DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 393 089 CS 012 407

AUTHOR DeMarco, Karen
TITLE Private School versus Public School Kindergarten and Its Effects on First Grade Reading Achievement.
PUB DATE 96
NOTE 43p.; M.A. Project, Kean College of New Jersey.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Undetermined (040) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; Grade 1; Kindergarten; Primary Education; *Private Schools; *Public Schools; *Reading Achievement; *Reading Readiness; Reading Research; Reading Skills
IDENTIFIERS Irvington Township School District NJ; Teacher Surveys

ABSTRACT

A study examined the hypothesis that there would be no significant difference in first-grade reading achievement, in the first half of the school year, between children who attended kindergarten at an academic/formal type public school and children who attended kindergarten in an intellectual/experimental type private school. Subjects of the study were 29 first-grade students in an Irvington, New Jersey, public elementary school: group A had attended public kindergarten and group B had attended private kindergarten. A survey was completed by their first-grade teachers to compare reading readiness skills achieved by students. Results of the survey revealed that the majority of students in group A had mastered the reading readiness skills and group B students had mastered 5 out of 20 of these skills. Students were given a pretest and a posttest. Findings concluded that, although there was a mean difference, it was not shown to be significant in either test. Related research examined concepts underlying kindergarten education and evaluative testing practices. (Contains 30 references and 6 tables of data. Five appendixes contain additional data and the survey instrument.) (CR)

Private School versus Public School Kindergarten and its Effects on First Grade Reading Achievement

by
Karen DeMarco

In Partial Fulfillment of the requirements for the
Master of Arts
Kean College of New Jersey
1996

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to compare public school and private school kindergarten programs to determine their effect on first grade reading achievement.

Twenty-nine first grade students in an urban, public elementary school completed a reading pretest in September, and a reading post-test in January. One-half of these students attended a private kindergarten and one-half attended kindergarten in a public school.

It was concluded that there was not a significant difference between both groups on the pretest, and on the post-test.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My deepest gratitude and appreciation is extended to my husband John for his understanding and encouragement during this educational endeavor. To my son, John Anthony, for his patience and cocperation during this time. To my parents, for their pride in what I have accomplished.

I would also like to thank Dr. Lillian Putnam for her direction and inspiration, and Dr. Albert Mazurkiewicz his professional help and guidance.

Table of Contents

LIST OF TABLES

Kindergarten education is the focus of a growing surge of concerns regarding the curriculum, teaching methods, and demands on young children (Peck, McCaig, & Sapp. 1988; Charlesworth, 1989). All states support kindergarten education, although only eight states mandate attendance.

More than three million children, 90 percent of the children in the United States, attend kindergarten (Spodek, 1985). Demographers predict that before the end of this century, children who grew up in poverty will constitute a significant portion of the population of the United States (Hodgkinson, 1988). At the same time, increasing cultural diversity and changing work patterns, with varied definitions of what constitutes a family, suggest that school, particularly kindergarten, may be one of the most stable, nurturant features in the lives of many children. This being the case, there is a need to develop kindergarten programs that are both culturally sensitive and intellectually stimulating (Fromberg, 1989).

Society expects kindergartens to prepare future adults who can adapt efffectively to a complex and unpredictable world. Research on kindergarten and early childhood education should help kindergarten teachers and administrators in this work. Many kindergarten studies, however, lack reference to classroom organization and curriculum content. Some have looked at attitudes of parents and teachers. Most studies note that teachers in half-day programs feel rushed. Few studies focus on attitudes of

children, although there is increasing study of social competence (Gullo, 1986; Humphreys, 1988; Puleo, 1988).

Kindergarten curriculums are changing. In recent years, kindergartens have become more academic/formal and less intellectual/experiential (Fromberg, 1989). In many places, the kindergarten curriculum has come to resemble a first grade curriculum. What happens when children are unable to "pass" this type of kindergarten? Many times they are placed in the first grade the following year, even though they have not mastered the skills that were taught in kindergarten. Reading achievement in the first grade becomes difficult.

Children who attend intellectual/experiential kindergarten and then attend academic/formal first grade may also have difficulty in reading achievement in the first grade.

To add information on this topic, a comparison of kindergarten programs in both public schools, and private schools should be made to determine which have academic/formal or intellectual/experimental curricula, and to determine the effects of each on achievement.

HYPOTHESIS:

This study will undertake one such comparison. The hypothesis for this study is that there would be no significant difference in first grade reading achievement, in the first half of the school year, between children who attended kindergarten at an academic/formal public school

type and children who attended kindergarten in a private school, intellectual/experimental type.

