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ABSTRACT

This study examined the difference between levels of importance and implementation for the National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy (NPKSLL) in four-year-old programs as perceived by West Virginia licensed pre-kindergarten programs directors and the differences based on director’s education level, years of experience, years in present position, program type and size, and the number of four year olds in the program. To examine this relationship, *The Early Childhood Language and Literacy Survey* (ECELLS) was designed based on the NPKSLL five goals: listening (Goal 1), complex speech (Goal 2), print awareness (Goal 3), story structure (Goal 4) and beginning writing skills and knowledge (Goal 5). Data were collected from 210 directors of pre-kindergarten programs. Data indicated that, overall, directors perceived Goals 1, 2, 3, and 5 to be important and Goal 4 to be less important and that differences between levels of importance and implementation were greater for Goal 4 than Goals 1, 2, 3, and 5. Directors perceived Goals 1, 2, 3, and 5 to be more fully implemented than Goal 4.

Generally, all goals were perceived to be important, but Goal 4 appears to be less important to directors. The levels of implementation for each goal were not consistent, but directors were implementing the goals to at least minimal levels. The demographic variables of highest level of education, program type and size had a positive impact on importance and implementation for all goals except Goal 2. Years of experience, years in present position, and number of four year olds enrolled in the program had no significant impact on importance and implementation for each goal.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

The early childhood knowledge base has expanded greatly in recent years, affirming some beliefs about good practices and challenging others. As a result, early childhood educators have gained new knowledge in organizing a comprehensive framework for promoting early learning, and early childhood programs have made significant changes. Recent initiatives to formulate national standards for public education, to pass federal legislation encouraging certain school reforms, and to use various media outlets and government-sponsored commissions to sway public perceptions of schooling provide evidence.

Since 1965, when the federal government announced its first major elementary-secondary education initiative, federal government has strongly influenced American schools. The original mission of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and Title I was to create equal educational opportunities for disadvantaged children by providing financial support to school districts serving a large concentration of low-income students. The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001, which reauthorizes ESEA, raises the expectations and goals of the Title I policy by emphasizing equal educational outcomes. This federal legislation highlights the serious commitment being made by the federal government to assure that schools are effective as the United States Department of Education monitors the nation’s progress on a set of national education goals adopted in 1990.

The Department of Education (1990) report, America 2000, elucidated the national goals that the public schools needed to attain by the year 2000. These goals are
now well established and used to judge national school performance. The purpose of the goals is to give the states some collective identity and to hold each state accountable to common benchmarks of performance and progress toward high quality educational opportunities.

The National Education Goals Panel’s (1991) first goal that every child would have access to high quality, developmentally appropriate preschool programs, is in keeping with the overarching goals of NCLB to close the achievement gap between advantaged and disadvantaged children (Kim & Sunderman, 2003). To narrow achievement gaps, NCLB expanded the federal role of education by forcing states to adhere to strict mandated timelines for instituting academic performance standards and assessments, to establish yearly progress goals, and to ensure teacher quality (NCLB, 2001). By the year 2005-2006, states must institute annual reading tests in grades 3 to 8, and 100% of teachers in core academic subjects must be “highly qualified” (NCLB, 2001). States must also establish performance standards and define progress goals to enable all students and major demographic subgroups to reach “proficiency” by the years 2013-2014 (NCLB, 2001)

The key measure of student learning attainment of “proficiency” is the annual state reading assessments, generating state actions on many fronts, and producing a strong catalytic effect on reading education. Preschool programs are an important vehicle for enhancing school readiness and reading readiness (National Research Council, 1998), as state policy makers play the leading role in the types of experiences offered in preschool literacy programs. State government affects the availability and quality of preschool reading environments to all children, the length of time available for reading
instruction, the support for services like libraries and new technologies during the school year and over the summer, the allocation of additional resources to preschools and neighborhoods in great need, and pedagogical techniques and materials (NRC, 2001).

**Status of Standards**

State policy makers provide support and pressure to raise reading achievement for all children. The primary focus of this support is in the formation and enforcement of national pre-kindergarten standards for literacy. It is important to incorporate standards in early childhood education because standards provide a baseline of expectations to which pedagogy and assessment can be aimed. Since standards consist of the values, expectations, and outcomes of education, they are an important step to ensure educational equity within and across preschools, school districts, states, and for communicating with publishers and teacher education institutions about the needs of state educators (Education Commission of the United States, 1996).

State agency education policies are primarily dictated by federal regulations, mandates, and legislation. Through the years, the federal government has had a perceptible role in making the kind of changes needed to increase literacy in early childhood by using federal authority to develop programs like Head Start and Title I. Additionally, federal regulations like the Education for All Handicapped Children Act and Public Law 94-142 in 1975, Public Law 99-457 in 1986, and Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and Public Law 94-142 in 1997 are enforced to provide for equitable early childhood education opportunities (Yudof, Kirp, Levin, & Moran, 2002). Since the 1980s, the paradigm of educational policies has shifted from equal opportunity to include quality and accountability. This altered national trend places emphasis on
readiness in the early learning years and articulation of pre-kindergarten standards in ways that are consistent with early childhood developmentally appropriate learning.

Since No Child Left Behind affects all public schools and mandates pre-kindergarten meet academic standards and be placed in the public school system, every early childhood program must regard the intent of the law and adhere to the national pre-kindergarten standards with benchmarks. In the past, state pre-kindergarten programs have been varied in their standards but with federal funding and legislation, the states are compelled to follow universal standards that meet or exceed the current developmentally appropriate best practice guidelines developed by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (National Association Education of Young Children, 2001). Developmentally appropriate best practice policies have influenced the standards, implementation, and evaluation according to the nationally accepted policy for all early childhood centers (NAEYC, 2001). Nearly all states have proposed standards of achievement but only 20 states sponsor pre-kindergarten program standards (NRC, 2002). West Virginia adopted the national pre-kindergarten standards in 2002 (WV Department of Education, 2003).

The national pre-kindergarten standards adopted by West Virginia, comply with the governor’s executive order to accredit all state child care by December 2003 (National Academy of Early Childhood Programs, 2000). The newly developed pre-kindergarten standards serve as the common reference point for developing curricula, instructional materials, assessments, accountability systems, and professional development, and are considered a lever to raise the overall quality of early childhood
programs. Furthermore, the standards protect the pre-kindergartens from literacy downward drift in educational expectations and attainment.

Childhood environments that support early literacy development are important for all children. The majority of the reading problems noted in NCLB school performance assessment report cards are the result of deficiencies that might have been avoided or resolved in the early childhood years (NRC, 2001). Reducing the number of children who enter kindergarten with inadequate literacy-related knowledge and skill is an important primary step toward increasing literacy and preventing reading difficulties (NRC, 1998). In the twenty-first century, universal national pre-kindergarten standards are an essential feature for quality education and increasing literacy for a wealthy industrialized nation.

*Status of Child Care*

During the 1990s, the number of children receiving childcare outside the home steadily increased in the United States. In 1995, the National Center for Educational Statistics’ National Household Survey found that 60% of preschoolers aged five or under are cared for in some form of nonparental care. In 2000, the Children’s Defense Fund estimated 70% of all preschool children receive childcare outside the home. In 2002, the U. S. Bureau of Census reported that 59% of mothers with a child under age one are in the workforce and 64% of mothers in the workforce have a child under age 5. The U.S. Department of the Treasury (1998) and The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (1999) estimate there are approximately 3.8 million children in each age cohort between the ages of 2 to 5. These figures rose to 4 million for each cohort in 2003 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2004). The number of these children cared for outside the home will increase, as
poor mothers are being required to seek employment or lose federal monetary benefits, due to widespread social welfare reform.

Welfare reform, particularly The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act, enacted in 1996, replaced the former program, Temporary Assistance to Needy Families. This act mandated that federal welfare funds be provided through block grants that are administered by each state. This new legislation redefined welfare not as an ongoing safety net for children, but as a temporary support for needy families that require single mothers to leave home for work (Feeney, Christensen, & Moravcik, 2001). Federal and state policies that place new emphasis on employment for single mothers spawned an increasing demand for childcare services for even the youngest children from very low-income families (Carnegie Task Force on Learning in the Primary Grades, 1996).

The National Center for Education (1998) reports a steep increase in three and four year old enrollments in early childhood programs over the last 35 years. In 1965, less than 20% of children were enrolled, but by 1990, the majority of 4 year olds and one-third of 3 year olds were enrolled in programs. The 1997 figures indicate 65% of 4 year olds and almost 40% of 3 year olds enrolled in early childhood programs (Eager to Learn, 2002). In 2003, childcare cost anywhere from $4,000 to $10,000 a year (NAEYC, 2003), while education consumed more than 7% of the Gross National Product (NRC, 2003). These figures strongly suggest that preschool enrollments are large and growing in size and political power.
The Growth of Childcare

As the number of children cared for outside the home has grown, so has the conviction that education should be included in childcare, as care and education cannot be thought of as separate entities in dealing with young children (Caulfield & Kataoka-Yahiro, 2001). This assertion underlies the growing need for quality childcare, as there is a growing recognition among parents and educators for establishing and enforcing universal childcare standards. Furthermore, the establishment of universal childcare preschool standards for teaching and learning of literacy in early childhood programs is often cited as one of several key indicators of high quality childcare (Gallagher, Rooney, & Campbell, 1999). Parents are relying on childcare programs in even larger numbers and they know the quality of the programs matters and they want a high quality early childhood system that has uniformity through standards and accountability with equal access for all (Powell, 1997).

Societal and employment changes have brought about an important transformation in program characteristics. Children are now enrolled in programs at younger ages and the length of program day for all ages of children has been extended in response to fully employed mothers desire for early academic learning programs (Mitchell, Seligson, & Marx, 1989). Similarly, childcare programs have been established in public schools, some for children as young as 3, and many offer before and after school care (Seppanen, Kaplan, DeFries, & Seligson,, 1993).

In recognition of the critical importance of early learning experiences and in response to a growing demand, the number of early childhood programs continues to increase (Willer et al, 1991; NCES, 1993). For example, in 1980 through 1990, Head
Start made the largest expansion in the history of early childhood education by doubling the number of programs and establishing Early Head Start, a Head Start Reauthorization policy for low-income pregnant women and families with toddlers. This expansion and new programs created significant changes in services and learning practices as well as state and national legislation (NEGP, 1991).

**Childcare and Education**

A distinguishable change in childcare is that early childhood providers are now defining their policies in academic and education terms. Childcare professionals, with growing support from parents and educators, increasingly define their mission to combine loving care with learning. The emerging consensus is that nonparental care for young children should attend to education, including school readiness and reading readiness, as well as provide a caring and facilitating environment for secure emotional development and social relationships with others (Kamerman, 1999). The accrual of federal mandates, parent demands, and convincing research (NICHD, 1996; Frede, 1998; High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, 1998) reporting that young children are capable learners if taught developmentally with quality educational experiences in the preschool years, have had a positive effect on school programs, policies, and learning.

Changes in the characteristics of the early childhood programs have been modified as programs are serving more children and families from increasingly diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds. This changing student population requires all programs to foster and demonstrate responsiveness to diversity, affirming that culture and language are critical components of a child’s development, (NAEYC, 2002) literacy, and the child’s ability to come to school ready to learn (NCLB, 2001).
The Carnegie Foundation in 1991 issued the Ready to Learn project as a plan to ensure that children coming to school were ready to learn. In 1997, as part of the effort to strengthen educational opportunities for students coming to school ready to learn, the Department of Education issued final regulations for implementing the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The Americans with Disability Act (1993) and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (1997) require that all early childhood programs embrace diversity and practice inclusion by making reasonable accommodations to provide access for children with disabilities or developmental delays in every program (DEC/CEC & NAEYC, 1998).

There are six million three to eighteen years olds with disabilities (Wetzstein, 2002), and 53% of the disabled children ages three to five years old spend all or part of the day in inclusive settings, including Head Start and childcare (National Center for Education Statistics, 2001). This growing trend toward full inclusion of children with disabilities has resulted in considerable change in the merging academic perspectives of early childhood education and early childhood special education (Carta et al, 1991; Mallory, 1992, 1994; Wolery, Strain & Bailey, 1992; Bredekamp, 1993b; DEC Task Force, 1993; Mallory & New, 1994b; Wolery & Wilbers, 1994).

Several factors have revolutionized early childhood education. Federal mandates toward full inclusion of all children and the accumulation of convincing evidence from research that young children are more capable learners than current practices reflect (Mastropieri & Scruggs, 1994; Wetzstein, 1995; Malakoff, 2000; Morrison, 2001; Wetzstein, 2002) have resulted in federal education standards. Copious research (Wetzstein, 1995; High/Scope Education Research Foundation, 1998; St. Pierre, Layzer,
& Barnes, 1998; Harvey, 1999; Wetzstein, 2002) findings that good educational experiences in the preschool years can have a positive impact on school have exerted the push for universal pre-kindergarten standards.

National Pre-Kindergarten Standards

The national Pre-Kindergarten Standards are consistent with current research positions that early learning is critical to future achievement (Harvey, 1999; Oden, Schweinhart & Weikart, 2000; Malakoff, 2000). Numerous researchers suggest that what children learn during the first years of life build the foundation for all later learning (Lazar & Darlington, 1982; Wetzstein, 1995; Oden, Schweinhart & Weikart, 2000; Malakoff, 2000; Wetzstein, 2002). These early enrichment experiences directly affect the neurological development of the brain and have lasting implications for a child’s capacity for learning (Shore, 1997; Restak, 2000; NRC, 2002). The researchers (Wetzstein, 1995; Malakoff, 2000; Oden, Schweinhart & Weikart, 2000; Bredekamp & Copple, 2002; Wetzstein, 2002) conclude that a developmentally appropriate learning environment is essential for optimal early learning and is a prerequisite to building an educational foundation for a child’s future learning and achievement (Wetzstein, 1995, 2002).

A crucial and indispensable part of a child’s future education is language and literacy (Malakoff, 2000). Four out of ten elementary school children have literacy problems (NRC, 2002). Since literacy learning is a complex process involving the mastery and interaction of multiple skills and knowledge, a child’s reading-related development should start at a young age (NRC, 2001). The national pre-kindergarten standards emphasize language and literacy in the early years with developmentally appropriate experiences that four year olds need to acquire to be ready to read.
Summary

Early childhood education stands on the brink of a new era in preschool learning, influenced by converging trends: (1) an unprecedented number of working mothers, creating a strong and increased demand for child care; (2) a consensus among professionals and parents that the care of young children should provide them with educational experiences; (3) a growing evidence from child development research that young children are capable learners, (4) an accumulation of research studies revealing that educational experiences during the preschool years can have a positive impact on school learning; and (5) a federal government mandate for quality education with accountability outcomes. This convergence of practical, moral, scientific and financial considerations suggests a heightened interest in the education of young children and new opportunities for improvement in early learning and the enhancement of children’s lives through increased literacy. If pre-kindergartens programs are to fulfill parental and educational needs for quality, more emphasis must be placed on the content, quality, and performance. As a means to facilitate quality of the pre-kindergarten experience for young children, the federal government has mandated universal pre-kindergarten standards for quality education with accountability outcomes.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine the importance and level of implementation of the National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for language and literacy as perceived by West Virginia directors of licensed four-year-old programs. Further, differences were examined in regard to the following pre-kindergarten and director demographics: program type, number of four year old enrolled in the program, and
program size, and director’s education level, years of experience in early childhood field, and years in present position.

Research Questions

1. What are the differences between the importance and the level of implementation of the National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy in four year old programs as perceived by West Virginia directors of licensed pre-kindergarten programs?

2. What are the differences, based on the director’s education level, years of experience in early childhood field, years in present position, program type, number of four year olds in the program, and program size, in the relationship between the importance and level of implementation of the National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy in four year old programs as perceived by West Virginia directors of licensed pre-kindergarten programs?

Operational Definitions of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following operational definitions of terms were employed:

1. Director Years of Experience in Early Childhood Field – The number of self-reported years the selected early childhood director has been in the early childhood education.

2. Director Years in Present Position – The number of self reported years that the selected director has served as director in the selected center or school.

3. Education Level – The highest formal education diploma or degree the director has earned.
4. Four Year Old Pre-Kindergarten Program Types –
   a. Child Care Center – Early childhood pre-kindergarten programs funded by tuition, federal and state education monies.
   b. Group Child Care Home Center - Childcare center provided by relatives or friends in family childcare homes with three to fifteen children with a caregiver.
   c. Head Start – A federally funded comprehensive program for underprivileged children, designed as early intervention for “at risk” children.
   d. Private Pre-Kindergarten Preschool – For profit preschools that serve a selected population
   e. Public School Pre-Kindergarten – Early childhood classroom placed within the public school system

5. Number of Four Year Olds in the Program - The official school enrollment of four year old students in the program.

6. Pre-Kindergarten Director – An administrator of an early childcare facility who is responsible for curricular decisions and instructional strategies and practices. The director is responsible for establishing and promoting standards and professional development in the context of program delivery.

