Effects of the Nurturing Curriculum on Social, Emotional, and Academic Behaviors in Kindergarten Classrooms

Jo Ellen Vespo
DeeAnn Capece
Bita Behforooz
Utica College

Abstract. Researchers and educators argue that social and emotional development affect academic success, and therefore should be targets for intervention. It is strongly suggested that such intervention begin during kindergarten. The purpose of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of the Nurturing Curriculum, which is designed to improve emotional and social behaviors in the classroom. Eight kindergarten teachers conducted the Nurturing Curriculum throughout the school year. Aggression, dominance, disruptive behavior, socially immature behavior, and academic immaturity decreased significantly over time. Prosocial behavior increased significantly over time. Comparison to a cohort not exposed to the Nurturing Curriculum indicated that these improvements are not simply due to normal developmental changes in emotional and social behaviors. Collectively, the emotional and social behaviors measured accounted for 82 percent of the variance in academic immaturity at the end of the school year. Thus, the Nurturing Curriculum positively influenced social, emotional, and academic behaviors in kindergarten classrooms.

School readiness is defined as including the readiness to learn specific content as well as the ability to be successful within the school context (Carlton & Winsler, 1999). According to Carlton and Winsler (1999), success in the school context depends on the interaction of a child's emotional, behavioral, linguistic, cognitive, motivational, and physical strengths and weaknesses. Consistent with Carlton and Winsler's

perspective, a report from the National Education Goals Panel report (Kagan, Moore, & Bredekamp, 1995) also identified several dimensions related to academic success: physical well-being and motor development; social and emotional development; approaches to learning (cognitive style); language development; and cognition and general knowledge. The present study focused on the social and emotional dimension. Kagan et al. (1995) identified self-concept, self-esteem, self-efficacy, self-awareness, ability to express one's feelings appropriately, empathy, and peer socialization as being key attributes of social and emotional behavior in the classroom. They further argued that these characteristics are malleable and therefore should be easily influenced by intervention programs.

A recent review of research by Raver (2002) confirms the relationship between social and emotional development and

academic outcomes. In fact, several recent longitudinal studies confirm a *causal* relationship between early social and emotional development and later academic success. More specifically, longitudinal studies have shown that antisocial behavior interferes with a child's ability to make friends, have positive relationships with teachers, and become involved in classroom activities. On the other hand, prosocial behavior allows the child to collaborate with others, develop a sense of belonging, and become engaged in classroom activities (Ladd, Birch, & Buhs, 1999; Ladd, Kochenderfer, & Coleman, 1997; Pettit, Bates, & Dodge, 1997; Wentzel & Caldwell, 1997). Raver's report further indicates that early intervention programs do have a positive influence on these behaviors (2002).

Therefore, developmental psychologists and educators argue that emotional and social behaviors must be targeted as key programming goals in education settings. It has been suggested that intervention should take place as early as kindergarten, because this represents a significant transitional year for children as they move from the home/child care environment to the school environment (Shore, 2002; Vecchiotti, 2003). La Paro, Kraft-Sayre, and Pianta (2003) report that children who experience success early in school are likely to be successful in subsequent years. The opposite is true for children who experience early difficulties. Despite the importance of the kindergarten year, educational policy regarding kindergarten curriculum is not consistent nationally (Vecchiotti, 2003). Vecchiotti (2003) advocates for the establishment of national standards for kindergarten based on developmental theory and research designed to enhance children's social skills as well as academic skills.

