to accept the challenge of the traditional kindergarten. Through an intensive testing program teachers become aware of the differences in children. With this knowledge available teachers and principals can design programs that fit the needs of each child.

The next step in a program of this magnitude was to determine where children would attend class and which teacher they would have. It was the intent at the outset of the

planning to have children assigned to the same teacher for the testing program as they would have during the school year. It is the philosophy of the Millard Public Schools that the teacher who did the testing would have a better understanding of the child's needs when school began in the fall.

The testing program for the children took a minimum of five days. Within these five days each child was given a vision test, a hearing test, and a minimal physical examination by a nurse. Other staff members tested the children in the following areas: sensory-motor development, auditory and visual perceptual development, language development, psycho-social development, and speech development.

The two days following the completion of the testing program were used for staffing sessions. The staff met to discuss the results of each test. Because each staff member had to relay the findings from each child's test to the kindergarten teacher, this staffing was a long and tiring procedure. Since the kindergarten teacher made a home visit to every child's home it was of utmost importance that she understand the test results so she could adequately explain them to the child's parents.

The final stage of the testing program was the visit by the teacher to the home of every child tested. During

this home visit the total results of the test were interpreted to the child's parents. With this information available, parents then had to make the decision as to whether or not they would send their child to school or keep him home for another year. If the parent chose to keep the child home the conference was ended. However, if the parents made the decision to send their child to school, teachers gave some suggested activities to the parents that could help prepare the child for kindergarten. At the conclusion of the conference, the teacher gave the parents some indication of the kinds of programs the child would begin with in the fall.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF THE STUDY

In Chapter Two, a number of theories and conclusions were stated concerning the value of a pre-kindergarten testing program. Most important was the need for as much information as possible about each child so he could adequately start in a formal school setting. This study was valuable because it showed there was much to be done with the results of pre-kindergarten testing in order to determine the readiness of a child for kindergarten.

Chapter IV will present and discuss the testing instrument and give an overall evaluation of the program.

I. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE TEST

The test was used with all children eligible for kindergarten. The test was divided into the following six sections:

- (1) Physical Development-given by a school nurse and health aide.
- (2) Sensory-Motor Development-given by the principal or an instructional aide.
- (3) Visual and Auditory Development-given by the reading teacher.
- (4) Language Development-given by the reading teacher.
- (5) Psycho-Social Development-observed and recorded by the guidance counselor.

- (6) Speech Development-given by the speech therapist.

While the above mentioned staff members were testing children on a one-to-one basis the remaining children were actively involved with projects in the classroom under the direction of the classroom teacher. These projects were also designed to help the teacher make group observations of the children. The group observations were recorded so that the information could become a part of the total test instrument results.

Physical Development. The physical development test was divided into four sections which were administered by a nurse and health aide. The first section was a vision screening. As the test was administered the results were recorded and annotated comments were made. The child's eyes were also examined for any other physical defect that could have indicated a need to refer the parents to a doctor for a more indepth examination of the child's eyes. The child's hearing was tested with the use of an audiometer. This test was administered in a quiet area so the child was not disturbed by sounds other than the audiometer tones. Annotated comments were made which gave the tester needed information which would be helpful when considering the possibility of a more extensive examination by an ear specialist. Following these tests an examination was made of the oral cavity. At this time the nurse checked the

throat, shape of the mouth, teeth and tonsils. Information was then recorded for future use. The final section of the physical development test had to do with motor and muscular development. During this test the child was put through a series of activities that gave an indication of any physical abnormality.

Sensory-Motor Development. The sensory-motor development test gave an indication of how the child's perception of something was interpreted and demonstrated through some physical activity. During this examination the child was asked to pick up certain objects. It was noted how easily the object was picked up and which hand was used in demonstrating the use of the object. The child was asked to identify certain shapes such as circles, triangles, and squares. After the identification of each item was made the child was asked to reproduce the object on paper with the use of a pencil or crayon. Observations were made to see how well the writing instrument was handled and to note whether the child was seeing the whole object and then making a reproduction or if the child was using pencil-point vision in the reconstruction of the item. Pencil-point vision is when a child sees only the immediate portion of the picture that is being cut. As the child made reproductions of the circle, square and triangle the tester noted the direction of pencil movement. This information was

helpful in identifying future needs when the child began to write. Another portion of the test asked for the child to draw a simple picture of a person. Here again notes were taken that gave the tester needed information regarding what a child's mind sees and what the hand can produce.