7. Pre-Kindergarten Program – Any group program located in a center, school, or other facility that serves four years old children. The primary purpose of the program is to support children’s learning and development and to provide care for children in families where adults are working or engaged in other activities.
8. Program Size - The official enrollment of the school as reported by the West Virginia Department of Education categorized according to the Child Care Center Licensing Regulations No. 3.56, 3.57, and 3.58.

   a. Type I Center – A day care center with the capacity of thirty or fewer children. Licensed centers begin with attendance of 13 children.

   b. Type II Center - A day care center with a capacity of 31 – 60 children.

   c. Type III Center - A day care center with a capacity of 61 or more children.

Significance of the Study

The national pre-kindergarten standards for literacy became effective for all 434 licensed pre-kindergartens in West Virginia, in 2003. It is important to know the level of implementation and perceived importance that early childhood directors demonstrate for the new standards as it can provide valuable information for classroom teachers, directors, community leaders, and other stakeholders. With this information, directors can identify attitudes, weakness, and strengths, and make changes as needed to create a high quality pre-kindergarten and increase literacy. Directors could view incongruence in the standards perceived importance and the level of implementation and make changes to create the most effective experience for the child.

West Virginia Department of Education could provide more education and training to the early childhood directors on the vital role literacy skills have in preparing a four year old to be “ready to learn” in kindergarten (West Virginia Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy, 2002) and the part they play in reading achievement, school retention and success. Directors can apply this information to provide professional staff development, targeting what four year olds need to know
before entering kindergarten. Directors could provide professional development on developmentally appropriate best practices and in-service training on how to provide and implement developmentally appropriate opportunities and experiences.

Community leaders, such as county commissioners and school board members, can synthesize information about director’s level of importance of standards and factors involved in their preferences to promote development of a diverse range of early childhood services to meet the needs of all families within their jurisdiction.

Persons involved in planning, developing, and administering early childhood programs can utilize the information provided by the study to develop policy and practices. By interpreting the present situations, conditions, interactions, and events, this research will increase the knowledge base of early childhood education, and can provide information for greater efficacy for programs and greater language and literacy achievement for students. College and university faculty could benefit from the data to design and prepare curriculum for preservice teachers.

Limitations of the Study

1. Data in this study are provided by West Virginia directors of licensed early childhood centers and may not be generalizable to all early childhood centers outside of West Virginia.

2. The study uses self-reported assessment surveys and therefore is limited to the accuracy of the participants.
CHAPTER TWO

Review of Related Literature

Overview

This chapter includes a review of the literature relating to the development of the national and state standards for early childhood education, the establishment and implementation of the national pre-kindergarten standards for language and literacy, and the factors that affect key practices for implementation. This chapter also includes a description of the study’s theoretical background and concludes with a discussion of the theoretical base for the Early Childhood Education Language and Literacy Survey (ECELLS).

National Perspective on Standards

The publication of A Nation at Risk (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) ignited a firestorm of reform activity. When the initial reforms produced disappointing results (Cohen & Spillane, 1992), concerns about the educational preparation of the nation’s students compared to other countries gained momentum. Popularity and motivation for reform activity increased, prompting President George Herbert W. Bush to convene state governors, which included then-governor Bill Clinton, for a national summit on education in Charlottesville, Virginia.

At the summit, President Bush and the governors agreed to establish six national education goals to be reached by the year 2000 (National Educational Goals Panel, 1991), and to undertake a major state-by-state restructuring of the public education system within a framework of assessment and accountability (Cavazos, 2002). This action led to the creation of the National Education Goals Panel (1991), which concluded that to
meaningfully measure progress on the goals, national education standards needed to be defined as to what students should know and be able to do needed to be defined (National Educational Goals Panel, 1991).

On January 21, 1990, in President George Herbert W. Bush’s State of the Union address, he unveiled the six national performance goals for education, focusing on raising the level of educational achievement for “all students” (Cavazos, 2001). The first goal stated every child should start school ready to learn, proposing that all disadvantaged and disabled children have access to high quality preschool programs, and parents be involved as a child’s first and continuing teacher, as well as preschool children receiving nutrition and health care necessary to arrive at kindergarten ready to learn (Robelen, 2002).

In June 1991, Congress established the National Council on Education Standards and Testing (NCEST) to determine the desirability and feasibility of national standards and tests. In January 1992, NCEST issued a report recommending national content standards and development of a national system of assessments based on those standards (NCEST, 1992). Subsequently, the United States Department of Education proposed a framework of education reform based on high standards, modeled after the California reforms started in the 1980s. The Department of Education agreed with NCEST that the starting point for education improvement should begin with content standards that could be implemented at the national and state levels (Wixson & Dutro, 1999). The Department of Education patterned the content standards and accountability process after the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (1988) and Curriculum and Evaluation Standards (1989) policies.
The new philosophy of standards based reform was based on the presumption that once broad agreement is reached on what is to be taught and learned, everything else in the education system can be redirected toward reaching higher standards (Wixson & Dutro, 1999). Promoting this view, in 1991 and 1992, the Department of Education constructed a grant awards system for teachers to develop national standards in science, history, the arts, civics, geography, foreign languages, and English language arts. This was the first time competition to develop curriculum frameworks for state content standards occurred.

President Bill Clinton made Goals 2000 a focal point of his administration’s agenda, focusing on changing teaching with new policy instruments (Wixson & Durton, 1999). The new policy instruments were proliferated to bring about changes in teaching and learning and to reduce regulation, bureaucracy, and government interference in state reforms (Smith & O’Day, 1999). The policies were to include new content standards and instructional frameworks, authentic assessment of meaningful tasks aligned with standards, and changes in teacher education to enact the standards (Cohen, 1995).

**Federal Standards Based Reform**

Standards based reform efforts continued throughout the Clinton administration and into George Walker Bush’s presidency, but the focus changed from teaching to learning (Tucker & Codding, 1998), with the enactment of the No Child Left Behind (2001) federal education bill. As a result, there was an explicit effort to develop performance standards aimed at defining levels of competence in relation to content standards (Wixson & Dutro, 1999).
The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation required states to establish a new form of content standards, assessments, reporting, and accountability (NCLB, 2001). Since the national reform movement had focused on learning in elementary through secondary school there had been few reform efforts concentrated in early learning until 2003 when President George W. Bush announced a goal to bolster early education (Cavazos, 2003).

Touting that it is the federal government’s job to ensure “quality education for all students of all ages” (George W. Bush, 2003), President Bush proposed $45 million for research efforts over five years for identification of effective early literacy programs and teaching strategies in early childhood education. This education goal required all states that receive money under federal child care and welfare programs to develop early education standards (Cavazos, 2003).

The initiative called for a major overhaul of Head Start, the federal government’s flagship early childhood program, requiring it to implement standards in early literacy, language, number skills, and be evaluated on whether they effectively prepare children to meet those standards (Robelen, 2002). The performance standards were to be based on what children need to know to be ready to learn on the first day of school (NCLB, 2001). Monies were appropriated for Head Start teachers’ training in early literacy instructional techniques and for the subsequent development of pre-kindergarten literacy standards with accountability to measure “quality” as defined by a student’s performance level on such things as knowing their letters, having a strong vocabulary, and love of books (Hatch, 2002). This was the first time standards and accountability was federally legislated for early childhood education for the states.
State Perspective on Standards

Education has been primarily a state responsibility as states have been creating and funding pre-kindergarten programs since 1903 (Mitchell, Seligson & Marx, 1989). There have been several state policy actions affecting early education that correspond to national trends and federal reforms. Between 1960 – 1970, a national trend of giving poor children a head start resulted in eight states starting pre-kindergarten Head Start programs. In the 1980s, education reform was fueled by reports like A Nation at Risk (1983) and a number of studies publishing positive consequences for participation in high quality early childhood programs. These reports and studies influenced the expansion of Head Start and public school pre-kindergarten programs. Lazar and Darlington (1982) and Lee, Brooks-Gunn, and Schuur (1988) found that high quality preschools had long-term positive effects for learning among low-income children. Studies by Alexander and Entwisle (1988) and Slavin, Karweit, and Madden (1989) produced findings indicating that early childhood experiences are formative and may predict consequences for future academic success. Studies like these stimulated 23 states to start or expand pre-kindergarten programs in the 1980s.

In the 1990s, neuroscience research proved that a child’s early environments and experiences had lasting effects on brain development and cognition (Chugani, Phelps, & Mazziotta, 1987; Caine & Caine, 1991; Kuhl, 1994). The Dana Alliance for Brain Initiatives (1996) supported these findings and concluded that from infancy through 10 years of age, brain cells form most of the connections they maintain for life and those connections have the greatest malleability during that time. These studies supported the earlier findings of Bowlby (1969) and Stern (1985) that indicated positive supportive
relationships during the earliest years of life are essential for cognitive development, healthy emotional development, and necessary for social attachment. Neuroscience research and the growing understanding of how much children learn in the early years before going to school motivated another 21 states to start or expand pre-kindergarten programs in the 1990s (National Research Council and Commission on Behavioral and Social Science and Education, 2000).

Studies by Frede and Barnett (1992) and Marcon (1992) on developmentally appropriate teaching in preschools and kindergartens concluded that developmentally appropriate practices provided experiences that produced greater success for children in the early grades compared to children that did not attend high quality developmentally appropriate preschools and kindergarten programs. Schweinhart, Barnes, & Weikart launched a 40 year longitudinal study in 1973 on the long-term influence of standards based developmentally appropriate early childhood programs on low-income at risk children. Schweinhart, Barnes, & Weikart’s decades of research clearly demonstrated that high quality developmentally appropriate early childhood programs with standards produced long-term positive effects.

During the education reform years of 1980 – 1995, state policy makers delegated authority over public education to local school districts, especially in matters of curriculum and instruction (Massell, Krist & Hoppe, 1997). In the past, districts have entrusted the curriculum to teachers or textbook publishers and have not provided instructional guidelines, other than occasional state directions on course requirements or behavioral objectives (Cohen & Spillane, 1993).
Prior to 1999, only three states, Delaware, Ohio, and Oregon, had a distinct pre-kindergarten program that followed all Head Start Performance Standards (Schulman, Blank & Ewen, 1999). Today, although there are differences among states related to their respective educational histories, traditions, and political personalities, the standards movement is evident in every state (Massell et al., 1997). Most states invest to some degree in preschool education involved with multiple state agencies and budgets (US General Accounting Office, 2000).

**Pre-Kindergarten Delivery Systems**

The four basic distinct programs or delivery systems for preschool education are public school, Head Start, childcare, and pre-kindergarten, and they operate in communities with federal, state, and local support (National Governors’ Association, 2000). As with the federal government, state interests in preschool education cross department and agency lines, involving Health and Human Services, Education, Labor, Agriculture, and Treasury departments and agencies.

Pre-kindergarten programs are usually funded from education and other general revenue sources. The federal government contributes 5% of the Title I funding to preschoolers (US General Accounting Office, 2000). The amount of state funding appropriated for all types of pre-kindergarten programs has grown dramatically over time. Before 1970, the total annual investment across the first eight states that started preschool programs were less than $25 million (Marx & Seligson, 1988). By 1988, there were 28 states involved in early education, spending an annual total of $190 million (Mitchell, Seligson, & Marx, 1989). By 2000, there were 42 states spending nearly $2 billion annually on preschool education (Gormley & Luca, 2000). Today, forty-two
states invest in early learning either by funding their own pre-kindergarten programs, supplementing the federal Head Start program, or both (Ceglowski & Bacigalupa, 2002). Only nine states invest no state funds in either pre-kindergarten programs or Head Start. These states are Idaho, Indiana, Mississippi, Montana, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Utah and Wyoming. Three states, Maine, Wisconsin, and West Virginia permit school districts to offer pre-kindergarten programs for four-year-olds in public schools and appropriate state funds for this purpose (Ceglowski & Bacigalupa, 2002). With Policy 2525, West Virginia appropriates the necessary funding and placed all licensed public pre-kindergartens in a public school setting at the beginning of the 2004 – 2005 school year (West Virginia Department of Education, 2003).

Preschool education has always been considered by the federal government to be a community and state issue allowing for a wide variance in preschool programs among states (Gornick & Meyers, 2001). In the past, each state regulated child care programs using different standards and with significant exemptions permitted in many states (Gazan, 1998).

*State Standards Based Reforms*

The passage of NCLB has changed the face of early childhood education on the state level, as it requires all states to establish a format for content standards, assessment, reporting and accountability (NCLB, 2001). If all children are to enter school ready to succeed, as NCLB (2001) proposes, then every state must have a well-functioning standardized early education program so all children will have access to quality preschool education. The chief state school officers (2000) called for action to ensure that every preschool-aged child had quality early care and education, which they proposed can be
attained through national pre-kindergarten standards (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2000). The nation’s governors (2000) supported working toward the goal of a seamless early care and education system through standards (National Governors’ Association, 2000). Schumacher, Greenberg, and Lombardi (2001) concluded that one effective standardized system is more efficient than several separate ones with regulatory, administrative and other gaps, overlaps and inconsistencies.

Current federal government policies are shifting the responsibility for early education to the individual states to enact policies that will promote preschool education and build a unified preschool education system, that functions across the sectors of child care and enforce standards. The National Research Council (2001) supports the establishment of one set of state regulatory standards for all early childhood programs. These standards would provide a basis for maintaining receipt of public funding and ensuring national accreditation by maintaining the necessary infrastructure for effectively promoting preschool education.

Historically, the federal role in matters of social policy was to promote equity among states, to be a funding partner with states, to set standards, to create models of best practices, to conduct research, and to gather and report data. The National Research Council (2001) suggests that if the federal government wants to enact NCLB (2001) legislation, then they should conduct annual assessments of preschools, fund research to develop evidence–based curricula for young children, and create significant financial incentives for states to develop locally responsive educational standards.
Federal Literacy Policy and Standards from 1965 to 1988

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act: Title I and Head Start programs were enacted in 1965. During this time, Robert Kennedy and other Democrats endorsed the use of tests as part of the Elementary and Secondary Act (ESEA) because they thought tests results would show that poor and minority students needed the government to intervene to improve their education (Shannon, 1998). The ESEA policy shared a value for accountability, not to ensure those policies serve the neediest, but to show whether the policy is working, so that funding could be directed. In part, this movement continued under President Lyndon Johnson’s War on Poverty, based on a platform that suggested race, class, and position should not restrain individual access to literacy. This act was typical of the national conservative trend in society, reflecting a commitment to the protection of local values and beliefs. In literacy education, this included control of textbooks and a focus on hierarchical, systematic skill instruction as a “neutral” procedure for reading instruction (Edmondson & Shannon, 1998; Shannon, 2000).

In the 1980s, reports on reading positioned public education as imperative for national security, producing a position that it was the right of every American to accumulate wealth through literacy education (Shannon, 2000). This was a diversion in an otherwise liberal political environment indicative of the prominent book, Becoming a Nation of Readers (1985). In this book the author posits literacy as a basic human right and that literacy knowledge will keep a nation free (Edmondson & Shannon, 1998), emphasizing help for the disenfranchised and highlighting enlightenment ideals.
In 1989, America 2000 was enacted and later this policy became Clinton’s Educate America Act. The program, America Reads, was introduced during President Bill Clinton’s 1996 State of the Union address, listing the following three core literacy components: (1) the primacy of economic growth through literacy education that eventually leads to success in the job market, (2) the development of a shared sense of community through literacy support, and (3) the development of efficient literacy education practices emulating business principles, including standardization and accountability (America Reads, 1997). This policy established a community program of volunteer reading tutors to help children gain independent reading literacy by third grade. The intent was similar to other Clinton administration policies, including the School-to-Work Initiative and welfare reform, requiring people to participate in education and job training activities in order to receive federal financial assistance. This was the first time that education was directly linked to the economy by defining a “reading success equation” (Edmondson & Shannon, 1998).

As the America Reads Act was being implemented in 1997, Representative Bill Goodling, Chairperson of the House Education and Workforce Committee launched The Reading Excellence Act. The Reading Excellence Act of 1998 (P. L. 105-277), was originally authorized by the National Institute for Literacy (2004) and based on the philosophy that literacy is a learned skill and not a biological awakening and as such must be taught with skill-based instruction in the years before kindergarten.

The Reading Excellence Act, enacted in 1998, asked for a commitment to teaching reading based on systematic, scientifically based materials with well-trained
teachers. The National Institute of Literacy (2004) disseminated scientific reading research to teachers through its Partnership for Reading Initiative. It established federal competitive grants to early childhood programs that proved they have enhanced early learning in language and literacy by providing high quality instruction based on the scientifically based research. The Reading Excellence Act included the following four major literacy goals: (1) teach all children to read in their early childhood years, (2) improve reading skills of students and the instructional practices of teachers through the findings of scientific research in reading, including phonics, (3) expand the number of high quality family literacy programs and, and (4) reduce the number of children who are inappropriately referred to special education due to reading difficulties. A subgroup section of this legislation is similar to America Reads (Title III, Section 301) in that it also had a reading tutoring component with a voucher-like system.