The Nurturing Curriculum, which is based on developmental theory and developmentally appropriate practice, is consistent with the standards described by Vecchiotti (2003). The curriculum targets emotional and social behaviors (Bavolek, 1988), and is designed to enhance self-esteem and self-

concept; increase both awareness of one's own needs as well as empathy for others' needs; teach communication, problem-solving, and negotiation skills; and help children to develop nonviolent means of expressing anger and frustration. These are the same emotional and social behaviors identified by Kagan et al. (1995) as being related to academic success. Teachers implement the lessons as part of the regular class curriculum. A separate curriculum exists for grades K-12 (Bavolek, 1988). Black and Dubowitz (1999) noted that although the nurturing programs are theoretically sound, they must be evaluated for their effectiveness. To date, no such empirical evaluation of the Nurturing Curriculum exists (S. J. Bavolek, personal communication, January 26, 2005). Therefore, the purpose of the present study was to evaluate the effect of the Nurturing Curriculum on emotional, social, and academic behaviors in kindergarten classrooms.

Method
Participants
Children and teachers from an inner-city school district in the northeastern United States participated. The deputy superintendent chose 2 of the 9 elementary schools in the district to participate because she considered these to be the most similar in socioeconomic status and ethnic diversity, and she believed that the principals and teachers would be interested in participating in the study. The percentage of children eligible for a free lunch in each school (76.6 percent and 83.4 percent) indicates the relative poverty of this district. The schools are ethnically diverse, with the following percentage of children in each category: white: 54.2 percent, 56.5 percent; Hispanic: 11.7 percent, 10.5 percent; African American: 28.9 percent, 30.6 percent; and Asian: 5.3 percent, 2.5 percent. The city has a sizeable refugee population, resulting in approximately 23 percent of the children being English as a second language learners (ESL). Eight kindergarten classes, all 5 in one school and all 3 in the second

school, participated. At the start of the school year, the average class size was 23.8 students (range 22-28). Behavior ratings were collected prior to implementation of the Nurturing Curriculum (October), at midyear (January), and at the end of the academic year (June) for 135 children (65 males and 70 females). School district policy requires that children be 5 years of age by December 1st of the year the child enters kindergarten.

Five of the teachers were experienced kindergarten teachers. One teacher was an experienced Head Start teacher who was teaching kindergarten for the first time. The other two teachers were recent college graduates who were teaching for the first time.

Procedure

Training and Materials. During August, the executive director of the Family Nurturing Center of Central NY, Inc., conducted a two-day workshop. This workshop focused on the philosophy and themes of the nurturing program, as well as on the Nurturing Curriculum. Teachers were given an opportunity to review the curriculum, demonstrate the implementation of one lesson from the curriculum, and receive feedback. Six of the teachers completed the training, and two only attended for one day. One of these two had received an abbreviated training in the Nurturing Curriculum in the previous year. Each teacher received the Teacher's Activities Manual for the kindergarten "Developing Nurturing Skills" Curriculum.

The Nurturing Curriculum lessons are designed to take about 20 minutes to administer, and they include both informational and experiential components (e.g., role play, discussion) and, typically, a home review/ practice as well. The kindergarten curriculum consists of 71 lessons targeting self-image, self-awareness, appropriate expression of feelings, empathy, communication skills, and appropriate peer interaction. Examples of lessons include: "Classroom Rules," "Self-Concept & Self-Esteem," "Choices & Consequences," "Friends," "Expressing Myself-Communication," "Feelings: What Are They?," "Empathy," and "Problem Solving & Negotiation." The teacher conducts the lessons with the class as a group and the participation of each individual child is strongly encouraged. To illustrate the lessons, two examples are provided. For the "Classroom Rules" lesson, children begin by each stating one thing that they like about the class. Then the children brainstorm and generate classroom rules. Next, they draw a picture of the rule to place on a mural of classroom rules to be hung on the wall. In the "Problem Solving & Negotiation" lesson, children sit in pairs, facing each other, while pulling on their end of a towel, for 30 seconds. The teacher discusses how pulling on the towel is like having an argument, with each person thinking that he/she is right and the other person is wrong. Then the teacher discusses how problem solving means finding a solution. The children are instructed to say: "We have a problem. The problem is: (we both want the towel at the same time)." Next, the children brainstorm and generate solutions to the problem. Finally, the teacher discusses the idea that negotiation involves working together to solve a problem (Bavolek, Weinbergr, & Smith, 1992).