PROCEDURES:

A first grade heterogeneous class, consisting of 32 students, at a public elementary school in Irvington, New Jersey were the subjects of this study.

In September these students were administered a reading readiness test (Macmillan Connections reading series, 1989 Level R, form B). This pre-test assessed phonics/decoding, vocabulary, and comprehension. In January these students were adminstered a post-test , the Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests-Revised G, 1987, which assessed visual-auditory learning, letter identification, word identification, word attack, word comprehension (antonyms, synonyms, and analogies) and passage comprehension. In the results of this study, Group A refers to students who attended public school kindergarten, and Group B refers to students who attended private school kindergarten.

A survey was given to the first grade teachers in the public school where the subjects of this study attended. The survey compared Group A and Group B in regard to the reading readiness skills achieved by these students upon entry in the first grade.

A survey was also given to the private schools Group B attended in kindergarten. The survey questions included the average number of children in a class, the number of

kindergarten classes in the school, the number of teachers and teacher's aides per class, the certification level of the teachers and aides,the number of years teaching experience they held, and if their kindergarten classes were full-day or half-day. The same survey was also given to the teachers in the public school where Group A attended. The results were analyzed for differences.

Results

As indicated in Table I, there was a mean difference in the pretest between Group A and Group B. This difference was not significant as shown by a *t* of 0.91.

Table 1

Means, Standard Deviation as t of the Pretest Results

	Mean	S.D.	*t*	Sig.
Group A (Public)	33.93	5.36	0.91	N.S.
Group B (Private)	31.85	6.78		

Tables II, III, IV, and V indicate the results of the four parts of the post-test.

As indicated in Table II, there was a mean difference in the results of the Word Identification Test between Group A and Group B. This difference was not significant as shown by a t of .35.

Table II

Means, Standard Deviation as of t of the Word Identification Post-test Results

	Mean	S.D.	t	Sig.
Group A (Public)	59.73	18.64	.35	N.S.
Group B (Private)	57.21	20.58		

As indicated by the means in Table III, there was a slight difference between Group A and Group B on the Word Attack section of the post-test. This difference was not significant as shown by a t of .48.

Table III

Means, Standard Deviation as of t of the Word Attack Post-test Results

	Mean	S.D.	t	Sig.
Group A (Public)	39.60	17.69	.48	N.S.
Group B (Private)	36.00	22.72		

Table IV indicates a mean difference between Group A and Group B on the Word Comprehension section of the post-test. However, this difference was not significant as shown by a t of -.46.

Table IV

Means, Standard Deviation as of t of the Word Comprehension Post-test Results

	Mean	S.D.	t	Sig.
Group A (Public)	60.47	15.69	-.46	N.S.
Group B (Private)	63.21	16.67		

As indicated in Table V, there was slight mean difference between Group A and Group B on the Passage Comprehension section of the post-test. As shown by a t of -.08, this difference was not significant.

Table V

Means, Standard Deviation as of t of the Passage Comprehension Post-test Results

	Mean	S.D.	t	Sig.
Group A (Public)	43.40	15.52	-.08	N.S.
Group B (Private)	43.93	18.94		

Kindergarten teachers in both public and private schools completed a survey on kindergarten classes in their school. Private schools had a slightly higher average number of students per class, but there wer less kindergarten classes in each school. Both public and private schools had the same number of teachers per class, but private schools had less teacher aides. All teachers are certified to teach

kindergarten; only two private schools hav teacher aides who are certified. The public school teachers had an average of 7.5 years experience, while the private school teachers had 8 years. All private schools have a full-day program, while the public school has a half-day program.

Table VI

Survey of Kindergarten Classes in Public and Private Schools

		Private Schools:									
	Public	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
Question 1:	22	24	26	25	20	25	23	22	26	21	24	25
Question 2:	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Question 3:	1 2	1 0	3 1	1 2	1 1	1 0	1 0	1 0	1 1	1 1	1 1	1 1
Question 4:	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Question 5:	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Question 6:	12 3	2	5 7 12	15	10	8	6	1	3	9	10	11
Question 7:	H	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F

The first grade teachers in the public school completed a survey which compared Group A and Group B in regard to the reading readiness skills achieved by these students. The majority of students in Group A have mastered these skills, while the majority of students in Group B have mastered 5 out of 20 of them.