Can the child color within lines? This test gave the tester an idea of eye-hand coordination. Further information was gained when the child was asked to cut out a picture. Again the tester observed which hand the child used when he picked up the scissors. Did the child look ahead and anticipate the cuts to be made or did he appear to be using pencil-point vision. When the cutting was done the portion that had been cut off was pasted in a position to form a more complete picture. The child was asked to place the part in the proper place and paste it there. Given a picture with a pathway leading toward a house the child was asked to draw a line on the pathway to the house staying within the lines. The final activity for the child was to print his name and reproduce some letters from a page with examples given.

Auditory and Visual Perceptual Development. The child was asked by the tester to respond to a series of activities or commands. Part of the test dealt with numeration in which the child was asked to repeat a series of numbers. The first series of numbers was very simple such as "four, two or five, three". Each series of numbers

became a little more difficult and complex. The tester recorded the child's responses.

In the next testing situation the child was asked to turn his back to the tester and listen carefully while pairs of words were pronounced. The child was to distinguish between the pairs of words that were the same and those words that were different.

Because children should have an adequate vocabulary and a basic understanding of spoken language by age five, part three tested the child's ability to understand and follow simple commands. In this test the child was told to make certain moves and perform simple activities to see if the child could follow orders and keep those orders in proper sequence.

Part four of the test checked the child's understanding of what he heard. The child listened to several short sentences given orally by the tester. At the end of each sentence the child responded with a yes or no answer. An example of this exercise would be the following sentence. Can birds fly? From the child's response the tester determined whether or not the child understood and interpreted spoken language properly.

In part five the child was asked to distinguish between similarities and differences. This activity required the child to think in terms of the examples given in the sentences. An example of the sentence follows. Airplanes

fly and so do _____ . The tester listened for difficulties in articulation and noted the response. Several sentences were given orally by the tester. While the child repeated the sentence the tester was recording articulation difficulties. This record was made of the spoken word so curriculum could be prepared to meet the child's needs.

In conjunction with the above test, section seven dealt with rhythm and auditory perception. The child listened to directions given him to perform certain rhythmic activities. An example of this activity would be to tap your foot three times. The final two sections of the auditory test gave an indication of the child's ability to hear and understand soft whispers and imitate sounds.

Visual Perception. The visual perception test had six parts. First the child was asked to discriminate between different and like objects. Several different and like objects were placed on a table. The child was asked to discriminate between objects as the tester asked various questions. Second, the child was asked to match colors of crayons or colors of different pieces of paper. Naming the colors was not stressed, only the ability to place like colored objects together. The third task was similar to part one because the child was asked to group similar objects. In part one the child was given an object and asked to select from a number of objects the one that was most like the object

given him by the tester. Fourth, the child was shown shapes and told to select an object with the same shape. Included in this section was the matching of pictures. Fifth, the child was shown a pattern or design made up of color forms. Then the forms were rearranged, and the child was to reproduce the original pattern of the color form. The sixth and final test for visual perception was testing the child's visual tracking ability. The tester used a pencil or other similar object and asked the child to follow the pencil movement with the eyes without moving the head. First, the pencil was moved from right to left. Next the pencil was moved up and down. All of the above test activities helped the tester to measure the possibility of a serious eye problem.

Language Development. The language development test consisted of the following fifteen items:

- (1) The child was to explain the use of a predetermined list of words.
- (2) The child was to make associations between like and unlike words.
- (3) The child was to determine the difference in the weights of various objects.
- (4) The child was questioned to see if he could identify himself by first name, last name, sex, and age.
- (5) The child was asked to determine the approximate time of day, such as morning, afternoon, or evening.

- (6) The child was asked to group objects by size, shape, and color.
- (7) The child was asked to use simple number combinations. First he was to count ten objects. From the group of ten the child was to select various size groups.
- (8) The child was asked to determine the difference in longest, biggest, most and same.
- (9) The child was asked to describe positions in space.
- (10) The child was asked to place an object on, beside, under or behind another object such as a chair.
- (11) The child was asked to point to his own body parts as they were named.
- (12) The child was to solve a problem that was posed by the tester.
- (13) The child was asked to describe the senses and their functions.
- (14) The child was asked to distinguish between left and right.
- (15) The child was asked if he knew his parent's name, address and phone number.
- (16) The tester observed the child throughout the test to get an idea of how he felt about himself.

Psycho-Social Development. The psycho-social development test was an observation of the child's behavior as an individual and in a group. The observer watched for such signs as communication with others, independence of actions, emotional strain, sharing and other psychological attributes. Please refer to section IV of the test in appendix C.