Implementation and Evaluation. Teachers were asked to follow the curriculum in the order provided in the manual and to complete two lessons per week, so that the 71 lessons would be distributed consistently throughout the academic year. Lessons were conducted in each classroom independently. Teachers were free to choose the days and times for implementing the lessons. The schedule could vary from week to week. A journal was provided to each teacher to record the lesson number, when it was conducted, and the teacher's feedback regarding the lesson.

A graduate student from the education program at Utica College served as a participant-observer during the study. She was present in each classroom for half a day (in the mornings for 3 classes and in the after-

noons for 5 classes) each week throughout the school year. She assisted in each classroom during regularly planned activities, not including the Nurturing Curriculum lessons. Based on her observations, she rated the children's behavior on a modified version of the Teacher Checklist of Social Behavior (see Coie & Dodge, 1988, for the original). The scale was modified in the following way. Based on teachers' objections, the attraction subscale was not included. Also, the item "This child is good at games and sports, a good athlete" was dropped from the prosocial scale, because the observer did not have the opportunity to observe these activities. Furthermore, items regarding math and reading skills were dropped from the academic ability subscale because the assistant was not able to observe these characteristics frequently enough to make a valid judgment. We also did not have access to any documentation of children's performance in these areas. This subscale was renamed "academic immaturity" and only included two items reflecting academically related behaviors: "This child has trouble sitting still or concentrating" and "This child has trouble completing lessons." The modified version, shown in the Appendix, consisted of six subscales (aggression, dominance,

disruptive, socially insecure, academic immaturity, and prosocial), with a total of 36 items. Items were rated on a 7-point scale ranging from "never" (1) to "almost always" (7). The assistant rated the behaviors for each child in the class prior to the implementation of the Nurturing Curriculum (October), at midyear (January), and at the end of the academic year (June).

During the first set of observations, reliability was checked against an independent observer (a student in the undergraduate psychology major at Utica College) in two classrooms, with a median correlation of .90 between the two raters across the subscales. The range was from .27 to .98, with 75 percent of the correlations being above .80. The two lowest correlations occurred in the same classroom for socially insecure (.27) and dominance (.64). The correlations for these two behaviors in the other classroom were .98 and .91, respectively. The two observers attended at different times of the day in the classroom with the lower correlations. Perhaps the environmental context had a greater effect on socially insecure behavior and dominance than on the other behaviors, thus leading to different ratings by the judges. In general, however, the ratings were shown to be reliable.

Table 1
Mean Ratings for Each Behavior Across Time With Corresponding Effect Size

| Behavior | (L − H)[a] | Mean Ratings Time of Academic Year[b] | | | ES[c] |
		Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	
Aggression	(8-56)	12.14	8.93	8.31*	.98
Dominance	(6-42)	12.85	10.35	7.04*	1.39
Disruptive	(8-56)	15.69	12.16	9.53*	1.46
Socially Insecure	(8-56)	17.10	12.10	9.67*	1.13
Academic Immaturity	(2-14)	4.62	4.07	2.70*	.89
Prosocial	(4-28)	18.01	21.19	25.78*	1.69

[a]Range of possible scores from low (L) to high (H) on each scale.
[b]Time 1 = October, Time 2 = January, Time 3 = June.
[c]ES = Effect Size for change from Time 1 to Time 3.
*$p < .0001$

Results

At each time of data collection, ratings were summed across items within a subscale to yield a single score per child for each subscale. These scores were averaged across children at Time 1, Time 2, and Time 3, as shown in Table 1.

A series of 2 (School) by 3 (Time) ANOVAS, with Time as a repeated measure, was performed to analyze the impact of the Nurturing Curriculum on each of the behaviors measured. When significant effects were found, follow-up dependent t-tests were conducted to analyze for changes from Time 1 to Time 2 and Time 2 to Time 3. Because separate ANOVAs were used across the dependent variables, it was necessary to adjust the alpha level so that we did not capitalize on chance findings. The Bonferonni adjustment was used and only findings with an alpha level of .008 or smaller are reported (Hertzog & Rovine, 1985).