After The Reading Excellence Act was enacted, the National Research Council (1998) published *Preventing Reading Difficulties in Young Children* (Snow, Burns & Griffin, 1998), recommending strategies for promoting quality reading instruction. The recommendations for early learning included using reading to obtain meaning from print, having frequent and intensive opportunities to read, frequent exposure to regular spelling-sound relationships, learning about the nature of the alphabetic writing system, and understanding the structure of spoken words.

The National Research Committee (NRC) report identified and summarized research literature relevant to the critical skills, environments, and early development interactions that are instrumental in the acquisition of beginning reading skills (NRC, 1999). Critics of the NRC felt that the reports did not specifically address how reading
skills should be taught and that it produced a “consensus document based on the best judgments of diverse groups of experts in reading research and reading instruction” (National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 2000). Other opponents of the report said it did not consider a diverse, multiple perspective on reading (Edmondson, 2004).

In response to this criticism, Congress asked the Secretary of Education and the Director of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD), to convene a national panel to assess the status of the reading research-based knowledge, including the effectiveness of various approaches to teaching children to read. This led to the Director of NICHD and the Secretary of Education, developing a fourteen member National Reading Panel (NRP). The panel was comprised of scientific research experts from colleges of education, reading teachers, education administrators, and parents. The charge to this panel was to conduct a thorough study of scientific research and knowledge relevant to early reading development and instruction. Within this study, they were to ascertain an indication of reading readiness for application in the classroom, a strategy for disseminating this information to facilitate effective reading instruction in the schools, and a plan for additional scientific research regarding early reading development and instruction. This study constituted the first attempt to use scientifically based research to identify effective reading practices (Shannon, Edmondson, & O’Brien, 2002).

In 1999, the National Reading Panel released their findings in the following reports: *Report of the National Reading Panel, Report of the National Reading Panel: Reports of the Subgroup*, and *Teaching Children to Read: An Evidence Based Assessment of the Scientific Research Literature on Teaching and Its Implications for*
The NRP developed a list of topics for early reading that included phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary development, reading fluency, and reading comprehension (Shannon, 2000). The National Research Panel (NRP) research revealed that systematic phonics instruction produces significant benefits for students in kindergarten through sixth grade and for children having difficulty learning to read (NRP, 1999). They further conjectured that the ability to read and spell words was enhanced in kindergarteners who received systematic beginning phonics instruction.

The NRC’s (1999) results concluded that the first graders who were systematically taught phonics with phonemic awareness instruction beginning in the early years were better able to decode and spell, and comprehend text. They found similar results in older children who had phonic instruction during the early years, as they were better able to decode and spell and to read text orally but their comprehension was not significantly improved over other students that did not receive systematic phonemic instruction.

The National Reading Panel (1999) concluded that phonics instruction had a positive and significant effect on reading skills of students with learning disabilities and low-achieving students who are not disabled. Moreover, the Panel concluded that systematic phonics instruction significantly improved the low socioeconomic status child’s alphabetic knowledge and word reading skills more so than instructional approaches that were less focused on these initial reading skills (Shannon, 2000). The NRP (2000) further concluded that all grade levels benefited from systematic phonics
instruction in learning to spell with the impact being the strongest for kindergartners that received early phonics instruction but that impact decreased in later grades.

For poor readers, the panel found the impact of phonics instruction on spelling was small, reflecting the consistent finding that disabled readers have trouble learning to spell (Durkin, 1993; Cooper & Hedges, 1994; Harris & Hodges, 1995; Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998; NRP, 1998). Additionally, the National Reading Panel recommended a reduction in class size and the writing of literacy standards to enhance the quality and effectiveness of teaching reading.

George W. Bush’s administration used these reports as the primary influence for the Reading First Initiative, which highlighted the scientific research in the same areas as the National Reading Panel’s reports. The Reading First Initiative was a response to the acknowledged failure of the 1998 Reading Excellence Act (Manzo, 2002). The Reading Excellence Act (1998) and the Reading First Initiative were the first acts directed toward individual schools with low-test scores and high poverty rates (Edmondson, 2004). The Reading First Initiative replaced and enhanced the Reading Excellence Act (1998) as it attempted to enforce and monitor schools receiving federal grant money to adhere to the literacy standards and requirements of the 1998 Reading Excellence Act (Manzo, 2002). Schools that are part of the Reading First program are expected to adopt scientifically based reading programs and standards for K-3 students (Shannon, 2000), train teachers in the new reading strategies, and demonstrate adequate yearly progress to improve reading scores (Edmondson & Shannon, 2003).

Critics of The Reading Excellence Act and Reading First Initiatives were dismayed and apprehensive that schools were limited to specific research and reading
programs. The federal government held the position that science is the most typical way of determining what is best (Shannon, 2000) and that the best materials and teaching methods will benefit all students regardless of race, class, or gender (Edmondson, 2004).

In 2001, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (P.L. 107-110) reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Title I, Part B of the NCLB act included The Reading First Initiative (P. L. 105-277) directed at having all children to be able to read by third grade. The Reading First Initiative increased funding available to states and local education agencies to implement comprehensive reading instruction for K-3 children.

The Early Reading First Program (2001), part of Present George W. Bush’s “Good Start, Grow Smart” initiative was designed to transform existing early education programs into centers of excellence that provide high quality, early education to young children, especially those from low income families. The overall purpose of the Early Reading First Program (2002) were to prepare young children to enter kindergarten with the language, cognitive, and early reading skills necessary to prevent reading difficulties and ensure school success, through quality early childhood centers emphasizing pre-kindergarten language and literacy standards. The Early Reading First Program’s pre-kindergarten language and literacy standards included oral language emphasized with vocabulary, expressive language, listening comprehension, phonological awareness with a rhyming component, print awareness, and alphabetic knowledge.

the NCLB act and the Reading First Initiative (2001), teachers and schools were not only given scientifically proven standards, but they were assessed and held financially accountable for implementing standards and teaching strategies. In addition, test scores and adequate yearly progress were to be used to determine the extent of federal and state funding and involvement in schools (Edmondson, 2004).

**Summary of Federal Literacy Policy and Standards**

Historically, the philosophy undergirding literacy education has evolved in concert with changing national trends. The 1960s and 1970s emphasized that literacy education would bring freedom for the underprivileged, the 1980s stressed public education and literacy as necessary for national security, and the 1990s named reading as the key to America’s future success in a global economy. Since 2000, the trend for research based best practices has generated a proclivity for literacy standards based on systematic skills of reading instruction.

**State Literacy Policy and Standards**

The rise to prominence of state education standards over the last twenty years has coincided with the growing role of state education law and policy in district governance of local schools. Twenty-five years ago, most states did not have consistent literacy standards (National Education Goals Panel, 1998). For many years, the only local school districts standards were in the form of optional supplementary materials local educators could order if they sought assistance for curriculum revision (National Education Goals Panel, 1998).

In the seventies, the state role in education greatly expanded with the education finance equalization and minimum competency testing movements. Reports like A
*Nation at Risk* (1983) in the eighties, and business leaders and university officials’ reports of applicant’s deficient literacy and mathematics skills in the nineties, were a catalyst for a widespread national wave of state education reform (National Education Standards and Improvement Council, 1998). This premise of raising student achievement and literacy scores translated into the belief that every child should be taught with effective teaching strategies. The federal strategies of “raising expectations for every student in every school in the United States” was through the development of standards, which defined what students in every state “should aim for and be able to reach” (National Education Standards and Improvement Council, 1998). Government officials felt that the need for standards based reforms was national, but must be implemented and invented locally. Mechanisms for establishing state standards focusing on literacy began in 1995, as a continuing national conversation with the states about creating internationally competitive education standards for America (National Education Standards and Improvement Council, 1998).

The federal and state role in local school districts has grown in public funding, professional licensing, school accountability, student achievement testing, graduation standards, and curriculum and content standards. Since standards are no longer optional for schools, all states have content standards (Gandal, 1997; Joftus & Berman, 1998). With the increasing emphasis on state standards, standards have become more comprehensive in scope and detailed in coverage.

*State Literacy Content Standards*

Litarcy content standards are a major component in every state’s educational plan, but they can be lengthy, complex documents varying greatly from state to state in
organization and content. Each state’s definition of literacy content standards varies in terms, expectations, curriculum frameworks, goals, learning outcomes, proficiencies, and benchmarks (Archibald, 1998).

The National Education Goals Panel (1998) defines standards as the knowledge and skills students should know and be able to do. The National Council for Education Standards and Testing (1998) document states, “Content standards should set out the knowledge, skill, and other understandings that schools should teach in order for American students to attain high levels of competency in the subject matter…those skills include ways of thinking, working, communicating, reasoning, and investigating that characterize each discipline… that ‘knowledge’ includes the most important and enduring ideas, concepts, issues, dilemmas, and information of the discipline.”

Literacy content standards should not be confused with performance standards. Content standards support knowledge, “what students are to know”, performance standards support skills, and “what students are able to do” (The Review of State Standards, 1999). Content literacy standards have a central role in systematic federal reform.

Given that state standards and local content standards are relatively recent developments, there is meager historical research or information on pre-kindergarten literacy standards (Tucker & Codding, 1998). A limited amount of literature is available on standards-based practices focusing on the effects of literacy content standards on local curricula, instruction, and teacher practices (Spillane & Jennings, 1997).

One of few studies (DeStefano & Prestine, 2002) on this topic was a four-year-study directed at assessing the implementation of the Illinois Learning Standards project.
This study evaluated the extent to which districts were implementing learning standards, identified factors that enhanced or inhibited implementation, and investigated the relationship between standards and student achievement (DeStefano & Prestine, 2002). There were no significant correlations to standards having a positive effect on learning in the first three years, but in the fourth year, the findings revealed significant correlations between literacy standards implementation and learning in language arts content areas. The study found that students attending schools with higher overall literacy standards implementation levels scored higher in Grade 3 reading, revealing a positive correlation between standards and student achievement.

From their inception, state content standards have held a considerable degree of importance and significance, as they are a key component of the state education policies (Archibald, 1998). State literacy standards enable local schools to have more control and responsibility for local education. In many states, content standards have been the channel for large scale reform programs aimed at upgrading curriculum and linking other initiatives and policies to make reform more coherent (Archibald, 1997).

Nationally, substantial resources have been directed at the development of content standards (Saxe, 1998). From 1997 to 2001, the federal Reading Excellence Act allocated $280 million to states for literacy needs in high-poverty areas and for standardization of reading instruction (Roller & Long, 2001). Many states adopted similar state level policies patterned after the language and intent of the federal Reading Excellence Act. For instance, Pennsylvania’s well-known program, Read to Succeed, shares the same definition of reading and research as The Reading Excellence Act.
Despite state content standards’ prominence in education reforms and the large financial investment in developing them, the quality of state content standards received little critical scrutiny until 1995. State literacy standards’ goals and content create high expectation for curriculum reform and student learning and enjoy widespread acceptance but there is little consensus on how state standards should be organized and how specific they should be (Joftus & Berman, 1998). In the last ten years the national focus has turned to developing, raising, and refining standards on both national and state levels (Joftus & Berman, 1998; Lerner, 1998; Munroe & Smith, 1998; Raimi & Braden, 1998) and it has only been since 2001 that early learning has been included in the mainstream of the standards reform movement (National Education Goals Panel, 2001).

**Review of State Content Standards**

An annual review of state content standards for literacy was conducted by The American Federation of Teachers (AFT) in 1995. The results of this review was reported in *Making Standards Matter* (1997). This report examined the state standards for literacy including assessment programs and incentives for students linked to achievement of state standards (National Education Goals, 1998), and included a state-by-state review of the quality of state content standards. That same year the Fordham Foundation began publishing an annual *The State of the State Standards*, a state standards review. The Council for Basic Education (CBE) published a study in 1998 that focused on English language arts and mathematics content standards. These reports represent the first
systematic attempt to evaluate the overall quality of state content literacy standards (National Education Goals, 1998).

The findings from the AFT, CBE, and Fordham Foundation suggest that state content standards varied greatly in how they were organized, in the level of detail and specificity of the content prescription, and in the clarity expression (Archibald, 1998). In the English Language Arts sections of the AFT and CBE state-by-state reviews of literacy standards, on a scale of 0 to 4, twenty states received an “inadequate” status with scores ranging from zero to 1.99, while five states received “exemplary” status with scores ranging from 3.00 to 4.00 (American Federation of Teachers, 1995; Council for Basic Education, 1998). The remaining states received “barely adequate” scores of 2.00 to 2.34. After the AFT and CBE reports, the federal government insisted all states develop a system of state standards modeled after the “exemplary” standard system (Archibald, 1998).

The Fordham Foundation report was based on the AFT findings, as it did a meta-analysis of all states that received a score of 2 or better in standards. In the English Language Arts section concerning reading the Fordham’s Foundation report listed scores ranging from C to C+ in a letter grade scale of A-F (Fordham Foundation, 1997). Potentially, the Fordham scores could be much lower as it did not include in the sample 20 states with content standards that did not achieve at least an “adequate” score in the AFT evaluation.

**Effects of Content Standards**

Given that state and local content standards are relatively recent developments, there is little research on these standards in relation to student achievement or on pre-
kindergarten standards and achievement (Tucker & Codding, 1998). Alternatively, many organizations and researchers support the NAEYC’s claim that children’s experiences during early childhood not only influence their later functioning in school but also can have effects throughout life (NAEYC, 2003) Gallahue (1993) found that the preschool years are the optimum time for the development of fundamental motor skills necessary for later achievement. Dyson and Genishi (1993) found that the preschool years represent the optimum time for language development that supported literacy, which they concluded was a foundational aspect with lifelong implications.

Barnett’s (1995) research demonstrated long-term effects of early childhood education programs. He concluded that high quality early childhood programs have a standardized approach to instruction with developmentally appropriate practices while low quality programs do not, and that high quality early childhood education can produce sizeable improvement in school achievements. Barnett’s findings supported Schweinhart, Barnes, & Weikart (1993) longitudinal findings that children from low-income disadvantaged families who participate in standards-based high quality preschool programs are significantly less likely to have been placed in special education, retained a grade, participated in a crime, or dropped out of school compared to low income students that did not attend standards-based preschool. These findings are also supported by the evidence in the longitudinal studies of Lazar and Darlington (1982), Berreuta-Clement, et al. (1984), and Miller and Bizzell (1984), who reported positive consequences for children in early childhood programs with a standardized approach to learning with developmentally appropriate practices.

Howes’ (1988) study of preschool children through first grade indicated that high quality childcare could predict academic success, adjustment to school, and reduce behavioral problems for children in first grade. Although these studies show potential positive effects of high quality childcare, the Cost, Quality and Child Outcomes Study Team in 1995 found that good quality, identified in the studies as developmentally appropriate practices for standards of instruction that support children’s cognitive development, is provided in only 15% of the states’ early childhood programs. Twenty percent of the early childcare programs surveyed were rated “barely adequate” or “inadequate” for quality. Twelve percent were in settings considered not effective to the development of learning (Cost, Quality and Child Outcomes Study Team, 1995). An
unintended outcome of this study was a federal and state early childhood paradigm shift toward standards for early learning.

**Establishment of State Literacy Standards**

In 1996, the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) found disappointing results when it surveyed 50 states on the progress of establishing early literacy standards in connection with Goals 2000 and found disappointing results. Five states were not formally participating in Goals 2000. Twenty states reported that “not much is going on.” In several southern states early childhood education seemed to be controversial “even to speak about” because of religious opposition of government inference in family rights to govern early childhood. In Louisiana, the state legislature voted to eliminate the early childhood initiative after protest from conservative groups. Many states had neglected to comply with the Goals 2000 legislation and had not established the required early childhood programs. Twelve states have established exemplary programs that are serving as a federal model for other states (Office of Educational Research and Improvement, 1996).

**Model Programs with Literacy Standards**

In 1999, Smart Start was established through Georgia’s Early Learning Initiative (GELI) to develop and implement a long-term plan to increase school readiness including language and literacy standards (Education Commission of the States, 2004). Furthermore, Georgia has an Office of School Readiness (OSR) authorized to administer the Georgia pre-kindergarten programs in areas of licensing of the 976 childcare centers managed by Head Start Collaboration Office.
In 1999, South Carolina passed the First Steps Initiative that included language and literacy standards focused on preparing children for school (Education Commission of the States, 2004). The legislation is a comprehensive, results-oriented statewide initiative to help prepare children to be ready to read. It is the first and only legislation in South Carolina for pre-kindergarten early language and literacy learning. South Carolina also has a state policy that supports literacy achievement through an interagency collaboration for literacy education in low-performing public and private preschools (District Support to Low-Performing Schools Initiative, 2001).