CONCLUSIONS

At the inception of this study, it was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference in first grade reading achievement, in the first half of the school year, between children who attended kindergarten at an academic/formal public school, and children who attended kindergarten at an intellectual/experimental private school. The hypothesis of this study was found acceptable because the results were statistically not significant.

The results of the pretest (which was given in September) indicated a slight mean difference between Sample A and Sample B. However, in a survey completed by the first grade teachers in the public school where this study was conducted, the majority of students in Sample A had mastered all twenty of the reading readiness skills in the kindergarten curriculum while the majority of students in Sample B had only mastered five of them. The pretest did not assess all twenty of these skills; if it had, the results may have been different.

During the course of this study, all students followed the same reading curriculum, were exposed to identical reading materials, and received the same instruction from the classroom teacher. The post-test results indicate a slight mean difference between Sample A and Sample B on all four

parts of the test; however, the difference was not significant.

Kindergarten teachers in the private schools where Sample B attended, and public school teachers who work in the school where Sample A attended completed a survey (Appendix C) in regard to class size, number of classes, teacher/student ratio, number of teacher aides, certification levels, experience level, and the type of kindergarten program in their respective school (full day or half-day). The results of this survey indicate similiar findings. The average class consists of twenty-two students in the public school, and an average of twenty-four students in the private schools. All classes have one teacher; however, only seven out of eleven private schools have teacher aides, while all classes in the public school have one aide per class.

This survey also indicates that all private schools have full day kindergarten programs, while the public school has a half-day program for all of it's classes. It must be pointed out that both the pretest and post-test results were not significant even though the students in Sample A attended kindergarten only half the time that Sample B did. The emphasis on academics in the public school successfully prepared these children for first grade.

Educators today need to become more aware of the effects of kindergarten curriculum and programs. With more and more children attending school at ages three and four, kindergarten can and should become more academic in order for

there to be a higher success rate in first grade reading achievement. Future research needs to examine these programs, and to determine what is really best for the children.

KINDERGARTEN EDUCATION: RELATED LITERATURE

As kindergartens have become an almost universal experience for American children, there is a need to rethink the concepts underlying kindergarten education. Child development research and theory can help educators understand what young children can know. What children need to know is determined by what society thinks is important. Kindergartens have taught children various things at different times. Kindergarten programs that have developed from diverse traditions also teach young children different things. Educators today need to make explicit what they believe children should learn in kindergarten. Kindergarten programs can be responsive to children's developmental levels while emphasizing cultural knowledge and the foundations of academic scholarship. Such programs should be evaluated both in terms of their developmental appropriateness and in relation to their educational worth to the children taught and communities served (Spodek, 1988).

In recent years, early childhood educators have increasingly frowned on the practice of delaying kindergarten for a year, usually until the child is six rather than five. But while most experts agree the strategy does not really help in the long run and might be harmful, it remains ever popular (Newsweek,1995).

According to Barbara Willer, a spokeswoman for the National Association for the Education of Young Children, it is typically done with the best of intention, but it is a misguided approach. Parents who do it are concerned that their children aren't ready or will somehow benefit from being held out a year. But the research is pretty clear that there are no long-term positive effects, and there may in fact be negative effects. The basic recommendation is to fix the school program, not the child (New York Times, 1995).

Shepard and Smith, professors of research and statistics at the University of Colorado at Boulder, researched programs that gave children an extra year to prepare for school and found no educational gains. In their 1987 study, forty children from extra-year classes were compared with forty from schools that did not offer such programs. When both groups had finished first grade, the extra-year students showed a one-month advantage in reading scores but no difference in math or in ratings of things like maturity. Parents also reported that the extra-year children had poorer attitudes toward school (New York Times, 1995).

In increasing numbers, school districts are adding an additional year at the outset of children's school careers, instituting extensive policies of kindergarten retention, and establishing prekindergarten "readiness" programs for children deemed "not ready" for traditional

school-entry programs. Typically, the decision to place children in these programs are based on the inappropriate use of tests.

Previously, when teachers sought to evaluate children in child-centered programs, readiness and standardized tests were criticized as irrelevant and unhelpful. But now testing has become much more prevalent in public schools generally and in kindergarten in particular.

It is the schools, not the children, that have changed, partly in response to demands for accountability. The pressure for teachers at each grade level to be held accountable has resulted in " academic trickle-down," a major influence on teachers in earlier grades. Their decisions about what and how to teach are strongly influenced by the need for their students to perform well in the next grade level, as indicated in part by test results. In other words, teachers are very likely to shape the instruction to match a test's specific focus (Meisels, 1989).