Table 1 shows that there were main effects for Time across all dependent variables: aggression, $F(2, 132) = 38.92$, $p < .0001$; dominance, $F(2, 132) = 102.16$, $p < .0001$; disruptive, $F(2, 132) = 111.66$, $p < .0001$; socially insecure, $F(2, 132) = 62.96$, $p < .0001$; academic immaturity, $F(2, 132) = 45.41$, $p < .0001$; and prosocial behavior, $F(2, 132) = 159.04$, $p < .0001$. The follow-up dependent t-tests indicated that aggression, dominance, disruptive, socially insecure, and academic immaturity decreased significantly from Time 1 to Time 2 and again from Time 2 to Time 3, while prosocial behavior increased significantly from Time 1 to Time 2 and again from Time 2 to Time 3. The effect sizes were all greater than .80 and considered to be large (McCartney & Rosenthal, 2000).

There were no main effects for School. Not only were the effects consistent across schools, but across children as well. The percentage of children who improved from Time 1 to Time 3 on each behavior is as follows: aggression-99 percent, dominance-96 percent, disruptive-95 percent, socially insecure-93 percent, academic immaturity-89 percent, and prosocial behavior-95 percent. Although improvements were noted in both schools, the pattern of change over time varied slightly. Two significant interactions between Time and School, for aggression ($F(2, 132) = 18.89$, $p < .0001$) and prosocial behavior ($F(2, 132) = 8.17$ $p < .0001$), were found. In one school, there was a large decrease in aggression from Time 1 to Time 2, then it remained stable at Time 3 ($M = 13.11$, 8.71, and 8.39, respectively); while in the other school, aggression was low at the beginning and stayed relatively stable throughout ($M = 9.38$, 9.44, and 8.10 for Time 1, 2, and 3, respectively). For prosocial behavior, for one school the behavior increased steadily from Time 1 to Time 2 to Time 3 ($M = 17.47$, 21.80, and 25.79, respectively). For the other school, prosocial behavior remained stable from Time 1 to Time 2, but increased at Time 3 ($M = 19.54$, 19.62, and 25.74, respectively).

Thus, the findings suggest that the Nurturing Curriculum had a consistent and cumulative effect on the children's behavior over time. One could hypothesize, however, that the changes were due to developmental maturation. To assess this possibility, we compared the findings to the behavior of a cohort of children who were in kindergarten in the same two schools in the previous year. These children were part of a pilot study and were rated using the same measures as in the present study. The children were in two different classrooms (N = 6 from one classroom and N = 8 from another classroom), with one class in each of the two schools used in the present study. Two of the teachers who participated in the present study taught these children as well. The curriculum in the classes was the same in both years, except that these children were not exposed to the Nurturing Curriculum. This cohort is not a true control group and the findings presented below should be interpreted with caution. However, the pilot cohort provides some context for interpreting the findings from the present study. The first set of measures for these children was collected in the month

of December; thus, they were 2 months advanced developmentally compared to the first set of measures for the children in the present study. A multivariate t-test across the 6 dependent variables revealed only one difference initially between the groups: the children in the pilot study were more aggressive than the children in the present study, t (154) = 3.79, $p < .0001$ (please note, we had data on 142 children at the beginning of the present study). Second, analysis of variance showed that there were no significant changes in the children's behavior in the pilot program across the school year. Therefore, the behaviors measured do not change significantly without intervention. As shown in Table 2, effect sizes were much greater for the present cohort, which received intervention, as compared to the previous cohort, which was not exposed to the Nurturing Curriculum.