In 2000, Colorado’s Department of Education held numerous workshops and conferences with local school districts to establish a framework based on the national standards for early literacy standards in preschools (Bodrova, Leong, Paynter, Semenov, 2000). The state agenda adhered to a similar format used in West Virginia for the development of Pre-Kindergarten standards in 2001. The framework included: (1) establish consistent definitions for standards and benchmarks, (2) establish a consistent format for early literacy standards and benchmarks, (3) articulate a set of early literacy standards and benchmarks based on current national and state standards documents that reflect the foundational knowledge and developmental difference representative of the research on early literacy development at the pre-kindergarten and kindergarten levels, and (4) provide sufficient and appropriate information aligned with this set of standards and benchmarks to aid pre-kindergarten and kindergarten teachers in assessing the early literacy development of their students and making classroom instructional decisions.

In 2003, Michigan passed a School Readiness Program that implements language and literacy standards through High/Scope Perry Preschools (2003). The program
targeted preschoolers not eligible for Head Start, but at risk for school failure. Researchers consistently found language and literacy differences favoring the High/Scope Perry Preschool programs. The High/Scope Perry Preschools’ 40 year study (2003) of economically disadvantaged children found significant differences that favored a preschool group over a no-preschool group, based on selected tests of intellectual and language performance on reading, language, math, total school achievement and attitude toward school. The children were assessed at 7, 14 and 19. Schweinhart, Barnes, & Weikart (1993) supported the conclusion that programs with child-initiated learning in a constructivist, developmentally appropriate approach with standards, in contrast to those preschool programs that are teacher-directed, are superior in terms of childhood emotional development.

In 1997, a study by Schweinhart, Barnes, and Weikart supported the previous results and added that there is a significant difference in adult citizenship favoring the High/Scope Perry Preschool approach. These findings were consistent with those of other High/Scope Perry Preschool sites across the full spectrum of socioeconomic, ethnic, and cultural background. The companion study in other countries by independent investigators also confirmed that preschool children attending well-implemented High/Scope Perry Preschool programs outperformed those in settings without these active learning opportunities (Sylvia, 1992; Veen, Roeleveld, & Leseman, 2000). The findings suggested that language and literacy developmentally appropriate practices taught in an active learning environment with established standards, resulted in significant differences in student literacy achievements.
Since 1999, the following states have developed language and literacy standards for preschools and/or Head Start: Georgia, Vermont, Colorado, Florida, Maryland, Michigan, North Carolina, South Carolina, Wisconsin, and West Virginia (Education Commission of the States, 2004). These states have had systematic success in articulating standards for young children in ways that are consistent with their unique place in the educational process (Marzano & Kendall, 1996).

Head Start developed the first literacy content and performance standards for four-year-olds, but there has been little research on the academic effects. The lack of definitive research on established early childhood Head Start standards may be due to many factors. Chester E. Finn, Jr., president of the Thomas B. Fordham Foundation, criticized members of what he calls the “preschool establishment” who resist strong accountability and “shun responsibility for advancing a child’s cognitive development” (2002). This resistance may be in reaction to the White House summary (2002) stipulating that data from local Head Start providers on how they are meeting the standards would be used in evaluating future contracts.

Amos Hatch (2002) found that pre-kindergarten standards have met with some resistance as early childhood educators see standards as vitally important in early childhood education, unless they are used in ways that put pressure on teachers to abandon their mission of teaching young children in favor of teaching a core set of competencies. Hatch argues that young children are not developmentally ready for the emphasis of academic expectations. Hatch views the proliferation of standards for early childhood settings as threatening the integrity of early childhood professionals and the quality of educational experiences for young children. Hatch asserts that it is difficult to
make a compelling case that young children actually benefit from this movement, as there is little empirical evidence of a causal link between standard setting and enhanced student learning (Hatch, 2002).

_Literacy Standards and Student Achievement_

Most of the research on literacy standards has reviewed the effect of standards on instruction, teaching practices and curriculum (Spillane & Jennings, 1997). Little research has been conducted on the relationship of literacy standards to student achievement. Wixson and Dutro’s 1999 descriptive study of what is known about standards and early reading analyzed 42 states with an emphasis on a subset of 14 documents that provided grade-by-grade information on standards in grades K-3. The findings revealed that documents that do not provide standards for each grade missed important content that is unique to K-3 levels. The National Center for Early Development and Learning in 2000 developed a study measuring students’ reading readiness in all 50 states’ kindergarten programs. Twenty-two states including West Virginia received failing grades in reading readiness.

_Literacy Standards and State Academic Standards_

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 encompasses Title I, the federal program for disadvantaged students, and sets into play a requirement that all states are required to have literacy standards since the standardized tests must be aligned with state academic standards. In 2004, Rebora reported on the federal probe of each state’s literacy standards. In the school year 2002-2003, all states were assessed on the quality of their standards relative to the use of scientifically based research including benchmarks and authentic assessments. Twenty-two states received failing marks (Rebora, 2004). At that
time, West Virginia was in the process of finalizing dissemination of pre-kindergarten literacy standards to early childhood programs (West Virginia Department of Education, 2003).

In 2001, State and District Support to the Low-Performing Schools Initiative was enacted that distributed research based strategies and exemplary practices to improve low-performing schools. The literacy focus of this initiative was improving professional development in literacy, interagency collaboration in supporting literacy achievement of students in low-performing schools through public-private preschools, Title I, and IDEA (District Support to Low-Performing Schools Initiative, 2001). One element of this legislation was the formulation of early literacy standards based on scientifically researched early learning developmentally appropriate practices. The state initiative, Programs and Policies for Early Reading Success for grades K-2 (2001) was created to set state expectations for early reading instruction.

In 2004, the Reading First Act, created a competitive grant to help states and districts set up scientifically research-based reading programs with emphasis on grades K-3. A smaller early reading program was also developed to help states assist 3-5 year olds in disadvantaged areas to read (Rebora, 2004). This is first time competitive grants have been implemented for early literacy.

There are some prominent opponents of standard reforms. Michael Apple (2001) calls the standards movement “reform on the cheap.” David Elkind (2002), publisher of The Hurried Child (1987), challenges the appropriateness of standards-based approaches to reforming early childhood education, because pre-kindergarteners need a stronger emphasis on how young children develop and learn.
The West Virginia Pre-Kindergarten Language and Literacy Standards

The Early Learning Opportunities Act, first enacted in 2001, provided the framework for states to develop and operate early learning programs to produce educational gains for young children below compulsory school age. After three years of work, the national pre-kindergarten standards were released in a federal document, *Guidelines for Pre-Kindergarten Learning and Teaching*, in November 2002. This was the first national guideline model for states to pattern pre-kindergarten standards for learning and teaching (The First National Guidelines, 2002). The national guidelines are designed to address all areas of growth and development for children 3-5 years of age. The national pre-kindergarten standards were developed by education experts under the direction of Dr. Sharon Kagan and endorsed by NAEYC.

*The National Pre-Kindergarten Standards: Guidelines for Teaching and Learning* (Pre-Kindergarten Standards, 2002), is organized around three domains with guidelines. Domain 1 includes self knowledge, social skills, and motivation to learn. Domain II includes the basic symbol system of each child’s culture, and Domain III includes the knowledge of the world in which they live. The West Virginia Language and Literacy Pre-Kindergarten Standards (2002), like the national pre-kindergarten standards are subdivided into language, literacy, and writing. The relationship between the National and West Virginia standards is illustrated in Appendix II.

While *The National Pre-Kindergarten Standards: Guidelines for Teaching and Learning* (Pre-Kindergarten Standards, 2002) brought national focus and support for states to form early childhood standards, there had been little success in West Virginia in the formation of pre-kindergarten standards until funding became attached to the
development of standards. The West Virginia Department of Education was compelled by the Grow Start, Grow Smart federal initiative to have voluntary guidelines for 3-5 year olds, to continue receiving funds from the Child Care and Development Fund. To meet this prerequisite, a panel of education and early childhood experts that included the Director of Early Care and Education Quality Initiatives in West Virginia’s DHHR and the West Virginia Director of Early Childhood in the Department of Education, was established to formulate West Virginia pre-kindergarten standards (WV Pre-Kindergarten Standards, 2002).

The Process

In 2001, West Virginia held Quality Initiative and Curriculum workshops and conferences to begin the process of establishing pre-kindergarten standards. The state conference agenda adhered to a format similar to Colorado’s process for establishing pre-kindergarten standards. A nineteen member panel met with other education and early childhood experts and kindergarten teachers to establish a consistent definition that could be aligned with state kindergarten standards for terms such as goals, objectives, and experiences.

The panel reviewed the NAEYC recommended developmentally appropriate practices, various position papers on current research and theory, the Head Start Child Outcomes document, and the national model, Pre-Kindergarten Standards: Guidelines for Teaching and Learning (2000). Decisions were made to use the NAEYC’s developmentally appropriate recommended practices, the language in the Head Start Performance Standards documents, and the standards and benchmarks of the national pre-kindergarten standards (2000) model. The panel established a consistent format for each
subject area and articulated a set of standards and benchmarks based on the federal model and the NAEYC’s recommendations for developmentally appropriate practices in each content area (WV Pre-Kindergarten Standards, 2002).

In an attempt to provide continuity between the pre-kindergarten standards and the kindergarten standards, the national pre-kindergarten standards model (2000) was employed in developing standards and benchmarks for each subject area for alignment with the West Virginia kindergarten standards (WV Pre-Kindergarten Standards, 2002). The final West Virginia pre-kindergarten standards document used the same format, language, and style as the West Virginia kindergarten standards document (WV Pre-Kindergarten Standards, 2002).

Members of the panel met with the Department of Education policy committee to create procedures for the pre-kindergarten standards’ review that adhered to the Department of Education’s process. The State Board of Education gave the authority for the final approval of the standards to the Advisory Committee of PIECES, an early childhood governing body. The PIECES’ advisory committee approved the pre-kindergarten standards and decided to review the standards every five years, unless there are significant changes to the curriculum or criteria (WV Pre-Kindergarten Standards, 2002).

In 2002, West Virginia adopted the West Virginia Pre-Kindergarten Standards: Guidelines for Teaching and Learning (2002) document defining what four-year-olds should know and be able to do at key benchmarks before entering kindergarten. In the NCLB transition school year of 2002-2003, the West Virginia Department of Education permitted counties and schools to use either current instructional goals and objectives or
the newly developed state content standards. Beginning July 1, 2003, all counties and schools were required to use the new standards, objectives, and performance descriptors (West Virginia Department of Education, 2002). The West Virginia pronouncement that the standards are to be implemented in the 2003-2004 school year, included all licensed pre-kindergarten early childhood centers in the state.

On February 25, 2003, the panel convened a workshop to discuss the content standards and objectives with local early childhood providers and early childhood experts. To better introduce and explain the standards to preschool educators, the panel developed the *West Virginia Outcomes for Children*, as an additional guidance document (WV Pre-Kindergarten Standards, 2002).

*The Standards Document*

*The West Virginia Pre-Kindergarten Standards: Guidelines for Teaching and Learning (2002)* document includes a discussion of critical issues related to current national and state standards and a description of the development process for the early literacy standards and benchmarks. It includes current scientifically based research and pertinent early childhood development theories.

The West Virginia document has the same standards, domains, guidelines, benchmarks, and vignettes as the national pre-kindergarten standards. *The West Virginia Pre-Kindergarten Standards: Guidelines for Teaching and Learning (2002)* included additional information and guidance to help classroom teachers implement the standards in a developmentally appropriate manner.

The West Virginia Pre-Kindergarten Standards (2003) document covers a broad span of content areas with goals, emphasizing wherever possible the integrated nature of
early learning. Each guideline has multiple goals that are supported by scientifically based research and theory. The goals are specific knowledge, skills, or attitudes that, together, constitute the broader guideline.

Each goal has specific objectives to delineate the knowledge, skills or attitudes children are expected to gain between the ages of 3-5. Since the standards are developmentally appropriate and age is not a good predictor of what children can learn or do, the objectives are not divided by age (NAEYC, 2002; WV Pre-Kindergarten Standards, 2002). Teachers are encouraged to select objectives that correspond to the child’s needs, level of understanding, experiences, and maturity level.

Since the early childhood teachers and program directors are accountable for higher academic achievements that are specified in the standards, the document provides sufficient and appropriate authentic assessment information aligned with the standards and benchmarks to aid pre-kindergarten teachers in assessing the early literacy development of the students (WV Pre-Kindergarten Standards, 2002). There is a table guide included in the final document for teachers to select a guideline and a benchmark according to the developmental age of the child.

Listed under the guideline, the goal, and the objective is a section entitled, “What Children Will Need to Experience” to guide specific experiences for children to achieve individual goals (The West Virginia Pre-Kindergarten State Content Standards, 2002). Benchmarks are included to assess children according to authentic tasks. Vignettes of appropriate classroom practices and authentic assessments are included at the end of each teacher’s page to give a concrete illustration of the principles underlying the development of the guidelines (The West Virginia Pre-Kindergarten State Content Standards, 2002).
The vignettes are recorded observations that have happened in Head Start programs, childcare centers, and preschools in various geographical settings including full-day, half-time and part-time programs (The West Virginia Pre-Kindergarten State Content Standards, 2002). This was included to give teachers a concrete model to implement, integrate, and evaluate guidelines and goals. The West Virginia Pre-Kindergarten State Content Standards (2002) define the specific content areas that combine to form the broader goal.

Factors That Effect Importance and Implementation of Literacy Standards

Types of Programs

The focus of this study is on the West Virginia delivery systems for pre-kindergarten education that operate with local, state, and federal support. The delivery systems include Head Start, childcare and pre-kindergarten. Children with disabilities may be served in any of the programs (IDEA, 1997). These are not distinct delivery systems because pre-kindergarten programs may use childcare and Head Start programs as delivery systems and some public schools are Head Start grantees. Collaboration between Head Start and childcare organization is promoted by State Initiatives to Promote Early Learning: Next Steps in Coordinating Subsidized Child Care, Head Start, and State Pre-Kindergarten (2001), a federal Head Start policy.

Head Start

Head Start is a Federal-Local grant program to provide comprehensive preschool programs for children living below the poverty level, through state funding and federal Title I programs. In every state, Head Start is delivered by community organizations, public schools, and local government and is free to eligible families. Federal funding supports the direct services, quality improvements, compensation, professional
development and training, technical support, and all ongoing research and assessments (Gazan, 1998). Head Start programs provide comprehensive services for families and children that include psychological and social services, nutrition and health services, and parent involvement and education (McKey et al., 1985). The program has a developmentally appropriate curriculum that has been found to produce immediate positive effects on reading achievement of about 0.5 standard deviation per year according to studies by White and Casto (1985) and Ramey, et al (1985). According to research by Bryant, et al (1994), the Head Start developmentally appropriate curriculum approach produced positive effects and attributed to the program’s intensity, breadth, and attention to the involvement of the children’s parents. Conversely, the Bryant, et al’s study found evidence that the Head Start effects declined over time and were negligible several years after children exited the programs.

Head Start programs must meet federal performance standards for all areas of operation including teacher qualification and accountability of child outcomes. Beginning the 2003-2004 school year, Head Start teachers were required to have at least an associate degree in early childhood education or child development and class sizes were to be limited to 16 children for at least one teacher and one other adult (West Virginia Department of Education, 2003).

The reauthorization of the Head Start federal regulations placed emphasis on early literacy through literacy standards with accountability for the results. The West Virginia Pre-Kindergarten Standards (2002), curriculum content standards and objectives are aligned with the Head Start curriculum, standards, and outcomes framework. Head Start and West Virginia pre-kindergarten curricula are designed to reflect a level of
performance that supports successful transition into kindergarten (West Virginia Department of Education, 2002).

**Childcare**

Childcare has many different types of program delivery options with many variations for full and part time programs (Dozier, 2004). Some programs emphasize academics, others may focus on social development only, and others may not provide any instruction (Dozier, 2004). Childcare has full day programs for a full year offered by private not-for-profit community based agencies, proprietary organizations, and non-public schools (West Virginia Department of Education, 2003). Childcare also delivers services through a part day, part year, private nursery schools. Many childcare programs are small, home based business (West Virginia Department of Education, 2003).

Childcare in West Virginia childcare is financed primarily by families (West Virginia Department of Education, 2003). Some federal and state public funds help low-income families purchase child care. West Virginia does not collect data on how much money is spent on pre-kindergarten programs (West Virginia Department of Education, 2004).

West Virginia regulates childcare programs using standards, except in religiously affiliated programs, part-day programs, and home based programs (West Virginia Department of Education, 2003). The regulatory standards include class size, teacher qualifications, requirements for ongoing professional development, and evidence-based curriculum using the West Virginia Pre-Kindergarten Standards (2002). Teacher qualifications vary within every childcare delivery system. In some childcare centers, a teacher does not need to have any training in early childhood topics before working with
children, but all childcare center workers must be at least 18 years old (West Virginia Department of Education, 2003).