In 1988, in the state of Georgia, legislation was passed requiring a statewide test for kindergarten promotion. The paper-and-pencil, normed-referenced test was used to determine first grade readiness. Perhaps those who passed legislation were not aware of the preschool foundations needed for formal and academic first grade work. Other states

have contemplated similar legislative action.

Many elementary school leaders believe this would be a step in the wrong direction. In a study conducted by Glickman and Pellegrini (1988), the results of a two-year longitudinal study showed that the major predictor of first grade success is not determined by written test scores, but by the social competence of children demonstrated in interactive, peer-group settings.

Glickman and Pellegrini studied thirty-five kindergartners in an elementary school located in a small southern city. In the second year, they worked with twenty-four of those children as first graders. (The others had transferred.) To measure social competence- children's adaptation to their environment- they examined playground behavior of kindergarten children, including passive non-interactive, passive interactive, and adult-directed play, locomotion, rough-and-tumble play, object play, aggression, and games-with-rules.

Popularity was measured as determined by children's nomination of peers, and they used Rutter's Children's Behavior Questionnaire (teacher's ratings of antisocial and neurotic behavior) and the Metropolitan Readiness Test (a standardized measure of achievement). The same measures were taken in the first grade, except that the state's first grade criterion-referenced test (CRT) in reading and mathematics

was also used.

The goal of this study was to find out what information actually does predict academic success in first grade, as defined by CRT scores. Glickman and Pellegrini wanted to prove or dispute the state policy makers' argument that if test score performance in first grade is a valid measure of success, kindergarten test scores should predict first grade test scores.

Glickman and Pellegrini found that kindergartners' scores on the Metropolitan Readiness Test predicted only 34 percent of the variance in first grade performance, compared to 58 percent of the variance accounted for by measures of social competence, popularity, and teacher rating. Combining these social measures with readiness scores, however, provided over 90 percent accuracy. They found that certain social dimensions significantly predict specific first grade test performance.

Although this was a small. one-school study, it reinforces the findings of similar studies indicating that young children are not reliable paper-and-pencil test takers and that other measures of competence need to be observed. For example, it has been shown that children's ability to negotiate roles in socio-dramatic games promotes the use of language and is an indicator of later literacy achievement (Pellegrini, Galda,and Rubin 1984). Childhood behavior plays a significant role in correctly determining first grade

readiness and, in crder to adequately assess children's competence, we need to know as much as we can about them as unique developmental beings (Glickman and Pellegrini, 1988).

Bernard Spodek, Ed.D., professor of early childhood education at the University of Illinois states that five-year olds today have basically the same abilities that five-year olds had decades ago. What's changed is the kindergarten curriculum, which, unfortunately, in many places has come to resemble a first grade curriculum. When the curriculum gets too tough, kids fail.Children who fail a first grade type kindergarten are very often made to repeat the same program, or are placed in a transitional kindergarten (Marzollo,1990).

No matter how such retention decisions are explained to children and parents, the stigma of failure attaches itself in some degree to the child who is held back. Thus, the notion of failure is introduced into the life of children and their family at just the critical time when the children need to experience school success and their parents need to be thrilled with their children's imaginative paintings, clay creations and stories.

Shepard and Smith (1994) found that kindergarten children do not benefit academically if held back and may even be harmed socially and in terms of their self-esteem. Head Start and special education research have demonstrated that children do better in rich, challenging kindergartens.

Children just need age-appropriate programs (Spodek, 1990).

State legislators became alarmed by studies saying that American children were not as well educated as their peers in other countries. They demanded more accountability from schools. Some state legislatures even passed laws mandating specific curriculum goals for each grade level and requiring children to be tested and retained in the same grade if they couldn't meet those goals. According to Finn (1989), clear minimum standards at every grade level ensure that children who can meet them will go on to the next level.

If a state mandates kindergarten testing, that state has to use tests that are given under the same conditions to everyone- standardized tests. This presents many problems for young children, who very often test badly due to short attention spans, fidgeting, etc.

According to Meisels, there is no reliable and valid standardized achievement test for kindergarteners.For other grades maybe; but not for kindergartens. The evidence does not support the use of standardized achievement tests for kindergarten placement.

The state of Georgia, in the 1987-1988 school year, used McGraw-Hill Inc.'s California Achievement Test (CAT) to determine grade promotions for the following school year. Of 88,000 kindergarteners, about 12.5 percent were retained in the spring of 1988. That was about 11,000 children flunking kindergarten.