Speech Development. The speech clinicians used a standardized instrument to measure speech development in the areas of articulation, voice quality, pitch, loudness, and rhythm.

II. EVALUATION AND SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT.

Table I, pages 36-37 shows the responses of parents as revealed in the parent opinionnaire. The results of the opinionnaire were broken down by school, thus revealing the thoughts of the parents from four different attendance areas. Of the one hundred seventy opinionnaires returned one hundred twenty-one, or 71%, of the parents attended one of the meetings. Forty-nine, or 29%, did not attend either of the two meetings. One hundred eighteen, or 69%, of the parents found the meetings to be helpful; four, or 3%, did not feel the meetings were valuable and forty-eight, or 28%, had no opinion.

When asked if they felt the week long testing program was beneficial, one hundred sixty-nine, or 99%, felt the program was valuable. Parents were asked if they preferred the one-half day registration roundup of the past to the preferred the week-long testing program. When asked if the parent conference held following the testing program was valuable, one hundred sixty-four, or 96%, replied favorably. The final question asked whether or not the parents would be

willing to keep their child home for one week so that next year's kindergarten children could take part in a program that would be held during the school year. One hundred fifty-four, or 91%, replied yes. Ten, or 6%, replied no.

The remainder of the opinionnaire was made up of narrative comments by parents. The following comments are those made by parents of children who were in the program. The comments are written just as the parents responded.

I thought the program was very beneficial to both child and parent. Child could gain an idea of what school would be like for him next fall. The parents also find out if his child is ready for kindergarten and if so, may help him if there are any points he needs help with.

I think the program was very beneficial both for our child and us. We got an idea of what was expected of the child and things he should know before entering school.

I think it is an excellent opportunity for the children. It gives them an idea of what to expect when school starts. It is also a good way to see if a child is ready for school.

I know our daughter enjoyed the roundup very much. It also gave me a chance to know where she needed help over the summer.

I was very impressed and satisfied with your program. It helped identify a learning problem with our child.

I felt the kindergarten roundup last year was very beneficial especially approved of the eye and hearing screening and parent-teacher conference following the program.

I feel this form of kindergarten roundup enabled us, as parents with children whose birthday is in August or September to decide whether or not we should send our child the following year.

I feel your program is very helpful in establishing whether or not a child is ready.

This being our first child in school, the roundup was very beneficial in helping us to recognize characteristics that would and would not help him in school. Also, the medical checkup warranted concern of the tonsils, which we appreciated being made aware of a potential problem.

I felt that I also benefited from the week long roundup. Last spring we learned many helpful tips regarding my child's learning, also discovered she needed glasses.

I thought the roundup was fantastic. This acquainted the child with school and the teacher. This also helped evaluate the child's bad and good points and what he needed help in.

I felt the week long roundup was very beneficial. Many children, I feel, are mentally ready for kindergarten but maturity is another matter.

I felt this program was very beneficial to the parents and the child. It gave us much better ideas on what areas to help the child in during the summer months. It helps also to make a decision whether to start a younger child or wait another year. I hope the program will continue next year.

Every parent may think he or she knows their child's potential, but after a thorough evaluation given by your expert staff the parents know their child even better.

No doubt, all aspects of last year's program were extremely valuable to us and our child and, inevitably the teachers too. Our child was enthusiastic about the opportunity to experience the school atmosphere and soon afterward, the parent conference provided us with the evaluation we needed to properly proceed in preparing our child for the fall season. So, we say, "Right on with the Roundup as previously presented."

RESULTS OF KINDERGARTEN ROUNDUP QUESTIONNAIRE

	SANDOZ			BRYAN			CENTRAL			CODY					
	Total poss.=70			Total poss.=62			Total poss.=19			Total poss.=75					
	Yes	No	Other	Yes	No	Other	Yes	No	Other	Yes	No	Other			
Did you attend either of the evening meetings held in Jan. or Feb?	46	19	0	36	16	0	11	2	0	28	12	0	121	49	0
	70%	30%		60%	31%		85%	15%		70%	30%		71%	29%	
If you attended, did you find the meetings helpful?	45	1	19	35	2	15	11	0	2	27	1	12	118	4	48
	69%	2%	29%	67%	3%	30%	85%	0%	15%	68%	2%	30%	69%	3%	28%
Did you feel the week-long Kindergarten Roundup was beneficial?	65	0	0	51	0	1	13	0	0	40	0	0	169	0	1
	100%			98%		2%	100%			100%			99%		1%
Do you prefer having a half-day Kindergarten Roundup Program mainly for registration purposes in place of the week-long program held last year?	0	65	0	0	51	1	1	12	0	0	40	0	1	168	1
		100%			100%	100%	7%	92%		100%	100%		5%	99%	.5%