Harter (1990) has argued that in evaluation studies, one may interpret any change within 1 standard error of measurement (SEM) to be due to developmental maturation, while change greater than one SEM can be attributed to the intervention. The SEM was calculated for each measure, and all those children whose initial scores were within one SEM of the floor for aggression, dominance, disruptive, socially insecure, and academic immaturity, and within one SEM of the ceiling for prosocial, were eliminated from further analysis (because their scores could not possibly change in the expected direction by more than one SEM).

The percentages of children eliminated for aggression, dominance, disruptive, socially insecure, academic immaturity, and prosocial, respectively, were: 49 percent, 14 percent, 13 percent, 10 percent, 14 percent, and 5 percent. For the remaining children, the percentages of those whose scores decreased by one SEM or more for aggression, dominance, disruptive, socially insecure, and academic immaturity, respectively, were: 96 percent, 94 percent, 92 percent, 84 percent, and 82 percent. For prosocial behavior, 92 percent of the children had scores that increased by one SEM or more. Although not conclusive, the evidence collectively strongly supports the effectiveness of the Nurturing Curriculum.

To assess the relationship of social and emotional behaviors to academic behavior specifically, a stepwise multiple regression analysis was performed, using academic immaturity at Time 3 as the outcome variable, while all other measures were entered as predictors. Seven predictors (see Table 3) added significantly to the prediction, accounting for 82 percent of the variance in the academic immaturity scores. The two variables with the greatest magnitude of change, prosocial behavior and disruptive, were the strongest predictors, together accounting for 72 percent of the variance in academic immaturity scores.

Teachers also provided quantitative and qualitative feedback regarding the curriculum. Five of the eight teachers returned their journals, while verbal feedback was

Table 2
Comparison of Effect Sizes of Pilot Study to Current Study

	Pilot: Comparison No Nurturing Curriculum	Current Study: Intervention Full Year of Nurturing Curriculum
Aggression	.07	.98*
Dominance	.07	1.39*
Disruptive	.30	1.46*
Socially Insecure	.06	1.13*
Academic Immaturity	.43	.89*
Prosocial Behavior	.00	1.69*

*$p < .0001$

obtained from all the teachers. The journals showed that teachers completed, on average, 25 of the 71 lessons (35 percent). All of the teachers started the lessons in late September, one stopped in November, two stopped in February, and two stopped in May. The highest lesson reached was number 53. Although lessons were prearranged in a fixed sequential order, teachers chose to rearrange the sequence based on relevance to current events and other topics being covered in the classroom. Teachers made concerted efforts to conduct the lessons throughout the entire school year. However, they eliminated certain lessons because they believed they were too developmentally advanced for the children. The main reason for not completing the lessons was time constraints. The teachers found that in order to complete the lesson, they needed much more than a 20-minute session in order to ensure that each child had a chance to participate. Teachers claimed they already had difficulty completing the traditional academic subjects such as math, phonics, science, and social studies, and had little to no time left for the Nurturing lessons. Finally, teachers indicated that due to special programs, there were very few times during the week when they actually had their entire class together in the classroom. This situation further limited the opportunities for doing the Nurturing lessons.

The overall response to the Nurturing Curriculum was positive. One teacher indicated that the lessons helped her get to know her students better and the students were able to get to know each other better. One teacher commented that she did not realize how deeply affected the children were by family, community, and world events. Another teacher indicated that the lessons sparked lively discussions and active participation from the children. An unanticipated, but welcomed, outcome was what the teachers believed to be positive effects on verbal skills, particularly for the English as a Second Language (ESL) children.