Each West Virginia childcare program develops their individual program guidelines for program size based on their sponsoring affiliate licensing or non-licensure of the program, but all licensed and non-licensed childcare centers must follow the state’s health and safety code regulations (West Virginia Department of Education, 2003). West Virginia licensing regulations (2003) define three types of centers by program size: A Type I center has the capacity of 30 or fewer students, Type II centers have the capacity for 31-69 students, and Type III centers have a capacity of 61 or more students (Early Care and Education Quality Initiatives, 2003). A childcare facility must have at least 13 students to be qualified as a childcare center. A center with 13 or fewer students is considered a home based delivery system and is not obligated to follow any licensing requirements except the health and safety regulations (West Virginia Department of Education, 2003). All West Virginia licensed day cares and early childhood programs must allow 35 square feet per child for education activities (Early Care and Education Quality Initiatives, 2003).

Pre-Kindergarten Programs

Pre-kindergarten programs are academic programs for four-year-old preschool education (West Virginia Department of Education, 2002). In West Virginia, academic pre-kindergarten programs use Head Start, childcare, and public schools to deliver pre-kindergarten programs. The approved West Virginia pre-kindergarten programs are providers of early care and education services including, but not limited to, childcare, private preschool, Head Start, county school systems, and community based programs
that meet or exceed all of the requirements of the state education policies and are a part of a county’s collaborative plan.

The pre-kindergarten programs operating in the public schools may use all of the Department of Education’s early care and education resources (WV Department of Education, 2002). The approved West Virginia pre-kindergarten programs can be counted in the school aid funding formula and are eligible to receive funds through a contracted agreement or direct administration of the county school system. Pre-kindergarten programs are usually funded from many education revenue sources and are free to families unless they are private pre-kindergarten programs. West Virginia provides funding for pre-kindergarten education through state funding including the school aid formula for eligible children, public school funding, Head Start federal funding, Even Start funds, Temporary Assistance to Needy Families, Child Care Development Funds, funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, funds provided by the School Building Authority, and any other volunteered private or public fund (WV Department of Education, 2002).

Although enrollment in pre-kindergarten in West Virginia is voluntary, children that do enroll are required to attend a minimum of three consecutive days a week for at least three and one half hours per day during the school calendar year (West Virginia Department of Education Code 18-8-1, 2002). A child can be “placed” out of a pre-kindergarten if the program director, principal, and teacher concur that requiring further attendance for that school year is not in the best interest of the child (West Virginia Department of Education Code 18-8-1, 2002).
Teacher qualifications require a qualifying minimum certification or endorsement that includes early education, pre-kindergarten endorsement, or birth to five certification. This minimum required permit is good for only one school year (WV Department of Education, 2002) and the person must pursue a Professional Teaching Certificate within five years of the original permit (West Virginia Board of Education Policy 5202, 2002). A person with a degree in preschool special needs, elementary education, child and family studies with an emphasis in early childhood education or child development, or persons with Board of Regents degree with an early childhood/child development specialization, or persons with an Associate of Arts degree in child development/early childhood or occupational development and one year of early education teaching experience can teach in West Virginia pre-kindergartens. However, under emergency criteria set forth in the West Virginia State Registry and Training System, a person who is 18 years old with a high school diploma or equivalent with no experience and possesses “the ability to understand and practice the core competencies with direction and instruction or through sponsorship” may teach in pre-kindergartens (WV STARS, 2002). Annually, each county provides 18 hours of staff development that must meet West Virginia State Training and Registry System requirements (WV STARS, 2002). Aides are required to attend 45 hours of training over a two-year period.

Quality control and accountability are a high priority for West Virginia’s pre-kindergartens since the passage of NCLB (2001), federal education bill included early learning. West Virginia public school pre-kindergartens’ commitment to quality and compliance is expressed in the newly developed pre-kindergarten standards, program accreditation requirements, and staff qualifications requiring early childhood credentials.
ranging from a Child Development Associate credential to teacher certification. West Virginia pre-kindergartens are evaluated through the Early Childhood Evaluation Rating Scale (ECERS) self-evaluation that was partially developed by NAEYC (West Virginia Department of Education Code 19-4-1, 2002).

The pre-kindergarteners follow a curriculum where cognitive, social-emotional and physical development is complementary and interactive. Literacy is paramount on the state’s pre-kindergarten agenda and is taught with the recommended evidence-based curriculum that is designed to promote the cognitive, social-emotional, and physical competence of young children (NAEYC, 2003). West Virginia has adopted the pre-kindergarten standards that have mandated developmentally appropriate practices and the West Virginia pre-kindergarten’s curriculum and activities must follow the standards using the suggested developmentally appropriate best practices (West Virginia Department of Education, 2002).

Quality of Childcare Delivery Systems

Positive consequence of participation in early childhood programs have shown that one or two years in high quality preschool improved school readiness and enhanced early scholastic achievement (Hubbell, 1983; White, 1985; McKey, et al, 1985; Haskin, 1989; Barnett, 1992; Reynolds, 1995). Students that attended developmentally appropriate early childhood programs demonstrated greater school competence and had lower grade retention and less special education placements than students who did not participate in high quality programs (Hubbell, 1983; White, 1985; McKey, et al, 1985; Haskin, 1989; Barnett, 1992; Reynolds, 1995). Longitudinal studies through the High/Scope Perry Preschool program supports the positive effects of preschool programs.
on long-term outcomes such as reducing school drop out rate and increased employment (Berrueta-Clement, Schweinhart, Barnes, & Weikart, 1993).

Scarr and Eisenberg (1993) conducted a longitudinal study to determine the differences, if any, between qualities of care in group home based childcare and center childcare. The study of 39 four-year-olds from two centers and two home based programs found that children in home based childcare spent more time in structured activities and in groups of larger size than children in center childcare. These findings supported the work of Innes, et al (1982) study on four year olds in home childcare and center childcare. Both studies found that children in home based childcare interacted more with their caregivers and displayed fewer negative behaviors than children in center based care.

In a prior study comparing home and center based child care in Sweden, Cochran’s (1977) findings revealed increased levels of verbal stimulation in home childcare. A longitudinal study conducted in the United Kingdom by Melhuish et al (1990, 1991) assessed the childcare center interactions between 246 18 months olds, producing evidence that center based children engage in more peer-peer behaviors than do children in home based childcare. This is consistent with findings reported by Clarke-Stewart and Gruber (1984, 1992) that found children in center based care displayed better social skills with peers than children in home based care.

and found no statistically significant differences between home based care and center based care. Goossens’ research was conducted in Holland on multiple care arrangements and found no difference in the childcare between home based and center based care. An AFT OPRE (2002) research study found no significant differences between family childcare homes and center classrooms on any cognitive scores except in logic and mathematics, as the family childcare homes showed higher scores in mathematics and logic and more positive social peer interactions.

Studies conducted by Schwarz et al (1973), Golden et al (1978), McCartney et al (1982), and Phillips et al (1987) found no differences in comparisons of center based and home based child care centers. In Ackerman-Ross and Khana’s (1989) research of childcare and language performance, comparisons were made between 40 white, middle class, three-year olds, who were in home based childcare since infancy and a group of white, middle class, three-year olds who had been in center based childcare since infancy. The study’s findings showed no real difference in auditory or receptive language performance.

Cognitive effects of home based childcare and center based childcare were researched by Lamb et al (1988), who sampled an equal number of boys and girls between 11 and 24 months of age in both types of childcare in Sweden. Lamb et al’s (1988) findings report no differences in the children’s cognitive development.

Other studies reported on the differences between home based and center based childcare in terms of social behaviors and found children in center based childcare exhibited more cooperative play (Ramey et al., 1983; Howes & Olenic, 1986) and more popularity with peers (Schindler et al, 1987; Field, et al., 1988; Balleyguier et al, 1991).
When comparisons were made in Field et al.’s (1988) research, between children who spent larger and smaller number of hours in center based care, more hours in center based care were positively associated with more social behavior (Field et al, 1988). Field et al’s (1988) findings of children with early entry into center based childcare engaged in more social, cooperative play, and sought the caregiver’s attention more often, than early entry, part time children. Howes and Olenick (1986) found that children in center based childcare were more likely than children in home based care to exhibit self-regulation, and those children in high quality child care centers were more compliant and less resistant than children in low quality childcare centers. No effects were found for age or the interaction between and age and type of childcare.

Quality of Early Childhood Programs

Preschools have been shown to produce benefits in children’s performances in areas that are related to school success (McKey, et al, 1985; Lee, et al., 1988), especially in the language and literacy content areas (Haskins, 1989). The 1995 longitudinal study, *Cost, Quality, and Child Outcomes in Child Care Centers*, produced by researcher Sharon Kagan in concert with researchers from the Universities of Denver, California, and North Carolina, examined the influence of typical childcare centers on children’s development during the preschool years to second grade (Peisner-Feinberg & et al., 1999). The study evaluated high quality childcare experiences in terms of classroom practices and teacher-child relationships. The study reports on the effects of these experiences to enhance a child’s ability to be ready to learn in kindergarten and through the early elementary years (Kagan, 1999). Measures were related to the child’s receptive vocabulary, mathematics, letter-word recognition, behavior problems, sociability, peer
relationships to classroom childcare quality and teacher characteristics (Peisner-Feinberg & et al., 1999).

One of the major findings of the *Cost, Quality, and Child Outcomes in Child Care Centers* was that all children, regardless of family backgrounds, who attended higher quality childcare centers scored higher on measures of cognitive and social skills in childcare and through transition into school (Peisner-Feinberg, et al., 1999). The influence of quality childcare effects lasted for at least 3 years. Children with mothers of lower educational attainment benefited more from high quality childcare. Studies on these children showed preschool positive effects lasting through second grade. Children with mothers of two years or more of post high school education effects lasted only through kindergarten. The quality of childcare classroom practices was positively correlated to a child’s cognitive development (Peisner-Feinberg, et al., 1995, 1999).

The *Cost, Quality, and Child Outcomes in Child Care Centers* concluded that high quality childcare can improve skills and school readiness of all children but that only a small portion of centers provided quality care (Miller, 1995). The researchers rated only one in seven centers as “developmentally” appropriate and one in eight centers was found to be neglectful of children’s basic needs, with a bleaker picture for the care of infants and toddlers.

Peisner-Feinberg et al (1999) found that states with more demanding licensing standards had fewer poor-quality programs. This report also encouraged states to develop pre-kindergarten standards based on findings as North Carolina had the lowest licensing standards and the least effective rated centers (Peisner-Feinberg, et al., 1995, 1999). North Carolina’s early childhood programs produced the least observable traits of a
quality program (Morris, 2000), by allowing lower staff to children ratios and requiring less early childhood education for its staff. The study found that teacher salaries and administrators’ prior experience were strong determinants of quality (Peisner-Feinberg, et al., 1995, 1999).

The *Cost, Quality, and Child Outcomes in Child Care Centers* study findings showed profit and nonprofit centers charge similar fees and that quality does not vary between for-profit and not-for-profit pre-kindergarten centers. Centers operated by public schools or other public agencies offered the highest quality, while church affiliated centers had the lowest quality.

Bryant (1993) did a study of children in North Carolina public preschools and concluded that they had lower ratings on language and reasoning measures than for other aspects of the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale (ECERS) (Bryant et al, 1993). Scores were particularly low for skills involving language use. A follow up study of 32 North Carolina Head Start classrooms produced the lowest scores for language and reasoning on the ECERS test (Bryant et al, 1993). In another comprehensive review of preschools’ effect on low-income families, Bryant (1995) concluded that preschool programs could produce large effects on IQ during the early childhood years and substantial persistent effects on achievement, grade retention, special education, high school graduation, and socialization.

The Abecedarian Project (Campbell and Ramey, 1994) is a longitudinal study of that tracks an infant in a comprehensive preschool program until the age of 15. The study had random selection with experimental and controlled grouping. Infants in the experimental group received enriched day care that stressed language and cognitive
development through age 5. At follow up testing in grades 3 and 8, the children in the experimental group had statistically significant higher reading achievement.

Brady, et al (1994) studied 42 inner city preschoolers 4 to 5 years old. At the beginning of the study, the preschoolers showed no evidence of phonological awareness for they could not generate rhymes or segment simple words into phonemes or read any words. Phonological awareness begins to develop around age 3, and is pivotal in learning to read (Brady, et al 1994). Phonological awareness with the ability to rhyme words has been proven predictive of future reading achievement (NRC, 2002). The 21 children who received training in enhancing the development of phonological awareness were closely matched to the 21 preschoolers who did not receive treatment. The treatment group received training in small groups for a total of 18 hours over four months, with 3 twenty minute sessions per week. The preschoolers had training in rhyming words, segmentation of morphemes and syllables, categorization of sounds, and identification of syllables. On posttests, 12 of the 21 preschoolers in the control group were still unable to generate any rhymes, and only one could segment any words into phonemes. All but one of the trained groups could generate rhymes, and six had complete full phonemic segmentation of words. Phonological awareness is included in the West Virginia pre-kindergarten language and literacy standards. Children who enter school with the competencies identified in the national pre-kindergarten standards should be better prepared to benefit from formal reading instruction (NRC, 2002; W.V Pre-Kindergarten Standards, 2002).

The overall program quality in a childcare setting has been proven to have positive effects on language and preliteracy skills (Barnett, et al 1987). The evaluation of
the North Carolina preschool programs found evidence of programs that could reduce the
degree of delay for high-risk children in language and literacy (Bryant, et al., 1993) with
the adopting of prereading standards. Studies by Barnett et al (1987) and Bryant, et al.,
(1993) found that the quality of the preschool program attended was related to children’s
vocabulary scores at kindergarten, even in the preschools labeled “mediocre” in quality.

Assessment programs like CARE (Roberts et al., 1989; Wasik, et al, 1990), the
Infant Health Development Program (IHDP, 1990; Brooks-Gunn et al, 1994),
Comprehensive Child Development Program (St. Pierre and Lopez, 1994), and Even
Start (St. Pierre et al., 1993) have documented the positive effects of high quality
classroom practices for disadvantaged children living in poverty, especially in language
children in Head Start classes yielded evidence that classroom quality was related to child
outcomes on school readiness.

Class Size

Guidelines for class size ratios for the number of teachers to children in
preschools vary from state to state. North Dakota and New York have the lowest adult-
to-child ratios with one adult required for every seven preschoolers (Murray, 2000).
Texas has the highest ratio with one adult required for every seventeen preschoolers.
West Virginia’s public pre-kindergartens are required to have two adults for every 18
pre-kindergarteners (West Virginia Department of Education, 2002). The other states
and the District of Columbia require, on average, 2 adults for every 20 preschoolers.
Public child care and private pre-kindergartens do not have to follow the specified
licensing requirements for class size.
The four key class size reduction studies are Tennessee’s Project Student/Teacher Achievement Ratio (STAR) (1985), Wisconsin’s Student Achievement Guarantee in Education (SAGE) (1996), California’s Class Size Reduction (CSR) (1996) and Indiana’s Project Prime Time (1997). Each of these studies reported that when class size dropped below 17 students per teacher, children benefited in achievement, particularly among urban and rural children from families “at risk” and in poverty. These studies revealed that the smaller class size allowed teachers to get to know their students better and provided more opportunities for individualization (Zahorik, 1999).

The longitudinal Tennessee class size project STAR (1985) was a three phase study designed to determine the effects of smaller class size in the earliest grades on short term and long term pupil performance. The 6,500 Tennessee students were randomly assigned to 330 classrooms of either small classes of 13-17 pupils and 1 adult, regular classes with 22-26 pupils and 1 adult, or regular classes of 22-26 pupils with a teacher and an aide (STAR, 1985).

The first phase of the project began in 1985 and ended four years later in 1988. Results obtained in kindergarten, first, second, and third grade classrooms of 13-17 pupils were compared with classrooms of 22-26 pupils for the same grades in reading, math and basic study skills. Smaller classes of 13-17 pupils produced substantial improvements in early learning and cognitive studies. The second phase of the project, the Lasting Benefits Study (LBS), began in 1994 and ended five years later (Nye, et al, 1999). The findings showed that the benefits persisted for at least five years, as measured by norm-referenced and criterion-referenced standardized achievement tests (Finn, 1997).
The third phase of the Project Challenge continued through 1999 (Boyd-Zaharias, 1999). This phase included 17 of the poorest school districts with well below average scores in reading and mathematics. These students were given small classes beginning in kindergarten and continuing through third grade. At the end of each year, these districts improved. On average, the final test scores produced above average scores in reading and mathematics. The researchers concluded that small classes ameliorate large schools’ effect, reduce grade retention and discipline problems, benefit minority students by giving students more individual attention and encouraging more active student participation (Achilles, 1996).