RESULTS OF KINDERGARTEN ROUNDUP QUESTIONNAIRE

	SANDOZ			BRYAN			CENTRAL			CODY				
	Total poss.=70			Total poss.=62			Total poss.=19			Total poss.=75				
	Total rec.=65			Total rec.=52			Total rec.=13			Total rec.=40				
Yes	No	Other	Yes	No	Other	Yes	No	Other	Yes	No	Other	Yes	No	Other
97	3		96	4		92	8		97			96	3	1
63	2	0	50	2	0	12	1	0	39	0	1	64	5	1
92	5	3	96	2		92	8		83	10	7	91	6	3
60	3	2	50	2	0	12	1	0	33	4	3	54	10	4

Did you feel the parent conference following the Roundup was beneficial?

Since your child had the opportunity to attend Roundup a week last spring would you be willing to have your child remain at home for a week this school year so other pre-schoolers can have the opportunity?

Teachers who participated in the testing program were also asked to give their opinions of the program. Each teacher was given an evaluation form with six questions. The teachers were to write brief comments giving their personal evaluation of the kindergarten testing program. The following comments are from teachers as they saw the testing program:

- (1) DID YOU FEEL THE EVENING MEETINGS HELD IN JANUARY AND FEBRUARY LAST YEAR WERE BENEFICIAL? EXPLAIN.

As teachers we had an opportunity to meet with parents and give them an idea of what to expect of our kindergarten program and what we would expect of their child. The speakers gave specific examples of how parents could help the child prepare for kindergarten. The booklets handed out provided guidelines and suggestions for parents to use during the summer.

I feel it helped me understand children better. I had more of an idea of where each child was to start. Parents had an opportunity to give some consideration to the kindergarten curriculum, and to their child's potential and capabilities.

- (2) DID YOU PREFER THE HALF-DAY ROUNDUP OR THE WEEK LONG ROUNDUP? EXPLAIN.

The children became aware of surroundings and met classmates and teachers. The children became more relaxed as the week progressed. This gave teachers the opportunity to evaluate each child's readiness more realistically. This program made a significant difference in the "first day" reactions. As a result of the roundup we could plan the program more realistically and plan for individual differences. When school began, I knew something about each child the first day. Several immature children were waiting until next year to begin kindergarten. More time to evaluate children and give them a real feeling for kindergarten. I felt it helped evaluate some children who were less mature and needed to remain home for a year.

(3) CITE EXAMPLES OF CHILDREN YOU FEEL WERE ESPECIALLY HELPED BY AN EXTENSIVE ROUNDUP.

One child was recognized as a child needing help. As a result of early testing he was placed in a special education class this year.

Parents were given suggestions to help their child; as a result he attended pre-school during the summer and they worked on his special problems. One child was recognized as an above average child in the area of reading. She was placed in an advanced reading program.

The hearing test of this child meant a recommendation to see a specialist. The child's hearing was actually saved because his problem was found in time. Another child was found to be hyperactive and it was suggested that he be taken to a doctor for further evaluation. The child was placed on medication.

This child was found to have a severe hearing loss. During the summer corrective surgery was done on her ears. Another child seemed to be very apprehensive of new situations and was found to be socially immature.

Another teacher found a child with infected tonsils. The child was taken to the family doctor where the problem was watched carefully.

Children with speech problems were identified and given help.

(4) ARE THERE ANY SPECIFIC THINGS THAT YOU WERE ABLE TO DO DURING THIS YEAR THAT WERE MADE POSSIBLE DUE TO THE TESTING PROGRAM.

We selected specific areas such as color words and shapes. We added more materials in the areas of eye-hand coordination. In areas of color words, shapes, nursery rhymes, we changed our program to fit the needs to the children. More work was planned for motor development. I knew how to deal with a child with psychological problems after talking to a school psychologist. We were able to give parents ideas of ways to help children. Less time was needed to get to know the children. I planned for child needs in summer.

- (5) DO YOU FEEL THE EVALUATION USED WAS ACCURATE IN GETTING TO KNOW CHILDREN'S STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES?

On the whole, the areas of strengths and weaknesses were well identified. Especially in the areas of physical problems such as hearing and vision. With the many specific areas evaluated we were given a more complete picture of each child. It was especially helpful to have more than one person's opinion about the readiness of each child. This evaluation would usually take me at least one month in the fall if I did it myself. With the various screeners, I feel the strengths and weaknesses were more readily observed. Children who were having trouble with academic work were either found in the screening or did not take the screening test.