Discussion

This study examined the impact of the Nurturing Curriculum on social and emotional behaviors and their relationship to academic behaviors in kindergarten classrooms. Research suggests that social and emotional behaviors are malleable and appropriate targets for intervention (Raver, 2002). The Nurturing Curriculum was associated with improvements in social and emotional behaviors, showing large effect sizes that were consistent across children. The behaviors targeted are consistent with those identified by kindergarten teachers as being essential to school success. A survey of 3,305 kindergarten teachers throughout the United States revealed that kindergarten teachers identified the following behaviors as being most important to school

Table 3
Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis With
Academic Immaturity at Time 3[a] as the Outcome

Variable Entered	R	R Square
Disruptive, Time 3	.813*	.662
Prosocial, Time 3	.847*	.717
Aggression, Time 3	.874*	.763
Academic Immaturity, Time 2	.888*	.789
Disruptive, Time 1	.896*	.803
Academic Immaturity, Time 1	.902*	.813
Aggression, Time 2	.905*	.820

[a]Time 1 = October, Time 2 = January, Time 3 = June.
*$p < .0001$

readiness: the child can communicate his/her needs, is not disruptive, follows directions, takes turns and shares, is sensitive to others, sits still and is alert, and finishes tasks (Lin, Lawrence, & Gorrell, 2003). We also found that as disruptive behavior decreased and prosocial behavior increased, the academic immaturity of the children decreased, confirming the relationships among social, emotional, and academic behaviors (see Kagan et al., 1995; Raver, 2002). Thus, the Nurturing Curriculum, derived from developmental theory and based on developmentally appropriate practice, is supported as a viable intervention program to be used within the school system. Because the curriculum is available for grades K-12, it is appropriate for early intervention as well as continued intervention throughout a child's schooling.

Several cautions must be noted regarding the findings. First, the findings are based on a quasi-experimental design. True causal effects can only be inferred from an experimental design. However, it is not always feasible, practical, and/or ethical to implement an experimental design in natural settings. The effects of other variables and generalizability of the results must be examined. In this case, we were able to compare the findings to the developmental changes of another, albeit smaller, cohort of kindergarten children. The changes in targeted behaviors were much larger in the intervention cohort. Also, the findings were consistent across eight classrooms, replicating the effects of the program. Using a comparison cohort and replication of findings are recognized as legitimate research methods for evaluating both the internal and external validity of findings when conducting program evaluations in the field (McCall & Green, 2004). Despite the limitations, this study stands as one attempt to evaluate the "design of appropriate curricula and instruction practices to best serve children's development" (Vecchiotti, 2003, p. 13). Such evaluations are greatly needed to establish the validity and cost effectiveness of educational and intervention programs (Black & Dubowitz, 1999; Hay & Jones, 1994; Vecchiotti, 2003).

Conducting research in natural settings also affects the researcher's control over the implementation of the program. This study does not address academic outcomes. We had anticipated including some measure of the children's math and reading skills. Unfortunately, the observer was not able to observe frequently enough during these lessons to make a valid judgment. We also did not have access to the children's academic records. A follow-up study in which such measures are included would be enlightening. However, the study does indicate that the Nurturing Curriculum has a positive impact on those self-regulatory behaviors required for academic success. For example, research has established that children who are able to concentrate on their work and complete their tasks typically have better math and reading skills than other children (Shore, 2002).

As was pointed out, the teachers did not complete all of the lessons, nor did they conduct them in the prescribed order. Despite these problems, the curriculum still had a positive effect. The inability of the teachers to complete the lessons highlights problems of practical interest as well. A unique feature of the Nurturing Curriculum is that it is designed to be used in the classroom by the teachers and children, rather than being ancillary to class instruction. The curriculum is designed to become part of the daily life of the classroom, arguably making it more effective (Bavolek, 1988). This unique feature may make the program desirable, yet difficult to implement. If the teachers are unable to find the time to implement the lessons, then the program cannot be of any value. We suggest that the Nurturing Curriculum be systematically examined for the minimum requirements needed for it to be effective in an effort to make the curriculum more practical. Teacher feedback should be included in this systematic evaluation.