The findings of all three phases of STAR led the researchers to believe that small classes are better, principally in the early years of schooling, because the program resulted in improved academic performance, improved cognitive scores, fewer grade retentions, more time-on-task, higher levels of student engagement, and reduced test score gaps between white and nonwhite students. Achilles’ (1996) follow up study of STAR research summarized that small classes beginning in kindergarten seem to prevent later school problems. Finn’s (1997) follow up study of STAR research attributed the benefits of small class size to the fact that students are more actively engaged in learning.

In a 2001 follow up of the STAR study, Finn, et al found that the year in which students started and the number of years they participated in small classes was an important determinant of benefits gained. Starting early and continuing for at least 3 years were necessary to ensure long term cumulative effects. Indiana’s Project Prime Time, the SAGE project, and the California Class Size Reduction Program findings show that short term exposure to small classes of less than 20 pupils can produce minor
increases in student achievement. Those gains in student achievement were stronger in the early grades, particularly for disadvantaged at risk children (Biddle & Berliner, 2002). The conclusions of these reports suggest that when planned carefully, long term participation in small classes in the early grades does generate gains in student achievement and that gains can increase with more exposure to small classes.

Nye, et al did a STAR follow up study in 2001 and found that controlling for achievement in the previous year, and small classes in grades 1-3 yield statistically significant positive effects on reading and mathematics achievement. In 2002, McCluskey followed up on the STAR results by assessing students in the eighth grade. Her findings were that students exposed to smaller classes were 5 months ahead of their peers in reading and mathematics (McCluskey, 2002). She found that decreasing school size is more advantageous than smaller classes, based upon the facts that since World War II, the average school size has grown by factors of five, student-teacher ratios have declined, and academic achievement has fallen. She concluded smaller class size benefited student achievement, but that smaller schools were better than smaller classes.

The Wisconsin’s Student Achievement Guarantee in Education (SAGE) is a five year program featuring class size reductions of 15 students to 1 teacher for kindergarten through third grade. The 15 to 1 student teacher ratio has four formats: regular 15:1 ratio in one classroom, 15:1 ratio of two classes in a shared classroom, 30:2 ratio employing team teaching; and 30:2 ratio with one teacher for 30 students and a floating teacher during reading, language arts, and mathematics. Achievement results based on pre and post tests discovered that SAGE students in grades 1 and 2 consistently outperformed students in 14 comparison schools, but there was no difference between the SAGE
different classrooms in reading, language arts, and mathematics. The researchers’ based their analysis of the effects of reduced class size on classroom events, on three years of teacher logs, questionnaires, interviews, and classroom observations to conclude that the importance of individualization of classroom practices is the chief mediator of the variables. Molnar, et al (1999) followed up on the SAGE study through a quasi-experimental, comparative-change design. Student Achievement Guarantee in Education (SAGE) results of 1996-1997 and 1997-1998 are consistent with the positive effects shown by the STAR projects (Molnar, et al., 1999). The California’s CSR and STAR programs demonstrated that smaller class sizes improved student achievement, improved student behavior and discipline both in the classroom and outside of school, improved student citizenship and participation in and outside of school, and enhanced development of responsible persons who can contribute to society (Achilles, 2003).

The Classroom Organization and Student Behavior study (2000) considered student engagement and its relation to academic achievement by reviewing the STAR project’s conclusion that engagement is an essential part of learning and achievement. The researchers reviewed the previous studies that linked smaller class size to positive achievement and positive engagement behavior (Farber & Finn, 2000). To examine the potential lasting effect, teacher ratings of student behavior were collected for 2,177 fourth graders and 2,804 eighth graders in Tennessee. All the students had participated during their K-3 grades in the STAR project. The findings suggested that fourth graders, who had participated in smaller classes, did not differ significantly in their classroom engagement behaviors from their peers who had participated in full sized classes (Farber & Finn, 2000). Alternatively, fourth graders in small classes did engage in more positive
classroom behaviors than their peers who had been in full sized classrooms with 2 adults. In grade 8, no differences were found in student engagement regardless of students’ previous class size.

All the above research supports the following conclusions that small class size has three main effects that lead to individualization: fewer discipline problems and more instruction, teachers are more knowledgeable about their students, and teachers are more enthusiastic about teaching (Zahorik, 1999). In small size classes, there is less misbehavior and when misbehavior does occur, it is more noticeable and teachers can effectively ameliorate the situation immediately. Less time spent on discipline leads to more time available for instruction. When classes are small, teachers experience less stress from disciplining, correcting papers, and not having time to do what needs to be done. As stress is reduced, enthusiasm and satisfaction increase and educators begin to implement active, hands on, developmentally appropriate teaching procedures (Zahorik, 1999).

More knowledge of individual students is another important result of these studies. Caregivers that come to know students personally and have a greater knowledge and understanding of each student’s place in the learning cycle, generate a caring and supportive environment for learning. The NAEYC (2002) has established that teachers can encourage children’s language by individually talking with them throughout the day.

The main result of more instructional time, knowledge of students, and teacher enthusiasm is individualization. Teachers individualize when they form small groups and provide numerous opportunities for each student to express his/her understanding. This can create greater coverage of content and greater in depth treatment of content. Zahorik
(1999) found that when class size was reduced teachers completed the grade level curriculum well before the end of the year. This study also reported that teachers of smaller class size had increased enthusiasm, increased use of manipulatives, interest centers, and cooperative grouping, because of less student misbehaviors. This study revealed that teachers could identify the learning problems of students more timely and the teachers provided help to individual students more frequently.

Hanushek’s study of class size reduction and school productivity (1999) revealed a statistically significant positive difference in the performance of teachers in smaller classes. Bracey’s (2000) reanalysis of Hanushek’s school productivity data supported the original findings and additionally found that class size influences students’ in voucher schools also.

Teachers Education and Experience

The conventional wisdom in child care literature is that the quality of child care experienced by children in centers is determined by the ratio of staff to children and the education and training of the staff (Hayes, Palmer & Zaslow, 1990). The teacher characteristics that impact perceived importance and implementation of literacy standards are teacher education, child care experience, and training. The childcare experience and training variables measure specific forms of child related skills, whereas education measures the acquisition of general skills.

Research by Howes, Phillips, and Whitebook (1992) provided evidence that adult child ratio and education are linked to caregiver use of developmentally appropriate practices. Although other research from the National Child Care Staffing Study (1990) found teacher training to influence the child care process, only college level training was
associated with effective teaching (Whitebrook et al., 1990). The researchers predicted that even with favorable teacher pupil ratios and group sizes, an untrained teacher with only a high school degree would not produce quality in a childcare center and would not use developmentally appropriate practices. Howes, Phillips, Whitebrook (1992) concluded that the childcare teacher, in the context of teaching, emerged as important to quality for childcare centers. They further concluded that when educated teachers teach in childcare centers, meeting high standards of quality, they are likely to engage in developmentally appropriate activities.

According to Blau’s (2000) study, *National Day Care Study*, teacher age, childcare experience and job tenure have negligible effects on quality of care. Attending college increases quality substantially, but graduating from college and attending graduate school provides no additional productive increases. Attending training workshops increases teacher quality and a college degree in a childcare related field provided another large boost in quality care. In the *National Day Care Study* (2000), older teachers with more experience were considered to exhibit more quality developmentally appropriate practices and only workshop based training increased quality.

Lamb’s nonparental child care (1998) study correlated the relationship between childcare inputs and childcare quality as measured by ECERS (Harms & Clifford, 1980, 1990) and Infant Toddler Environment Rating Scale (ITERS) (Harms, Clifford & Cryer, 1980, 1986). In Lamb’s study the correlations between ECERS-ITERS and the key inputs were group size, experience, tenure, workshops, high school, vocational/CDA degree, college, associate degree, bachelor’s degree, and graduate training (Lamb, 1998).
In the National Day Care Study (NDCS) (1980) teachers trained in early childhood education were consistently found to provide higher quality care (Travers, Goodson, Singer, & Cornell, 1980).

Galinsky’s 1994 research on family child care found that providers who received additional child care training and education produced the most nurturing and educational environment. The research supported by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) found the effects of some measures of recent training in early childhood education were robust (NICHD, 1996), but quality of care was not related to caregivers’ age, experience, or professionalism.

In 1999, McCartney used the data from the NICHD analysis to study the long term effects and found that the children who had closer relationships with childcare teachers had fewer problem behaviors and better thinking skills. Warm teacher child relationships also had some influence on children’s language and math skills through grade 2, but those effects were not as strong.

Using the NICHD data, The Study of Early Child Care (2002) found that caregivers who were better educated and had received more recent and higher levels of training provided richer developmentally appropriate learning environments (Clarke-Stewart, et al., 2002). Children with more educated and trained caregivers performed better on tests of cognitive and language development. The RAND research (2002) showed that student outcomes are related to the quality of the instruction they receive, which in turn reflects teacher preparation and ongoing teacher professional development (Snow, 2002).
In the 1995 analysis of quality childcare, *Cost, Quality, and Child Outcomes in Child Care Centers* study, researchers found a positive and statistically significant effect of the wage rate for teachers with low education, a positive and statistically significant effect of having a college degree, and a negative and statistically significant effect of teacher turnover to quality. The study found the director’s leadership style, measured by developmentally appropriate or inappropriate philosophy, is correlated to quality (Mocan, et al., 1995).

The follow up research of *Cost, Quality, and Child Outcomes in Child Care Centers* (1999) involved the study of three year olds in childcare centers to second grade. Data were collected in California, Colorado, Connecticut, and North Carolina through visits to 50 nonprofit and 50 profit childcare centers in each state to determine how the quality of the childcare influenced the child’s language, mathematics, readings, and social skills (Helburn, 1995). The researcher evaluated classroom practices and the teachers’ ratings of their relationship with each child. The findings showed high quality childcare significantly affects children in language, academic and social skills, regardless of demographic backgrounds.

In reference to the teacher, findings showed closeness of the caregiver-child relationship influenced children’s social development through the early school years. The report concluded that high quality childcare experiences of classroom practices and teacher-child relationship enhanced children’s abilities to take advantage of the educational opportunities as they enter school through second grade (Peisner-Feinberg & et al., 1999). These findings were considered long term, lasting at least through kindergarten for some children and through second grade for others. These findings
strongly supported the implication that better professional educational preparation produced higher quality programs (Peisner-Feinberg & et al., 1999) and higher state standards were needed for caregivers (Helburn, 1995).

In 1995, data from the *Cost, Quality, and Child Outcomes in Child Care Centers* study was used to examine the effects of teacher qualifications on the quality of childcare provided in centers (Helburn, 1995). The empirical results indicated that teacher education and training have statistically significant effects, even accounting for unobserved differences across centers. The results suggested that teachers with more education are more likely to implement developmentally appropriate practices (Phillips & Howes, 1987; Whitebook, Howes, & Phillips, 1989; Cost, Quality and Outcomes Study Team, 1995).

North Carolina received the lowest rating as having the worst childcare centers of the four states in the *Cost, Quality, and Child Outcomes in Child Care Centers* study. John Morris (2000) performed a post hoc multiple regression analysis of the study to determine factors that would account for North Carolina’s poor ratings. Morris found that North Carolina had the least stringent licensing requirements for childcare centers of the four states. When the North Carolina profit and nonprofit sectors were subdivided by ownership, the for-profit chain childcare centers and nonprofit centers operated by churches or community agencies produced significantly lower “hard to observe” quality than other nonprofit subsectors. The researcher suggested that profit firms take advantage of low state licensing standards.

Sue Russell of Day Care Services Association in North Carolina continued this study in 2003 and found similar multiple regression factors. The North Carolina data on
the early childhood workforce showed that the vast majority of childcare teachers did not have a two or four year college degree and earned less than $6.00 per hour (Russell, 2004), and the North Carolina turnover rate for childcare teachers exceeded 30% (Russell, 2004).

A study of 60 preschool, kindergarten, and first grade teachers found a significant relationship among teacher beliefs about how children learn and their views on the goals of early childhood education, positions on policies, and actual practices (Stipek & Pyler, 1997). Maxwell, et al (2001) research concluded that teacher characteristics are predictors of developmentally appropriate classroom practices. Teacher characteristics of education level, years of experience, and beliefs about developmentally appropriate practices accounted for 42% of the variance in observed classroom practices. Teacher education and beliefs in developmentally appropriate or inappropriate practices accounted for most of the variance in classroom practices.

McMullen and Kazim (2002) studied the relationship between educational background and the philosophical orientation of early childhood educators who were caregivers and teachers of preschoolers, ages 3 to 6 years of age in Indiana. The study compared the highest level of education attained by the early childhood professionals and their educational backgrounds, with their self-reported beliefs and developmentally appropriate practices. These results revealed that college education in any field, whether specific to working with young children or not, produced developmentally appropriate practices.

Charlesworth et al (1991, 1993, 1998) found a correlation between level of education and scores for self reported developmentally appropriate beliefs. Professionals
with a bachelor’s degree or higher, more strongly adopted developmentally appropriate philosophy than professionals with less education, even if that education was directly related to young children.

A study by Burchinal et al (2002) found that caregivers with more formal education in early childhood tend to provide higher quality child care. Results from this study revealed that caregivers with formal education in early childhood or workshop training were rated as more sensitive in interactions with children and as providing higher quality developmentally appropriate practices than other caregivers, even after adjusting for the caregivers’ experience and differences related to state, adult-child ratios and type of classroom. Additionally, children in those caregiver’s classes had more advanced language skills.

Vartuli’s (1999) research on early childhood teacher beliefs and how those beliefs relate to classroom practices based on three selected self reported testing instruments on beliefs and practices, concluded that beliefs were significantly more developmentally appropriate than developmentally appropriate practices in Head Start, kindergarten, first, second, and third grades. As the grade level increased, the level of self-reported developmentally appropriate beliefs and practices decreased. Teachers in first, second, and third grade did not rate developmentally appropriate practices as high as Head Start and kindergarten teachers. Teachers with fewer years of teaching experience and those with certification in early childhood education were more likely to believe in and use developmentally appropriate practices.
Summary

An examination of the literature revealed considerable evidence that high quality early childhood programs for children from birth to age 5 can have long term positive consequences for children’s success in school and later in life, especially for children from low income families. The literature indicated that high quality early childhood programs have a great potential for preventing later school failure, particularly if they have placed strong emphasis on language and literacy development.

Federal legislation has brought early learning to the forefront of state education reforms, based upon a number of studies demonstrating the long-term positive consequences of a high quality early childhood programs for children’s language and literacy achievement.
CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a description of the research design, population sampled, procedures, the instruments and the statistical method that were used in this study. Specifically, data were gathered to determine the differences between the importance and the level of implementation of the national pre-kindergarten standards for language and literacy in four year old pre-kindergarten programs as perceived by West Virginia directors of early childhood centers. These differences were further examined using a series of selected situational and demographic variables.

Study Design

The research methodology that will be used in this study falls under the general classification of descriptive research and more particularly, survey research. Descriptive research is used to depict present-day people, conditions, settings, and events (Charles & Mertler, 2002), and survey research is used to study populations by examining samples chosen from the population to discover the relative incidence, distribution, and interrelations of sociological and psychological variables (Kerlinger, 1986).

In this study, a single group of early childhood centers was studied only once (Stanley & Campbell, 1969). The study employed a survey research design to gather descriptive information from directors of four-year-old pre-kindergarten programs in West Virginia’s 440 licensed early childhood centers. The study examined the differences between the perceived importance and the level of implementation of national pre-kindergarten standards. Additionally, the study sought to identify differences between the levels of importance and implementation based on selected demographic-situational
variables. The independent variables were demographic factors and perceived importance and the dependent variable is the implementation level of the national pre-kindergarten standards. Both the independent variables and the dependent variable were measured by the early childhood centers directors’ perception of these factors.

Population and Sampling

The population for this study was all West Virginia directors of licensed early childhood four-year-old pre-kindergarten programs, employed during the 2004-2005 school year. According to the West Virginia Personnel Directory (2003), the West Virginia Department Human Health Resources (2003), the Director of West Virginia Early Childhood/Even Start (Jones, 2003), and the Director of Education Quality Initiative (Nutt, 2003), there were 440 preschool early childhood directors. All four-year-old, pre-kindergarten early childhood directors of a licensed early childhood program in West Virginia, employed during the 2004-2005 school year were surveyed.

Instrumentation

The survey instrument, The Early Childhood Education Language and Literacy Survey (ECELLS), was developed by the researcher and was used as the primary data gathering instrument in the study. Based on the existing National Pre-Kindergarten Standards, the two page survey instrument was designed to collect information about the practices for each of the research questions.

The Early Childhood Education Language and Literacy Survey (ECELLS) is a self-report, direct mail questionnaire consisting of two parts. The first part of the survey relates to demographic information and the second part of the survey instrument relates to the National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy.
Part one of the survey instrument measures six demographic factors identified in the research questions in chapter one. Items one, two, and three require demographic information concerning the early childhood director, including the highest level of education, years of experience as an early childhood director, and years of experience in the present position. Items four, five, and six require early childhood program information including program type, class size, and program size.