- (6) WHAT CHANGES WOULD YOU RECOMMEND TO MAKE OUR PROGRAM BETTER IN THE FUTURE?

I would only hold one parent meeting. Need a closer check on auditory screening. Set up a panel discussion made up of teachers and parents with questions that especially concern parents. Do not have so many people working with children. This confused the children.

Based on the foregoing information it appears that the testing instrument was well done and fulfilled the intended purpose. However, the evaluation of the program was inadequate. The testing instrument, as explained in the first section, of this chapter can be found in appendix C. In order to truly evaluate a program of this magnitude accurate records must be kept on the children for several years. Control groups would have been the ideal method of finding out the true value of such a program. Although this testing program was used in four of the eight elementary schools,

the reader is reminded that control groups were not established. Therefore, an adequate basis of comparison could not be made. Finally, a questionnaire must be developed that can objectively measure the worth of the testing program.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Purpose. The purpose of this study was to analyze the effectiveness of a pre-kindergarten testing program used to find out the actual readiness of children for kindergarten.

Objectives Of The Study. The objectives of this study were to test pre-kindergarten children through the use of a week long testing program. It was further hoped that an identification of children's needs could be established through the results of the test. Another objective was to confer with the parents of every child tested. Test results were interpreted and recommendations were made to parents concerning readiness for school. The final objective was for teachers to gain enough knowledge about the children to prepare an adequate curriculum to meet the needs of each child when he entered school.

Procedure. The following activities were carried out during the preparation and the duration of the program.

- (1) A thorough study was made of many testing instruments that had been used for testing young children. From the information gleaned from these tests a testing instrument was developed.
- (2) Sample schools were selected to participate in the testing. Four of the eight elementary schools in the Millard School District were selected.

- (3) Following the testing of the children the administrative staff determined that it would be necessary to question parents in order to determine the effectiveness and the value of the program. Teachers of the children tested were also asked to respond concerning their feelings toward the value of the testing program. Thus it was that an opinionnaire was developed to measure parent and teacher reaction to the testing program.
- (4) Following the analysis of the completed opinionnaire, recommendations were made for the improvement of the testing program.

Through an extensive examination of related literature it was found that many authors agreed on the need for early testing of children. Further, it was found that early testing can identify such problems as poor vision, impaired hearing, poor speech development, physical defects and mental retardation. By using the various testing programs, strengths and weaknesses of children could be identified. It was further related by many authors that even though a great deal of information was gained, inadequate use was made of the test results.

A comparison study of the two sets of schools was done using the results of the Metropolitan Reading Readiness Test. This test was constructed to give the teacher an indication of a child's readiness to read. The test has six parts: word meaning, listening, matching, alphabet, numbers and copying. Raw scores were taken from the test and transformed into a percentile rank for teacher use. The final interpretation of the test was broken down into five categories using raw scores. Any child scoring above 76 received a letter rating

of "A". The interpretation of this rating stated that this child was very well prepared for first grade work and should be challenged with enrichment materials. Any child having a raw score of 64-76 received a letter rating of "B". The interpretation of this rating indicated that this child was a good prospect for success in first grade. Any child having a raw score of 45-63 received a letter rating of "C". This child was considered to be likely to succeed in first grade. The child's strengths and weaknesses were observed closely so instruction could be planned according to his needs. Any child having a raw score of 24-44 received a letter rating of "D". A child with this rating was considered likely to have difficulty in first grade work and should be assigned to a slow section with considerable individualized help. A child having a raw score below 24 received a letter rating of "E". A child receiving this rating would likely face great difficulty and very specialized curriculum would fulfill his needs.

Also 460 kindergarten children were given the test. The test results of the 258 children who had been in the pre-kindergarten testing program were compared with the 202 children who were not in the pre-kindergarten program. Most of the 460 children tested had scores falling in the "A" and "B" category of the test. Therefore, it was felt that the test results were inconclusive in determining the

effectiveness of the pre-kindergarten test.

A brief summary of parent attitude toward the test is in order. It was evident from the comments of parents that they felt the pre-kindergarten testing experience was valuable and worthwhile. However, the responses received from the parent opinionnaire indicated little evidence of specific strengths or weaknesses of children. Some health problems were identified, but little was said about academic readiness for kindergarten.