The positive findings occurred even though teachers were not able to conduct all

of the lessons. In the future, it will be necessary to make sure that the teachers have the time to fit the Nurturing Curriculum into their schedules. McEvoy and Welker (2000) argue that the most effective social intervention programs are embedded in the curriculum on a consistent basis throughout the academic year. Although implementing such a program may require systemic modification of current educational practices in schools today, McEvoy and Welker (2000) contend that such modification is justified by the positive impact the programs have on social and academic behaviors. Considering the success of the Nurturing Curriculum in this demonstration study, it is recommended that school superintendents seriously consider the Nurturing Curriculum as an essential component of the school curriculum.

As stated earlier, in their National Education Goals Panel report, Kagan et al. (1995) identified five dimensions of development related to academic success: physical well-being and motor development; social and emotional development; approaches to learning (cognitive style); language development; and cognition and general knowledge. This study focused on social and emotional development as part of the regular classroom curriculum. As shown in previous research (Ladd et al., 1999; Ladd et al., 1997; Pettit et al., 1997; Raver, 2002; Wentzel & Caldwell, 1997), this study supports that social and emotional development have a significant impact on academic success. However, there is growing concern that in the current climate of "high-stakes testing," a potential overemphasis on the cognitive dimension will occur at the expense of the other dimensions identified by Kagan et al. (1995), leading to a neglect of the social and emotional development of the child (Carlton & Winsler, 1999; Shore, 2002; Vecchiotti, 2003). Lin et al.'s (2003) survey found that kindergarten teachers with less experience emphasized academic skills to a greater extent than social/emotional skills, as compared to more experienced teachers. The teachers in the present study seem to

reflect this trend. Although the teachers were positive about the Nurturing Curriculum, they did not see it as a "priority" and only fit in the lessons when they could. Theory and research should inform educators and guide social policy (Shore, 2002). The body of evidence supports that we must not ignore the social and emotional well-being of children as an educational goal (Shore, 2002). It is our hope that those professionals in the fields of education and developmental psychology will continue to advocate for a holistic approach to the education of children, as called for by the National Education Goals Panel (Kagan et al., 1995).

References

Bavolek, S. J. (1988). *The nurturing programs for parents and children.* Park City, UT: Family Development Resources.

Bavolek, S. J., Weinbergr, D. H., & Smith, C. T. (1992). *Developing nurturing skills: A school-based curriculum for kindergarten.* Park City, UT: Family Development Resources.

Black, M. M., & Dubowitz, H. (1999). Child neglect: Research recommendations and future directions. In H. Dubowitz (Ed.), *Neglected children: Research, practice, and policy* (pp. 261-277). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Carlton, M. P., & Winsler, A. (1999). School readiness: The need for a paradigm shift. *School Psychology Review, 28,* 338-353. Retrieved June 9, 2003, from Academic Search Elite database.

Coie, J. D., & Dodge, K. A. (1988). Multiple sources of data on social behavior and social status in the school: A cross-age comparison. *Child Development, 59,* 815-829.

Harter, S. (1990). Issues in the assessment of self-concept of children and adolescents. In A. M. LaGreca (Ed.), *Through the eyes of a child: Obtaining self-reports from children and adolescents* (pp. 292-325). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Hay, T., & Jones, L. (1994). Societal interventions to prevent child abuse and neglect. *Child Welfare, 73,* 379-403.

Hertzog, C., & Rovine, M. (1985). Repeated measures analysis of variance in developmental research: selected issues. *Child Development, 56,* 787-809.

Kagan, S. L., Moore, E., & Bredekamp, S. (1995). *Reconsidering children's early devel-*

opment and learning: Toward common views and vocabulary. Washington, DC: National Education Goals Panel.

Ladd, G. W., Birch, S. H., & Buhs, E. S. (1999). Children's social and scholastic lives in kindergarten: Related spheres? *Child Development, 70,* 1373-1400.

Ladd, G. W., Kochenderfer, B. J., & Coleman, C. C. (1997). Classroom peer acceptance, friendship, and victimization: Distinct relational systems that contribute uniquely to children's school adjustment? *Child Development, 68,* 1181-1197.