Another problem with standardized tests for kindergartners is that when they are used for such critical purposes as grade placement, they begin to dictate the content of the kindergarten curriculum. Those skills that are easiest to measure and least time-consuming to test become the most prevalent items on the test and, subsequently, often become the most dominant segments of the kindergarten curriculum. The ability to build a firehouse with blocks and tell an imaginative story about it can't be quantified on a standardized test, so the age-appropriate blocks are put away and workbooks take their place (Marzollo, 1990).

As kindergarten attendance has become nearly universal, and more than half of all children now enter kindergarten with prior early childhood education experience, disagreements have arisen about what kindergarten education should include. Some educators see kindergarten as primarily a socializing experience, allowing children to adjust to life in the elementary school. Others believe that kindergartens should focus more on teaching academic skills.

In 1926, Hill defined the three functions of the kindergarten: to minister to the nature and needs of children from four-to-six years of age, to look forward to the nature and needs of children as they develop through the sixth year, to look backward to the home, studying the experiences and types of learning which have taken place there. Reflecting o

Hill's summation, Greenberg (1987) stated that in terms of Professor Hill's goals and in terms of the developmental appropriateness as the National Association of the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) sees it, the American kindergarten movement seems to have gravely regressed.

Parents have voiced concerns about the nature of local kindergarten programs. Some prod kindergarten programs to do more, to give children a head start on the first grade curriculum. Others rebuke kindergartens for trying to do too much, for putting academic pressures on children too soon. Such conflicting demands are partly the result of the mixed messages that parents have received from dissenting "experts".

Competing conceptions of kindergarten education, sometimes characterized as academic versus developmental kindergartens, or child-centered versus content-centered kindergartens, reflect different ideologies. One ideology conceives of early childhood education as supporting children's personal development, with education following development. The other ideology view early childhood education as supporting children's learning and is concerned with teaching content (Spodek, 1988).

As more and more schools attempt to meet new standards for early childhood education put forward by the National Association for the Education of Young Children and other organizations, an added responsibility falls on the shoulders

of principals who must supervise these programs. In a study conducted by the Educational Research Service in 1986, 85 percent of the elementary principals surveyed maintained that academic achievement in kindergarten was of primary importance in their schools. This suggests that already at five years of age children are being pressured to perform.

Expecting children to meet a prescribed standard or to perform on assignments that do not consider their level of ability results in pressure for the wrong kinds of achievement. Young children must understand the function of print as well as the forms of print. They must realize that print gives a message and that the message may inform or give pleasure. When the form becomes too important, then the child can be discouraged from discovering the function of print (Barbour, 1989).

Searcy (1988) points out how we continue to drop our fledgling readers and writers from the " literacy club." Children's attempts at literacy are very often encouraged and rewarded by their parents; children believe they can read and write. When they enter school, they are told they cannot read because they are unable to read the materials presented to them. When they first come to school, most children have had some literacy experiences and know something about the reading and writing process. Instead of determining what children do know and building on that knowledge, teachers in all to many classrooms insist that children must learn to

read and write using one method and one standard. Though there are classrooms and teachers who do not practice such a philosophy, Durkin (1987) found that, in spite of all the rhetoric about the importance of individual differences, most kindergarten classes used whole-class instruction.

With pressure on schools to accomplish more earlier and to provide child-care services in addition to education, kindergartens have been forced to adapt. The extension of public kindergarten education into new parts of the country during the past fifteen years is one manifestation of those influences. In addition, traditional half-day programs have been lengthened so that twenty-two states now support local varieties of extended-day and all day kindergarten programs, compared with one state in 1974 (Robinson, 1984).

According to the Bureau of the Census count, in 1989, about 40 percent of the nation's four million kindergartners attended school all day, up from about 31 percent in 1980 (Newsweek, 1989). Six states and the District of Columbia have passed laws requiring their schools to offer full-day kindergarten. Several other states are considering similar proposals as are hundreds of local school districts across the country.

Although early childhood educators argue that three is the ideal age for school, kindergarten is still considered the disposable grade. Only eleven states and the District of

Columbia mandate it; twenty-six others provide it only on demand (Newsweek, 1995).

In 1990, the U.S. Census Bureau predicted that school enrollment would drop by about 1 percent by the year 2025. Currently, six million more children are attending school now than were ten years ago. From 1980 to 1993, kindergarten enrollment alone rose by 22 percent.