The results of the teacher's opinionnaire and comments given also coincided with the responses offered by parents. It could be seen that health problems were identified, and that children were a little more acquainted with teachers, but specific prescriptive measures were not taken.

A logical conclusion would be that teachers and administrators must have more and better training when determining the needs of the young child. First of all, a philosophy of the program must be well established before the testing can be done. If the program is worthwhile at all it is surely worth the time and effort necessary to develop guidelines not only for the implementation of the test but also for the use of the test results.

The second area of improvement would be to develop within the teacher a deep concern for the welfare of children. That is to say teachers must become more humanistic

and develop a keen sense of understanding of every child. The teacher must accept every child as a unique individual and his individuality needs to be strengthened, broadened, accepted and understood.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Amundson, Marion S. "A Preliminary Screening Program to Identify Functioning Strengths and Weaknesses in Pre-School Children," (Educational Thesis), Moorhead State College, Minnesota, August, 1972, pp.2-7.
- Bangs, Tina. Language and Learning Disorders of the Pre-Academic Child. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968.
- Bilka, Loisanne. An Evaluation of the Predictive Value of Certain Readiness Measures. (Paper presented at the meeting of the International Reading Association) Atlantic City, New Jersey, April, 1971, p. 2.
- Buktenica, Norman. "An Early Screening and Task-Learner Characteristic Model of Prevention," American Psychological Association, Miami, Florida, 1970, p. 1.
- Cole, Luella. A History of Education. New York: Rinehart and Company, 1956, pp. 568-569.
- Crosby, R. and Robert Liston. "Dyslexia: What You Can-And Can't Do About It." A Grade Teacher Notebook Reprint. Darien, Connecticut: Teachers Publishing Corporation, 1969.
- Deutsch, Martin, Irwin Katz, and Arthur R. Jenson. Social Class, Race and Psychological Development. Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1968.
- Hainsworth, Peter K. Development of Psychoneurologically-Oriented Screening Tests and Curriculum for the Disadvantaged Preschool Child. Meeting Street School. Providence, Rhode Island, 1969.
- Hanson, Irene. "The Use of Two Language Screening Tests with Kindergarten Children." Elementary English, November 1972, pp. 1102-1105.
- Harckman, Laura D. Multiple Prediction of Reading Achievement in Grades One Through Four Using Kindergarten Measures. (Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of The American Educational Research Association.) New York, February, 1971.

- Haring, N. and R. Schiefelbusch. Methods in Special Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- Hildreth, Gertrude H., Nellie L. Griffeths, and Mary E. McGauvran. Metropolitan Readiness Tests. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1965.
- Hirst, Wilma E. "Entrance Age A Predictor Variable for Academic Success?" The Reading Teacher, March, 1970, pp. 547-554.
- Hiroshen, Alfred. "A Comparison of the Predictive Validity of the Revised Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale and the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities," Exceptional Children, March, 1969.
- Jensen, Arthur. "How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement," Harvard Education Review, Winter, 1969.
- Jansky, J. The Prediction of Reading Failure for a Heterogeneous Group. Paper presented to the Orton Society.) October, 1969.
- Jenkins, Gladys G. These Are Your Children. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1963, p. 96.
- Kephart, William B. "Pre-Kindergarten Screening Clinics," Phi Delta Kappan, March, 1974, p. 459.
- King, Ethel M. "Beginning Reading: When and How?" The Reading Teacher, March, 1969, pp. 550-553.
- Miller, Wilma H. "Home Pre-Reading Experiences and First Grade Reading Achievement," The Reading Teacher, April, 1969, pp. 641-645.
- Minskoff, J. Gerald. "Understanding Learning Disabilities," Reading Forum. National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Bethesda, Maryland, 1971.
- Meyer, William J. "The Adaptive Behavior Rating Scale," Syracuse Center for Research and Development in Early Childhood Education, Syracuse University, New York, 1972, p. 2.
- Myklebust, H. R. Picture Story Language Test. New York: Grune and Stratton, Inc., 1968.