La Paro, K. M., Kraft-Sayre, M., & Pianta, R. C. (2003). Preschool to kindergarten transition activities: Involvement and satisfaction of families and teachers. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education, 17,* 147-158.

Lin, H., Lawrence, F. R., & Gorrell, J. (2003). Kindergarten teachers' views of children's readiness for school. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 18,* 225-237.

McCall, R. B., & Green, B. L. (2004). Beyond methodological gold standards of behavioral research: Considerations for practice and policy. *Social Policy Report of the Society for Research in Child Development, 18*(2), 1-19. Access: www.srcd.org/spr.html

McCartney, K., & Rosenthal, R. (2000). Effect size, practical importance, and social policy in children. *Child Development, 71,* 173-180.

McEvoy, A., & Welker, R. (2000). Antisocial behavior, academic failure, and school climate: A critical review. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 8,* 130-140.

Pettit, G. S., Bates, J. E., & Dodge, K. A. (1997). Supportive parenting, ecological context, and children's adjustment: A seven-year longitudinal study. *Child Development, 68,* 908-923.

Raver, C. C. (2002). Emotions matter: Making the case for the role of young children's emotional development in early school readiness. *Social Policy Report of the Society for Research in Child Development, 16*(3), 1-19. Access: www.srcd.org/spr.html

Shore, R. (2002). *What kids need: Today's best ideas for nurturing, teaching and protecting young children.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Vecchiotto, S. (2003). Kindergarten: An overlooked educational policy priority. *Social Policy Report of the Society for Research in Child Development, 17*(2), 1-15. Access: www.srcd.org/spr.html

Wentzel, K. R., & Caldwell, C. C. (1997). Friendships, peer acceptance, and group membership: Relations to academic achievement in middle childhood. *Child Development, 68,* 1198-1209.

Aggression (Possible range of scores: 8-56)
This child starts fights with peers
This child gets angry easily and strikes back when he/she is threatened or teased
This child says mean things to peers, such as teasing or name calling
This child always claims that other children are to blame in a fight and feels that they started the trouble
This child uses physical force or threatens to use physical force, in order to dominate other kids
When a peer accidentally hurts this child (such as bumping him/her), this child assumes that the peer meant to do it, and then overreacts with anger and fighting
This child threatens or bullies others in order to get his/her own way
This child gets other kids to gang up on a peer that he/she does not like

Dominance (Possible range of scores: 6-42)
This child acts stuck up or thinks he/she is better than other children
This child tries to tell other children how things should be done
This child usually wants to be in charge and set the rules and give orders
This child tries to dominate classmates and pushes self into existing play or work groups
This child shows off
This child gets impatient when other children do not do things the way he/she thinks they should be done

Disruptive (Possible range of scores: 8-56)
This child makes a lot of comments that are not related to what the group is doing; many of these comments are self-related
This child complains or whines a lot
This child acts silly or immature
This child seeks the teacher's attention too often
This child does things that other children think are strange or inappropriate
This child makes odd noises or unusual comments
This child bothers other kids when they are trying to do work
This child exaggerates and makes up stories

Socially Insecure (Possible range of scores: 8-56)
This child is too shy to make friends easily
This child is self-conscious and easily embarrassed
This child does not stand up for him/herself when someone picks on him/her
This child usually plays or works alone
This child gets his/her feelings hurt easily
This child never seems to have a good time
This child is timid about joining other children and usually stays just outside the group without joining in
This child is anxious and insecure in social situations

Academic Immaturity (Possible range of scores: 2-14)
This child has trouble sitting still or concentrating
This child has trouble completing assignments

Prosocial Behavior (Possible range of scores: 4-28)
This child is very good at understanding other people's feelings
This child is a leader, and tells others what should be done without being bossy
This child is very aware of the effects of his/her behavior on others
This child is good to have in groups, shares things, and is helpful