With the expanding job opportunities, social change, and the need for additional income many mothers of preschool and kindergarteners are placing their children in nursery and preschools so that they can enter the work force. These preschool and day-care experiences have evolved from supervised play and child care facilities to learning centers emphasizing the development of skills needed for success in school (Kear and Carruthers, 1983). Lofthouse states that many private kindergarten and day-care programs now focus on academics.

Parents have become more sensitive than ever to issues of quality in child care and early childhood education. The National Academy of Early Childhood Programs has developed a voluntary accreditation system for this purpose.

Accreditation takes place in three steps: a self-study process, an on-site visit by specially trained validators,and the accreditation decision by a commission of nationally recognized early childhood experts. All types of early

childhood programs can become accredited if they meet national criteria for high quality in the areas of curriculum,staff-child and staff-parent interactions, staff qualifications and development, administration, staffing, physical environment, health and safety, nutrition and food service, and evaluation.

The National Child Care Staffing Study (1989) explored how teachers and their working conditions affect the caliber of center-based child care preschools and kindergartens available in the United States today.This study concluded that the education of the teaching staff and the arrangement of their work environment are essential determinants of the quality of services children receive. The staff provided more sensitive and appropriate care-giving if they completed more years of formal education, received early childhood training at the college level, earned higher wages and better benefits, and worked in centers devoting a higher percentage of the operating budget to the teaching personnel. Too few teaching staff held competency-based credentials, such as CDA for these to be evaluated in the study.

This study also found that the most important predictor of the quality of care children receive, among the adult work environment variables, is staff wages. The quality of services provided by most centers was rated as barely adequate. Better quality centers had higher wages, better

adult work environments, better educated and trained staff, and more staff caring for fewer children.

Better quality centers were more likely to be operated on a nonprofit basis, to be accredited by the National Association for the Education of Young Children's National Academy of Early Childhood Programs, to be located in states with higher quality standards, and to meet adult-child ratios, group size, and staff training provisions contained in the 1980 Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements. In addition, teaching staff turnover had nearly tripled in the last decade from 15 percent in 1977 to 41 percent in 1988.

This study also concluded that children attending lower quality centers and centers with more staff turnover were less competent in language and social development. Children in centers with higher turnover rates spent less time engaged in social activities with peers and more time in aimless wandering. They also had lower Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test scores compared to children in centers with more stable teaching staff. Low and high-income children were more likely than middle-income children to attend centers providing higher quality care.

This year's Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup poll registered the largest one-year improvement in the grades given by the public to their local public schools since this question was first asked in 1974. "Students are often given the grades

A,B,C,D, and FAIL to denote the quality of their work. Suppose the public schools themselves, in this community, were graded in the same way. What grade would you give the public schools here- A,B,C,D,or FAIL?" The percentage of respondents awarding A's or B's jumped from 40 percent in 1992 to 47 percent in 1993, after nearly a decade of relative stability. College graduates in particular gave high ratings (54 percent A or B).

Ratings given the local public schools are as follows:

	A	B	C	D	F	?
National totals	10	37	31	11	4	7
Public school parents	12	44	28	12	4	-
Nonpublic school parents	5	32	41	9	11	2

Sixty percent of public school parents gave an A or B rating, while only thirty-seven percent of nonpublic school parents gave that rating.

The poll results also concluded that the public agrees with professionals that differences in funding from state to state and from district to district are largely responsible for the uneven quality of public education in America, and a 2-1 majority states a willingness to pay more taxes to bring schools in poorer states and communities up to standard.

Throughout our national history there has been substantial equivocation regarding the role of schooling in society and the responsibility of schools to very young

children. Educational expansionists-like many of their counterparts in early care and education-have argued that social, emotional, nutritional and health matters were central to the schools' mission, while equally ardent protagonists have claimed that schools needed to concentrate on pedagogical matters if they were to be effective.

Given to tenacity of the debate regarding the fundamentals of public schooling, it is hardly surprising that the new national educational goals have unleashed similar controversies. While the goals press the nation toward educational accountability, and clearly acknowledge the shared roles of schools and society for the betterment of the nation's children, they also suggest that effective schooling transcends cognition, and call attention to the full array of developmental variables, including physical, social, and emotional dimensions.

Although the research evidence seems unequivocal, additional research needs to be done to add to the body of literature and overcome decisions based on popularity, if, in fact we do believe education and the schools are for children.