- Reger, Roger (ed.) Pre-School Programming of Children With Learning Disabilities. Springfield: Thomas, 1970.
- Ruch, Floyd L. Psychology and Life. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1963, pp. 327-330.
- School Laws of Nebraska, Fifteenth Unicameral Edition (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1971), p. 230.
- Wilds, Elmer H. The Foundations of Modern Education. New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1958, pp. 454-455.
- Zike, Victor M. "Not All Five Year Olds Are Ready For School," Nations Schools, June, 1968, pp. 39-41.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

KINDERGARTEN ROUNDUP PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

- | | (YES) | (NO) |
|---|-------|-------|
| 1. Did you attend either of the evening meetings held in January or February? | _____ | _____ |
| 2. If you attended, did you find the meetings helpful? | _____ | _____ |
| 3. Did you feel the week-long Kindergarten Roundup was beneficial? | _____ | _____ |
| 4. Do you prefer having the Roundup held in:

_____ late April or early May.

_____ after school is dismissed approximately the first week in June. | | |
| 5. Did you feel the parent conference following the Roundup was beneficial? | _____ | _____ |
| 6. Since your child had the opportunity to attend Roundup a week last spring, would you be willing to have your child remain at home for a week this school year so other preschoolers can have the same opportunity? | _____ | _____ |

APPENDIX B

KINDERGARTEN ROUNDUP TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

We would appreciate your help in evaluating last year's Kindergarten Roundup.

Please complete by Monday, February 12.

1. Did you feel the evening meetings held in January and February last year were beneficial? _____ If yes, why? If no, why not?
2. Did you prefer the half-day Roundup or the week-long Roundup? Why?
3. Cite examples of children you feel were especially helped by an extensive roundup.
4. Are there any specific things that you were able to do during school this year that were made possible by having a more extensive roundup?
5. Do you feel the evaluation used was accurate in getting to know children's strengths and weaknesses? Yes _____
No _____ Why or why not?
6. What changes would you recommend to make our Roundup better this year?

APPENDIX C

P R E - K I N D E R G A R T E N S C R E E N I N G

Child's Name _____ Birthdate _____
 Address _____ Sex F _____ M _____
 Parent's Name _____ Phone No. _____
 School _____ Date of Evaluation _____

Results of Screening

<u>Developmental Areas</u>	<u>Approximate Rate of Readiness*</u>		
I. Physical Development			
A. Vision	3	2	1
B. Hearing and Oral Cavity	3	2	1
II. Sensory Motor Development and General Information	3	2	1
III. Auditory & Visual percep- tion and Language Develop- ment	3	2	1
IV. Psycho-Social Development			
A. Teacher	3	2	1
B. Observer	3	2	1
V. Speech Development (Optional)	3	2	1
Average Approximate Readiness Score	3	2	1

*3 - Reasonably Assured

2 - Questionable

1 - Unlikely

PARENT CONFERENCE REPORT

Child's Name _____ Date _____

Conference Attended By: _____

General Recommendation To Be Made:

Results of Conference:

I. PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT

Child's Name _____ Date _____

Evaluator (s) _____

A. Vision Screening

Pass _____

Recheck _____

Comments:

Recommendations for Home:

Recommendations for school:

Evaluator's Appraisal of Readiness:

Readiness Reasonable Assured _____

Readiness Questionable _____

Readiness Unlikely _____

B. Hearing Screening

Pass _____

Recheck _____

Audiometric Screening - Air Conduction - ASA Calibration

	125	250	500	750	1000	1500	2000	3000	4000	6000	8000
Rt. Ear											
Lt. Ear											

Comments:

C. Oral Cavity

Tonsils _____ Roof _____

Tongue _____ Teeth _____

Nose _____

Comments:

D. Note any physical difficulties, notable illnesses or abnormalities which may contribute to learning or school problems:

Recommendations for Home:

Recommendations for School:

Evaluator's Appraisal of Readiness:

Readiness Reasonably Assured _____

Readiness Questionable _____

Readiness Unlikely _____

II. SENSORY-MOTOR DEVELOPMENT AND GENERAL INFORMATION

Child's Name _____ Date _____

Evaluator('s) _____

- 4 - Outstanding
- 3 - Average
- 2 - Poor
- 1 - Refused

A. Sensory-Motor Development

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Child is able to grasp pencil with ease
Note hand used: _____ | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 2. A. Child is able to identify circle from example. | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| B. Child is able to draw circle from example. | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 3. A. Child is able to identify square from example. | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| B. Child is able to draw square from example. | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 4. A. Child is able to identify triangle from example. | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| B. Child is able to draw triangle from example. | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 5. Child is able to draw a simple picture of a person. | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 6. Child is able to color within boundaries. | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 7. Child is able to cut out picture. | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 8. Child is able to paste object in proper position. | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 9. Child is able to trace between lines. | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 10. Child is able to print his first name. | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 11. Child is able to copy letters and numbers. | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