Part two of the survey instrument consists of a list of 13 practices directly related to the National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy. These statements were drawn directly from *The Pre-Kindergarten Standards: Guidelines for Teaching and Learning* (October, 2002). See Appendix A for a listing of each item’s correlation to the national standards. Each item on the instrument was cross-referenced to one or more national pre-kindergarten standards for language and literacy. Each item consists of a structured statement followed by a 5 point Likert rating scale indicating the level of importance and the level of implementation.

Column one is rated according to the respondent’s perception of the level of importance each of the practices is to an effective language and literacy program for four-year-old pre-kindergarten programs. The Likert rating scale constitutes a continuum of importance from (NI) not important, (SI) slightly important, (MI) moderately important, (FI) fairly important, to (HI) highly important. Column two is rated according to the level of implementation, which the respondent perceives foreach practice in their center. The Likert rating scale follows a continuum of (N) never, (S) seldom, (O) occasionally, (F) frequently, or (A) always. See Appendix G for The Early Childhood Education Language and Literacy Survey (ECELLS).
Development of the Instrument

The Early Childhood Education Language and Literacy Survey (ECELLS) that was used in the study is a researcher developed Likert scale survey instrument. The practices on the questionnaire are cross-referenced to the National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy that was developed for four-year-olds in childcare programs. (See Appendix A) The National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy are based on the latest research and theory on early childhood development and practices that were adopted by the United States and subsequently by West Virginia. The survey practices specifically adhere to the adopted West Virginia standards and measures associated with the four-year-old pre-kindergarten program (See Appendix B).

Instrument Validation

Instrument validity was determined by administering The Early Childhood Education Language and Literacy Survey (ECELLS) to two separate panels of experienced practitioners and professionals in the early childhood field and in the education research field. The panel of early childhood professionals consisted of persons in the early childhood field or a similar population to the one being studied. The reviewers examined specific items for content validity and for the completeness of the questionnaire.

Instrument validation also included a review by experts in education research. The experts evaluated the instrument for readability and face validity. The panel of education experts was encouraged to make comments and suggestions concerning the survey directions, recording procedures, and specific items.

Based on the panel’s suggestions the survey’s directions for Column I and Column II were modified for clarity. The panel suggested providing an opportunity for respondents to list the exact number for the years of experience in early childhood field, years in present position, and number of students in the pre-kindergarten program in order to prevent having any empty cells in the statistical data analysis. Additionally, the panel observed duplication in the program type demographic. This was changed in the final product. All feedback provided was carefully studied and considered and the end product was a revised instrument reflecting the comments and suggestions of the panel.

Procedures

The ECELLS was administered to all 440 early childhood directors in West Virginia and a minimum acceptable return rate of 50 percent was sought in order to
assure reliability. The direct mail questionnaire was sent to all the early children pre-
kindergarten directors in licensed early childhood centers in West Virginia in a packet
that included a cover letter, the ECELLS questionnaire, and pre-addressed stamped return
envelope.

The cover letter encouraged participation and explained the purpose of the study
with the assurance of confidentially of subjects (See Appendix F). In an effort to boost
accuracy of answers and the percentage of returned questionnaires, early childhood
directors surveyed were informed in writing on the cover letter that only composite data
would be reported and neither they nor their early childhood center would be identified
by name or by distinguishable characteristics in the study’s findings (Gay & Airasian,
2000).

Data Analysis

Data analysis procedures for this study were quantitative in nature. This was a
descriptive research study, depicting present-day conditions, settings, and events based
on the perceptions of directors of the early childhood four year old pre-kindergarten
programs in West Virginia. To show current practices and status of the pre-kindergarten
programs, the research must first describe and then interpret the present situation,
condition, behaviors, interactions, and events in relationship to the national pre-
kindergarten standards. This information was described using descriptive statistics for all
variables. The Chi-Square, a nonparametric statistical procedure, was used to determine
the significance of differences between groups (Charles & Mertler, 2002). The Chi-
Square compared what was observed against what was expected (Charles & Mertler,
2002).
CHAPTER FOUR

Introduction

This chapter presents the data collected for this study, which examined the differences between the pre-kindergarten program directors perceived importance and implementation of the National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy. A statistical analysis of the data is provided. The chapter is divided into five sections: (a) population and sample, (b) demographic data, (c) major findings related to the differences between importance and implementation of the standards, (d) major findings related to the differences between the director demographics and their perceived importance and implementation of the standards, and (e) a summary of the chapter.

Response Rate

The population for this study consisted of the directors of the 440 licensed pre-kindergarten centers in West Virginia. These directors were identified in the January 2004 edition of the West Virginia Personnel Directory (2002), by the West Virginia Department Human Health Resources (2003), by the Director of West Virginia Early Childhood/Even Start (Jones, 2003), and by the Director of Education Quality Initiative (Nutts, 2003). Following the initial administration of the survey in October 2004, the initial population was reduced to 395. This change was necessary as a result of the closing of private four-year-old pre-kindergarten programs when the State of West Virginia placed pre-kindergartens in with the public school system. Additionally, the financial collapse of the West Virginia Multi-Cap Head Start Programs forced many Head Start programs to close. The result was that 45 previously identified pre-
kindergarten programs were removed from the state of West Virginia’s list of 440 licensed pre-kindergarten programs.

The data were collected from 210 of the remaining 395 directors who returned usable responses to The Early Childhood Education Language and Literacy Survey (ECELLS). Of these 210 responses received 186 were a result of the first mailing. This represented 47% of the early childhood centers surveyed (n=395). A second mailing resulted in 23 responses for a total of 210 or 53% of the population (n=395). This 53% response is in excess of the 50% plus one response requirement (Kerlinger, 1986).

Demographics

Part One of the Early Childhood Education Language and Literacy Survey (ECELLS) requested demographic data relative to director education, director experience, director tenure, program type, class size of four year olds in the program, and program size. This section provides a summary of the data collected for each variable.

Program Director Education Level

The first item on the ECELLS survey asked respondents to indicate the highest level of education completed. As indicated by Table 1, the largest percentage of the respondents, 45.7% (n=96), reported a post-baccalaureate degree. Sixty-three respondents (30.4%) reported a bachelor’s degree. The smallest percentages of respondents, 11.6% (n=24) were reported by the high school diploma and the associate degree respondents.
Table 1

Program Director Education Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Baccalaureate Degree</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Director Years of Experience in Early Childhood Field

The second item on the survey requested data relating to the director’s total number of years of experience in the early childhood field. As indicated in Table 2, the largest percentage of the respondents, 24.5% (n=51) had 6-11 years of early childhood experience. Forty-two (20.2%) of the respondents were reported by both directors that had five years or less of experience and directors that had 12-17 years of experience. This was followed by 17.9% (n=37) with 18-23 years of experience, and 17.3% (n=36) with 23 years or more of experience. The range of years of experience in the early childhood field reported was from less than one year to forty years. The mean years of experience were 14.27 and the standard deviation was 20.
Table 2

Program Director Years of Experience in Early Childhood Field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in Early Childhood</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 years or less</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-11 years</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-17 years</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-23 years</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 years or more</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Director Number of Years in Present Position

As indicated in Table 3, the largest percentage of the respondents, 53.1% (n=110), reported five years or less in their present position. Forty-eight (23.1%) of the 48 respondents reported 6-11 years in present position. This was followed by 12.6% (n=26) with eighteen years or more, and 11.1% (n=23) with 12-17 years in their present position. The range of the directors’ years in their present position was from 3 weeks to 30 years. The mean for tenure is 7.8 years and the standard deviation is three.
Table 3

Program Director Number of Years in Present Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years as Director</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 years or less</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-11 years</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-17 years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 years or more</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Type

As indicated in Table 4, the largest percentage of the respondents, 39.9\% (n=83), described their program type as an early childhood childcare or group home center. The second highest percentage, 27.9\% (n=58), was public pre-kindergarten programs. Forty Head Start directors (19.2\%) responded to this survey, and 13.0\% (n=27), reported they directed private pre-kindergarten programs.
Table 4

Type of Pre-Kindergarten Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head Start</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Center</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Pre-K Preschool</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Pre-K Preschool</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td><strong>208</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Four Year Olds Enrolled in Pre-Kindergarten Program

The fifth demographic question asked program directors to indicate the number of four year olds enrolled in their early childhood pre-kindergarten programs. As indicated in Table 5, the largest percentage of the respondents, 51.2% (n=106) had 1 to 20 four year old pre-kindergartners. Fifty-five (26.6%) respondents had 61 or more four year olds pre-kindergartners. The smallest percentage, 22.2% (n=46), had 21 – 60 four year old pre-kindergartners.
**Table 5**

Number of Four Year Olds Enrolled in Pre-Kindergarten Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Four Year Olds Enrolled in Pre-Kindergarten Program</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-20 four year old</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 -60 four year old</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 or more four year olds</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Program Size*

The sixth demographic question asked respondents to indicate the total number of all students enrolled in their early childhood program based on the State of West Virginia Board of Education classification types for early childhood centers. As indicated in Table 6, the largest percentage, 48.6% (n=101), was Type III - 61 or more students. Fifty-eight (27.9%) of the respondents were Type I – 30 students or less. Forty-nine (23.6%) of the respondents were Type II - 31 – 60 students.
Table 6

Program Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Size</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type I – 30 or less students</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type II – 31 to 60 students</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type III – 61 or more students</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N 208

Major Findings Related to the Importance and Implementation of National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy

The study’s findings related to pre-kindergarten program directors perceived importance and implementation of the National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy are presented in this section of the chapter. The data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software.

Goal 1: Listening

Survey items one, two, three, four and seven were derived from the objectives for Goal 1: Listening. The percentage of directors responding “Highly Important” ranged from 59.3% (n= 24) for item one (discriminate between sounds) to 77.5% (n=161) for item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment). The percentage of respondents reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 16.7% (n=35) on item two (listen attentively)
to 24.4% (n=51) on item four (letter-sound relationships). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 85.6% (n=179) for item one (discriminate between sounds) to 97.2% (n=202) for item three (listen for pleasure).

The percentage of directors responding “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 29.4% (n=60) on item one (discriminate between sounds) to 56.5% (n=116) on item two (listen attentively). The percentage of respondents reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 38.5% (n=79) on item two (listen attentively) to 54.5% (n=111) on item one (discriminate between sounds). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 80.0% (n=164) for item seven (phonemic awareness) to 95.0% (n=195) on item two (listen attentively).

The chi-square values ranged from $X^2 = 85.7$ for item seven (develop phonemic awareness) to $X^2 = 107.3$ for item one (discriminate between sounds). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (See Table 7).

**Goal 2: Complex Speech**

Survey items five and six were derived from the objectives for Goal 2: Complex Speech. The percentage of directors responding “Highly Important” ranged from 86.6% (n=181) for item six (conversation skills) to 88.0% (n=184) for item five (vocabulary growth). The percentage of respondents reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 10.0% (n=21) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 11.0% (n=23) for item six (conversation skills). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are
combined, the percentage responses ranged from 97.6% (n=204) for item six (conversation skills) to 98.0% (n=205) for item five (vocabulary growth).

The percentage of directors responding “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 60.5% (n=124) on item five (vocabulary growth) to 69.3% (n=142) on item six (conversation skills). The percentage of respondents reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 27.8% (n=57) on item six (conversation skills) to 35.6% (n=73) on item five (vocabulary growth). When the “Always” and “Frequently” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 96.1% (n=197) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 97.1% (n=199) for item six (conversation skills).

The chi square values ranged from $X^2 = 52.6$ for item five (vocabulary growth) to $X^2 = 54.7$ for item six (conversation skills). All chi-square values were significant at $p<.05$ (See Table 7).

**Goal 3: Print Awareness**

Survey items eight, nine, and ten were derived from the objectives for Goal 3: Print Awareness. The percentage of directors responding “Highly Important” ranged from 44.5% (n=90) for item nine (grapheme awareness) to 84.0% (n=173) for item ten (book familiarity). The percentage of respondents reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 13.0% (n=27) on item ten (develop book familiarity) to 38.1% (n=77) on item nine (grapheme awareness). When the “Fairly Important” and Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 82.6% (n=167) on item nine (grapheme awareness) to 97.0% (n=200) on item ten (book familiarity).
The percentage of directors responding “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 21.2% (n=42) on item nine (grapheme awareness) to 70.6% (n=142) on item ten (book familiarity). The percentage of respondents reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 26.9% (n=54) on item ten (book familiarity) to 48.0% (n=95) on item nine (grapheme awareness). When the “Always” and “Frequently” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 69.2% (n=137) on item nine (grapheme awareness) to 97.5% (n=196) on item ten (book familiarity).

The chi square values ranged from $X^2 = 82.1$ for item ten (book familiarity) to $X^2=243.1$ for item nine (grapheme awareness). All chi-square values were significant at $p< .05$ (See Table 7).

**Goal 4: Story Structure**

Survey items eleven and twelve were derived from the objectives for Goal 4: Story Structure. The percentage of directors responding “Highly Important” ranged from 42.0% (n=87) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 52.7% (n=109) on item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 31.4% (n=65) on item eleven (narrative story forms) to 31.9% (n=66) on item twelve (identify story elements). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 73.9% (n=153) for item eleven (narrative story forms) to 84.1% (n=174) for item twelve (identify story elements)

The percentage of directors responding “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 20.2% (n=41) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 33.4% (n=68) on
item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 41.9% (n=85) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 42.4% (n = 86) on item eleven (narrative story forms). When the “Always” and “Frequently” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 62.1% (n=126) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 75.8% (n=154) for item eleven (narrative story forms).

The chi square values ranged from $X^2 = 118.1$ for item eleven (narrative story forms) to $X^2 = 178.4$ for item twelve (identify story elements). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (See Table 7).

**Goal 5: Beginning Writing Skills and Knowledge**

Survey item thirteen was derived from the objectives for Goal 5: Beginning Writing Skills and Knowledge. The percentage of directors responding “Highly Important” were 71.0% (n=147) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of respondents reporting the item as “Fairly Important” 17.4% (n=36) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Fairly Important” and Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage response 88.4% (n=183) on item thirteen (understand that writing has a purpose).

The percentage of directors responding “Always” for level of implementation 43.8% (n=89) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of respondents reporting items on “Frequently” implemented 38.4% (n=78) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Always” and “Frequently” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses were 89.4% (n=167)
on item thirteen (understand that writing has a purpose). The chi square value of $X^2 = 212.2$ was significant at $p < .05$ (See Table 7).
**Table 7**

Differences in Importance and Level of Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Goal</th>
<th>IMPORTANCE</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1: Listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Provides opportunities for children to discriminate between sounds in their environment</td>
<td>3 1.5</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Provides opportunities for children to listen attentively</td>
<td>3 1.4</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provides opportunities for children to listen for pleasure and enjoyment</td>
<td>3 1.4</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Provides experiences for children to identify letter-sound relationship</td>
<td>3 1.4</td>
<td>6 2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Provides experiences for children to develop phonemic awareness</td>
<td>3 1.4</td>
<td>3 1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2: Complex Speech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Provides opportunities for children to experience a steady vocabulary growth</td>
<td>3 1.5</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Provides experiences for children to increase their conversation skills</td>
<td>3 1.4</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates significance at the .05 level
Importance: NI = Not Important; SI = Slightly Important; MI = Moderately Important; FI = Fairly Important; HI = Highly Importance
Implementation: N = Never; S = Seldom; O = Occasionally; F = Frequently; A = Always
Major Findings Related to the Differences in Importance and Implementation
Of National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy
And Demographics Variables

The second research question asked, “What are the differences, based on the
director education, director experience, director tenure, program type, class size of four
year olds in the program, and program size between the importance and level of
implementation of the National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy in
four year old programs as perceived by West Virginia directors of licensed daycare
programs?” The study’s findings for research question two are presented in this section
of the chapter. The presentation of the findings for this question is organized by the
National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy Guidelines and Goals
and by the demographic variables. The data were analyzed using the Statistical Package
for Social Sciences (SPSS) software.

Differences of Importance and Implementation of National Pre-Kindergarten
Standards for Language and Literacy and Education Levels

Goal 1: Listening

Survey items one, two, three, four and seven were derived from the objectives for
Goal 1: Listening. The percentage of respondents with a high school diploma reporting
“Highly Important” ranged from 50.0% (n=12) for item one (discriminate between
sounds) to 79.2% (n=19) for item two (listen attentively). The percentage of respondents
with high school diploma reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 8.3%
(n=2) on item two (listen attentively) to 33.3% (n=8) on item one (discriminate between
sounds) and item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment). When the “Fairly Important”
and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 83.3% (n=20) for item one (discriminate between sounds) to 91.7% (n=22) for item four (identify letter-sound) and item seven (develop phonemic awareness) for the directors with high school diploma.