REFERENCES

Barbour, N. (1989). Pressure to perform. Childhood Education. 65, 305-306.

Bowlus, F. (1986). Child care centers, preschools now being accredited. Young Children. 41, 34-35.

Boyer,E. (1991). Ready to learn: a seven-step strategy. Principal. 71, 13-15.

Cunningham, P., Hall, D., DeFee, M. (1991). Non-ability grouped multilevel instruction: a year in a first grade classroom. The Reading Teacher. 44, 566-571.

Delano, J. (1991). Supervising early childhood programs. Principal. 5, 23-24.

Elam,S., Rose,L.,Gallup,A. (1993). The 25th annual phi delta kappa/gallup poll. Phi Delta Kappa. 75, 137-152.

Freebody, P. (1995). Predicting reading achievement in the first year of schooling:a comparison of readiness tests and instructional programs. Journal of School Psychology. 23, 145-155.

Fromberg, D. (1991). Implementing the full day kindergarten. Principal. 71, 26-28.

Fromberg, D. (1989). Kindergarten: current circumstances affecting curriculum. Teachers College Record. 90, 392-403.

Glickman, C., Pellegrini, A. (1988). The case against kindergarten testing for promotion. Principal. 68, 34-35.

Granucci, P., (1990). Kindergarten teachers: working through our identity crisis. Young Children. 45, 6-11.

Hill, P.S. (1987). The function of kindergarten. Young Children. 42, 12-19.

Jalongo, M. (1986). What is happening in kindergarten? Childhood Education. 62, 154-160.

Kagan, S. (1991). Young children and education: first...and last. Principal. 71, 6-8

Lofthouse, R. (1994). The nuts and bolts of starting a tuition-based full-day kindergarten. The Education Digest 60, 54-56.

Kear, D. and Carruthers, B. (1983). The development and evaluation of a teacher training model for reading readiness. Reading Improvement. 20, 87-90.

McIntyre, E. (1992). Instruction meets learner: success of an inner-city learner in a traditional first grade classroom. Reading Horizons. 33, 3-17.

Meisels, S. (1989). High-stakes testing in kindergarten. The Education Digest. 55, 25-28.

Murzollo, J. (1990). Why kids flunk kindergarten. Parents. 65, 88-98.

Newsweek. (1989). From half day to full day. June 26, 1989. 62

Newsweek. (1995). The story rug is now full. April 3, 1995. 58.

The New York Times. (1995). Deciding if it's time for kindergarten or time to wait a year. July 20, 1995. C4.

Phi Delta Kappan. (1991). Reading tests and reading. Phi Delta Kappan. Research: May 1991. 72, 714-716.

Phi Delta Kappan. (1989). Quality counts in day care. Phi Delta Kappan. Research: January 1989. 70, 409-410.

Speece, D. and Cooper, D. (1990). Ontogeny of school failure: classification of first grade children. American Educational Research Journal. 27, 119-140.

Spodek, B. (1988). Conceptualizing today's kindergarten. The Elementary School Journal. 89, 203-211.

Whitebrook, M., Howes, C., Phillips, D. and Pemberton, C. (1989). Who cares? Child care teachers and the quality of care in America. Young Children. 44, 41-45.

Wiggins, R. (1994). Large group lesson/small group follow-up: Flexible grouping in a basal reading program. The Reading Teacher. 47, 450-459.

Williams, M. (1987). What do we does with "what do it does?" kindergarteners? Young Children. 42, 28-29.

Yore, L., Collis, B., and Ollila, L. (1988). Exploration of the predictive and concurrent validity of a global measure of cognitive development for grade one reading, mathematics, and writing achievement. Journal of Research and Development in Education. 21, 62-68.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Results of Pre-test, September 1995
Macmillan Connections Reading Series, 1989
Level R, Form B

Students in Sample A Public school	Raw score: Phonics/ Decoding 28 items	Raw score: Vocabulary/ Comprehension 12 items	Raw score: Total 40 items
Student A	23	9	32
Student B	27	9	36
Student C	25	7	32
Student D	22	10	32
Student E	21	8	29
Student F	11	8	19
Student G	28	11	39
Student H	28	11	39
Student I	21	9	30
Student J	27	12	39
Student K	28	10	38
Student L	24	12	36
Student M	28	9	37
Student N	26	7	33
Student O	27	11	38
Students: Sample B Private school			
Student P	24	12	36
Student Q	28	10	38
Student R	28	10	38
Student S	28	12	40
Student T	21	8	29
Student U	19	6	25
Student V	28	7	35
Student W	24	12	36
Student X	24	12	36
Student Y	18	6	24
Student Z	19	6	25
Student AA	16	5	21
Student BB	18	6	24
Student CC	27	12	39