B. General Information

- | | | | | |
|--|-----|----|---|---|
| 1. Child can identify himself by name,
(first and last) sex and age | | | | |
| Knows first name | yes | no | | |
| Knows last name | yes | no | | |
| Knows sex | yes | no | | |
| Knows age | yes | no | 4 | 3 |
| | | | | 2 |
| | | | | 1 |
| 2. Child knows parents' name, address
and phone number | | | | |
| Knows parents' name | yes | no | | |
| Knows address | yes | no | | |
| Knows phone number | yes | no | 4 | 3 |
| | | | | 2 |
| | | | | 1 |
| 3. Child is able to distinguish between
left and right | | | 4 | 3 |
| | | | | 2 |
| | | | | 1 |
| 4. Child can point to his own body
parts | | | 4 | 3 |
| | | | | 2 |
| | | | | 1 |
| 5. Child has an awareness of his
senses and their functions | | | 4 | 3 |
| | | | | 2 |
| | | | | 1 |
| 6. Child can relate behavior in re-
mote or abstract terms | | | 4 | 3 |
| | | | | 2 |
| | | | | 1 |

Recommendations for Home:

Recommendations for School:

Other Comments:

Evaluator's Appraisal of Readiness:

Readiness Reasonably Assured _____
Readiness Questionable _____
Readiness Unlikely _____

III. AUDITORY AND VISUAL PERCEPTION AND LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

Child's Name _____ Date _____

Evaluator(s) _____

- 4 - Outstanding
- 3 - Average
- 2 - Poor
- 1 - Refused

A. Auditory-Perceptual Development

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Child is able to repeat up to a series of five digits. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 2. Child is able to hear basic differences in prefixes and suffixes of words. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 3. Child can understand simple commands | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 4. Child can understand what he hears. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 5. Child is able to see similarities and differences. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 6. Child is able to repeat simple sentences. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 7. Child is able to reproduce simple rhythm sequences. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 8. Child is able to hear soft whispers and understand the words. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 9. Child can imitate sounds. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

A, B. Visual-Perceptual Development

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Child is able to visually discriminate between different and like objects. | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 2. Child knows colors and can match similar colored items. | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 3. Child can group similar objects. | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 4. Child can see relationships between objectives. | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 5. Visual tracking ability. | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

C. Language Development

1. Child can define words from basic vocabulary.	4	3	2	1
2. Child can see differences in weights of various objects.	4	3	2	1
3. Child has an understanding of general times of the day.	4	3	2	1
4. Child can group objects by size, shape, and color.	4	3	2	1
5. Child is able to use simple number combinations.	4	3	2	1
6. Child is able to understand concept of the longest, biggest, most and same.	4	3	2	1
7. Child can identify words describing positions in space.	4	3	2	1

Recommendations for Home:

Recommendations for School:

Comments:

Evaluator's appraisal of Readiness:

Readiness Reasonably Assured _____

Readiness Questionable _____

Readiness Unlikely _____

IV. PSYCHO-SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Child's Name _____ Date _____

Evaluator(s) _____

- 4 - Outstanding
- 3 - Average
- 2 - Poor
- 1 - Refused

1. Child is developing a definite positive self concept.	4	3	2	1
2. Child exhibits independence.	4	3	2	1
3. Child is even tempered with stable responses to daily events.	4	3	2	1
4. Child seldom cries.	4	3	2	1
5. Child is not self conscious with adults.	4	3	2	1
6. Child initiates communication with peers.	4	3	2	1
7. Child can share activities or possessions.	4	3	2	1
8. Child is able to alter his behavior to fit various play situations.	4	3	2	1
9. Child demonstrates willingness to join in group activities.	4	3	2	1
10. Child is eager and energetic in activities.	4	3	2	1
11. Child is able to postpone behavioral gratification.	4	3	2	1
12. Child recovers from anger or other emotional episodes.	4	3	2	1
13. Child is creative and original in activities.	4	3	2	1
14. Child accepts responsibility to take care of bathroom needs.	4	3	2	1

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15. Child has attention span appropriate for his age. | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 16. Child is able to follow directions given him. | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

Recommendations for Home:

Recommendations for School:

Other Comments:

Evaluator's Appraisal of Readiness:

Readiness Reasonably Assured _____

Readiness Questionable _____

Readiness Unlikely _____

V. SPEECH DEVELOPMENT

Child's Name _____ Date _____

Evaluator(s) _____

A. Articulation

Comments:

B. Voice Quality - Pitch - Loudness

Comments:

C. Rhythm

Comments:

D. Other

Comments:

Evaluator's Appraisal of Readiness:

Readiness Reasonably Assured _____

Readiness Questionable _____

Readiness Unlikely _____