Appendix B

Results of Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests, January 1996

Students: Sample A	Word Identification Raw Score:	Word Attack Raw Score:	Word Comprehension Raw Score:	Passage Comprehension Raw Score:
Student A	29	9	5	10
Student B	18	2	4	10
Student C	24	2	2	8
Student D	24	4	6	5
Student E	20	6	5	6
Student F	11	3	5	4
Student G	15	5	7	6
Student H	28	8	10	13
Student I	33	10	9	12
Student J	25	11	11	14
Student K	26	8	10	7
Student L	19	3	3	4
Student M	37	13	13	15
Student N	17	5	6	6
Student O	39	14	11	17
Sample B				
Student P	30	17	13	19
Student Q	21	5	6	9
Student R	22	1	3	3
Student S	35	8	11	13
Student T	31	14	13	14
Student U	12	0	3	2
Student V	17	2	9	5
Student W	28	8	10	9
Student X	30	7	8	12
Student Y	15	3	7	6
Student Z	23	5	9	10
Student AA	9	2	3	5
Student BB	19	6	5	8
Student CC	33	13	14	17

Appendix C

Kindergarten Survey

Please note: The following questions apply only to kindergarten classes.

1. What is the average number of children in a class?

_____

2. How many kindergarten classes are in your school?

_____

3. Indicate the number of teachers and teacher's aides in each class.

teachers:_____

aides:_____

4. Are the classroom teachers certified to teach kindergarten?

yes_____ no_____

5. Are the aides (or assistants) certified to teach kindergarten?

yes_____ no_____

6. Teachers: How many years have they taught in your school? _____
How many years have they taught (total)?

_____

7. Kindergarten: Full day or Half-day?

Full _____ Half_____

_____

Appendix D

Survey of Kindergarten Classes in Public and Private Schools

		Private Schools:									
	Public	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
Question 1:	22	24	26	25	20	25	23	22	26	21	24	25
Question 2:	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Question 3:	1 2	1 0	3 1	1 2	1 1	1 0	1 0	1 0	1 1	1 1	1 1	1 1
Question 4:	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Question 5:	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Question 6:	12 3	2	5 7 12	15	10	8	6	1	3	9	10	11
Question 7:	H	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F

Results:

Question 1: Average number of students in a class:
Public: 22
Private: 24

Question 2: Average number of kindergarten classes:
Public: 4
Private: 1

Question 3: Average number of teachers per class:
Public: 1
Private: 1
Average number of teacher aides per class:
Public: 2
Private: .72

Question 4: Are teachers certified to teach?
Public: Yes
Private: Yes

Question 5: Are teacher aides certified to teach?
Public: No
Private: No, in 9 schools.
Yes, in 2 schools.

Question 6: Teachers- Number of years in school:
Public: Average= 7 1/2
Private: Average= 8

Question 7: Kindergarten: Full day of Half-day?
Public: Half
Private: All were full day.

Appendix E

Sample A: Students who have attended public school in kindergarten.
Sample B: Students who have attended private school in kindergarten

Please indicate with an /x/ in each column if the majority of students in that group have demonstrated the ability to:

	Sample A	Sample B
1. Apply relationships spatial, visual, auditory	yes	no
2. Identify capital and lowercase letters.	yes	no
3. Recognize initial consonants, discriminate among and match initial consonant sounds and letters.	yes	no
4. Recognize initial consonant blends and digraphs.	yes	no
5. Recognize final consonants; discriminate among and match final consonant sounds/letters	yes	no
6. Discriminate among short vowel sounds.	yes	no
7. Recognize rhyming words.	yes	2 yes, 2 no
8. Define words in context.	yes	no
9. Label a picture.	yes	no
10. Describe a picture.	yes	3 yes, 1 no
11. Describe an experience.	yes	yes
12. Retell stories.	yes	yes
13. Determine sequence of events.	yes	1 yes, 3 no
14. Recall details that support a main idea.	yes	no
15. Predict outcomes.	yes	no
16. Classify and categorize.	yes	3 yes, 1 no
17. Respond to literature.	yes	no
18. Recognize sight vocabulary.	yes	no
19. Dictate sentences and stories.	yes	no
20. Follows oral directions.	yes	2 yes, 2 no