The percentage of respondents with high school diploma reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 50.0% (n=12) on item seven (develop phonemic awareness) to 70.8% (n=17) on item two (listen attentively). The percentage of respondents with high school diploma reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 20.8% (n=5) on item two (listen attentively) to 41.7% (n=10) on item one (discriminate between sounds) and item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 75.0% (n=18) for item seven (develop phonemic awareness) to 95.9% (n=23) on item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) for the directors with high school diploma.

The chi-square values for those with high school diploma ranged from $X^2 = 9.0$ for item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) to $X^2 = 30.8$ for item four (identify letter-sound). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 9).

The percentage of respondents with associate degree reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 52.4% (n=11) for item seven (develop phonemic awareness) to 90.5% (n=19) for item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment). The percentage of respondents with associate degree reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 9.5% (n=2) on item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) to 38.1% (n=8) on item seven (develop phonemic awareness). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly
Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 83.3% (n=20) for item one (discriminate between sounds) to 91.7% (n=22) on both item four (identify letter-sound) and item seven (develop phonemic awareness) for directors with associate degree.

The percentage of respondents with associate degree reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 23.8% (n=5) on item seven (develop phonemic awareness) to 52.4% (n=11) on item two (listen attentively). The percentage of respondents with associate degree reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 20.8% (n=5) on item two (listen attentively) to 41.7% (n=10) on item one (discriminate between sounds) and item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment).

When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 75.0% (n=18) on item seven (develop phonemic awareness) to 95.9% (n=23) on item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) for directors with associate degree.

The chi-square values for those with associate degree ranged from $X^2 = 2.0$ for item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) to $X^2 = 15.2$ for item four (identify letter-sound). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 9).

The percentage of respondents with bachelor degree reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 53.2% (n=33) for item one (discriminate between sounds) to 76.2% (n=48) for item two (listen attentively). The percentage of respondents with bachelor degree reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 19.0% (n=12) on item two (listen attentively) to 35.5% (n=22) on item one (discriminate between sounds). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage
responses ranged from 85.8% (n=54) for item four (identify letter-sound) to 95.2% 
(n=60) for both item two (listen attentively) and item three (listen for pleasure and 
enjoyment) for directors with bachelor degree.

The percentage of respondents with bachelor degree reporting “Always” for level 
of implementation ranged from 25.8% (n=16) on item one (discriminate between sounds) 
to 54.0% (n=34) on item two (listen attentively). The percentage of respondents with 
bachelor degree reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 41.3% (n=26) 
on item two (listen attentively) to 54.0% (n=34) on item seven (develop phonemic 
awareness). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses 
are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 77.3% (n=50) for item one 
(discriminate between sounds) to 95.3% (n=60) on item two (listen attentively) for 
directors with bachelor degree.

The chi-square values for those with bachelor degree ranged from $X^2 = 19.5$ for 
item two (listen attentively) to $X^2 = 96.4$ for item four (identify letter-sound). All chi-
square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 9).

The percentage of respondents with graduate degree reporting “Highly Important” 
ranged from 55.2% (n=53) for item four (identify letter-sound) to 80.0% (n=76) for item 
three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment). The percentage of respondents with graduate 
degree reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 16.7% (n=16) on item two 
(listen attentively) to 27.1% (n=26) on item four (identify letter-sound). When the “Fairly 
Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses 
ranged from 82.3% (n=79) for item four (identify letter-sound) to 96.8% (n=92) on item 
three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) for directors with graduate degree.
The percentage of respondents with graduate degree reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 28.1% (n=27) on item one (discriminate between sounds) to 56.3% (n=54) on item two (listen attentively). The percentage of respondents with graduate degree reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 38.5% (n=37) on item two (listen attentively) and on item seven (develop phonemic awareness) to 58.3% (n=56) for item one (discriminate between sounds). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 75.0% (n=72) on item seven (develop phonemic awareness) to 94.8% (n=91) on item two (listen attentively) for directors with graduate degree.

The chi-square values for those with graduate degree ranged from $X^2 = 21.7$ on item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) to $X^2 = 67.9$ on item four (identify letter-sound). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 8).

*Goal 2: Complex Speech*

Survey items five and six were derived from the objectives for Goal 2: Complex Speech. The percentage of respondents with high school diploma reporting “Highly Important” were 79.2% (n=19) for both item five (vocabulary growth) and item six (conversation skills). The percentage of respondents with high school diploma reporting the items as “Fairly Important” were 20.8% (n=5) for both item five (vocabulary growth) and item six (conversation skills). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses were 100% (n=24) on both item five (vocabulary growth) and on item six (conversation skills) for the directors with high school diploma.
The percentage of respondents with high school diploma reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 58.3% (n=14) on item five (vocabulary growth) to 79.2% (n=19) on item six (conversation skills). The percentage of respondents with high school diploma reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged 20.8% (n=5) on item six (conversation skills) to 33.3% (n=6) on item five (vocabulary growth). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged 91.6% (n=20) on item five (vocabulary growth) to 100% (n=24) on item six (conversation skills) for the directors with high school diploma.

The chi-square values for those with high school diploma ranged from $X^2 = 6.2$ for item five (vocabulary growth) to $X^2 = 13.4$ for item six (conversation skills). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 8).

The percentage of respondents with associate degree reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 95.2% (n=20) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 90.5% (n=19) for item six (conversation skills). No respondents with associate degree reported “Fairly Important” for item five (vocabulary growth). The percentage of respondents with associate degree reporting items as “Fairly Important” were 9.5% (n=2) on item six (conversation skills). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 95.2% (n=20) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 100% (n=21) for item six (conversation skills) for the directors with an associate degree.

The percentage of respondents with associate degree reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 57.1% (n=12) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 76.2% (n=16) for item six (conversation skills). The percentage of respondents with associate
degree reporting items “Frequently” implemented ranged 23.8% (n=5) for item six (conversation skills) to 38.1% (n=8) for item five (vocabulary growth). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged were 95.2% (n=20) on item five (vocabulary growth) to 100% (n=21) on item six (conversation skills) for the directors with an associate degree.

The chi-square values for those with an associate degree ranged from $X^2 = .836$ for item six (conversation skills) to $X^2 = 21.0$ for item five (vocabulary growth). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 8).

The percentage of respondents with bachelor degree reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 87.3% (n=55) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 90.5% (n=57) for item six (conversation skills). The percentage of respondents with bachelor degree reporting “Fairly Important” ranged from 6.3% (n=4) for item six (conversation skills) to 11.1% (n=7) for item five (vocabulary growth). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 96.8% (n=61) on item six (conversation skills) to 98.4% (n=62) on item five (vocabulary growth) for the directors with a bachelor degree.

The percentage of respondents with bachelor degree reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 63.5% (n=40) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 71.4% (n=45) for item six (conversation skills). The percentage of respondents with a bachelor degree reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged 27.0% (n=17) for item six (conversation skills) to 36.5% (n=23) on item five (vocabulary growth). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the
percentage responses ranged from 98.4% (n=62) on item six (conversation skills) ) to 100% (n=21) on item five (vocabulary growth) for the directors with a bachelor degree.

The chi-square values for those with a bachelor degree ranged from $X^2 = .836$ for item six (conversation skills) to $X^2 = 21.0$ for item five (vocabulary growth). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 8).

The percentage of respondents with graduate degree reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 85.4% (n=82) for item six (conversation skills) to 90.6% (n=67) for item five (vocabulary growth). The percentage of respondents with graduate degree reporting “Fairly Important” ranged from 7.3% (n=7) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 11.5% (n=11) for item six (conversation skills). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 96.9.4% (n=93) for item six (conversation skills) to 97.9% (n=74) for item five (vocabulary growth) for the directors with a graduate degree.

The percentage of respondents with graduate degree reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 60.4% (n=58) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 64.6% (n=62) for item six (conversation skills). The percentage of respondents with graduate degree reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged 30.2% (n=29) on item six (conversation skills) to 34.4% (n=33) on item five (vocabulary growth). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses were 94.8% (n=91) on both item five (vocabulary growth) and on item six (conversation skills) for the directors with a graduate degree.
The chi-square values for those with a graduate degree ranged from $X^2 = 11.9$ for item five (vocabulary growth) to $X^2 = 36.5$ for item six (conversation skills). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 8).

**Goal 3: Print Awareness**

Survey items eight, nine, and ten were derived from the objectives for Goal 3: Print Awareness. The percentage of respondents with high school diploma reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 22.7% (n=5) for item ten (book familiarity) to 68.2% (n=15) for item eight (understand print carries a message). The percentage of respondents with high school diploma reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 22.7% (n=5) for item eight (understand print carries a message) to 77.3% (n=17) for item ten (book familiarity). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 72.8% (n=16) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 100% (n=22) on item ten (book familiarity) for the directors with high school diploma.

The percentage of respondents with high school diploma reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 27.3% (n=11) for item eight (understand print carries a message) to 81.8% (n=18) for item ten (book familiarity). The percentage of respondents with high school diploma reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 13.6% (n=3) on item ten (book familiarity) to 31.8% (n=6) for both item nine (develop grapheme awareness) and item eight (understand print carries a message). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 59.1% (n=12) on item nine (develop grapheme
awareness) to 95.4% (n=21) on item ten (book familiarity) for the directors with high school diploma.

The chi-square values for those with high school diploma ranged from $X^2 = 6.2$ for item eight (understand print carries a message) to $X^2 = 41.1$ for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 8).

The percentage of respondents with associate degree reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 20.0% (n=4) for item ten (book familiarity) to 76.2% (n=16) for item eight (understand print carries a message). The percentage of respondents with associate degree reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 14.3% (n=3) on item eight (understand print carries a message) to 80.0% (n=16) on item ten (book familiarity). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 89.5% (n=17) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 100% (n=20) on item ten (book familiarity) for directors with associate degree.

The percentage of respondents with associate degree reporting “Always” for level of implementation range from 42.9% (n=9) on item eight (understand print carries a message) to 68.4% (n=13) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness). The percentage of respondents with associate degree reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 10.5% (n=2) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 42.9% (n=19) on item eight (understand print carries a message). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 78.9% (n=15) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 100% (n=20) on item ten (book familiarity) for directors with an associate degree.
The chi-square values for those with an associate degree ranged from $X^2 = 9.2$ for item ten (book familiarity) to $X^2 = 20.3$ for item eight (understand print carries a message). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 8).

The percentage of respondents with bachelor degree reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 43.5% (n=27) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 85.7% (n=54) for item ten (book familiarity). The percentage of respondents with bachelor degree reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 12.9% (n=8) on for item ten (book familiarity) to 37.1% (n=23) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 80.6% (n=50) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 98.4% (n=62) on item ten (book familiarity) for directors with bachelor degree.

The percentage of respondents with bachelor degree reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 24.2% (n=15) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 82.5% (n=52) on item ten (book familiarity). The percentage of respondents with bachelor degree reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 17.5% (n=11) on item ten (book familiarity) to 41.9% (n=15) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 66.1% (n=30) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 100% (n=63) on item ten (book familiarity) for directors with bachelor degree.

The chi-square values for those with bachelor degree ranged from $X^2 = 6.8$ for item ten (book familiarity) to $X^2 = 70.9$ for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 8).
The percentage of respondents with graduate degree reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 35.5% (n=33) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 85.3% (n=81) for item ten (book familiarity). The percentage of respondents with graduate degree reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 9.5% (n=9) for item ten (book familiarity) to 49.5% (n=46) for item nine (grapheme awareness). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 85.0% (n=79) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 94.8% (n=90) on item ten (book familiarity) for directors with graduate degree.

The percentage of respondents with graduate degree reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 20.4% (n=19) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 38.3% (n=36) on item eight (understand print carries a message). The percentage of respondents with graduate degree reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 50.5% (n=47) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 62.1% (n=56) for item ten (book familiarity). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 70.9% (n=66) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 95.8% (n=91) on item ten (book familiarity) for directors with graduate degree.

The chi-square values for those with graduate degree ranged from $X^2 = 39.7$ for item ten (book familiarity) to $X^2 = 121.4$ for item nine (grapheme awareness). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 8).

**Goal 4: Story Structure**

Survey items eleven and twelve were derived from the objectives for Goal 4: Story Structure. The percentage of respondents with high school diploma reporting
“Highly Important” ranged from 47.8% (n=11) for item eleven (narrative story forms) to 52.2% (n=12) for item twelve (identify story elements). The percentage of respondents with high school diploma reporting “Fairly Important” ranged from 34.8% (n=8) for item eleven (narrative story forms) to 43.5% (n=10) for item twelve (identify story elements). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged 82.6% (n=19) on item eleven (narrative story forms) to 95.7% (n=22) on item twelve (identify story elements) for the directors with high school diploma.

The percentage of respondents with high school diploma reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 4.8% (n=1) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 34.8% (n=8) on item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents with high school diploma reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged 34.8% (n=8) for item eleven (narrative story forms) to 52.4% (n=11) for item twelve (identify story elements). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged 57.2% (n=12) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 69.6% (n=16) on item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors with high school diploma.

The chi-square values for those with a high school diploma ranged from \(X^2 = 16.1\) for item twelve (identify story elements) to \(X^2 = 20.8\) for item eleven (narrative story forms). All chi-square values were significant at \(p < .05\) (see Table 8).

The percentage of respondents with associate degree reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 28.6% (n=6) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 42.9% (n=17) for item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents with
associate degree reporting “Fairly Important” were 38.1% (n=8) for both items eleven (narrative story forms) and item twelve (identify story elements). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged 66.7% (n=14) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 81.0% (n=17) on item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors with associate degree.

The percentage of respondents with associate degree reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 4.8% (n=1) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 19.0% (n=4) on item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents with associate degree reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged 52.4% (n=11) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 57.1% (n=12) for item eleven (narrative story forms). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged 57.2% (n=12) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 76.1% (n=16) on item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors with an associate degree.

The chi-square values for those with associate degree ranged from $X^2 = 14.3$ for item eleven (narrative story forms) to $X^2 = 38.6$ for item twelve (identify story elements). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 8).

The percentage of respondents with bachelor degree reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 46.0% (n=29) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 49.2% (n=31) for item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents with bachelor degree reporting “Fairly Important” ranged from 31.7% (n=20) for item eleven (narrative story forms) to 38.1% (n=24) for item twelve (identify story elements). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses
ranged 77.7% (n=49) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 87.3% (n=55) on item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors with bachelor degree.

The percentage of respondents with bachelor degree reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 28.6% (n=16) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 39.7% (n=25) on item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents with bachelor degree reporting items on “Frequently” implemented were 38.1% (n=24) for both item eleven (narrative story forms) and for item twelve (identify story elements). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged 66.7% (n=40) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 77.8% (n=49) on item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors with bachelor degree.

The chi-square values for those with bachelor degree ranged from $X^2 = 41.7$ for item eleven (narrative story forms) to $X^2 = 82.7$ for item twelve (identify story elements). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 8).

The percentage of respondents with graduate degree reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 38.9% (n=37) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 56.8% (n=54) for item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents with graduate degree reporting “Fairly Important” ranged from 25.3% (n=24) for item eleven (narrative story forms) to 28.4% (n=27) for item twelve (identify story elements). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged 67.3% (n=64) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 82.1% (n=78) on item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors with graduate degree.
The percentage of respondents with graduate degree reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 15.8% (n=15) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 32.6% (n=31) on item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents with graduate degree reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 41.1% (n=39) for item eleven (narrative story forms) to 43.2% (n=41) for item twelve (identify story elements). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged 56.9% (n=54) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 75.8% (n=72) on item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors with graduate degree.

The chi-square values for those with graduate degree ranged from $X^2 = 55.1$ for item eleven (narrative story forms) to $X^2 = 55.2$ for item twelve (identify story elements). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 8).

**Goal 5: Beginning Writing Skills and Knowledge**

Survey item thirteen was derived from the objectives for Goal 5: Beginning Writing Skills and Knowledge. The percentage of respondents with high school diploma reporting “Highly Important” was 78.3% (n=18) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of respondents with high school diploma reporting the item as “Fairly Important” was 17.4% (n=4) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage response was 95.7% (n=22) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors with high school diploma.

The percentage of directors with high school degree reporting “Always” for level of implementation was 47.8% (n=11) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose).
The percentage of respondents with high school diploma reporting “Frequently” for level of implementation was 34.8% (n=8) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage response was 82.6% (n=19) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors with high school diploma.

The chi-square value for those with high school diploma of $X^2 = 15.4$ was significant at $p < .05$ (See Table 8).

The percentage of respondents with associate degree reporting “Highly Important” was 66.7% (n=14) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of respondents with associate degree reporting the item as “Fairly Important” was 23.8% (n=5) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage response was 90.5% (n=19) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors with associate degree.

The percentage of directors with associate degree reporting “Always” for level of implementation was 42.9% (n=9) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of respondents with associate degree reporting “Frequently” for level of implementation was 38.1% (n=9) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage response was 81.0% (n=18) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors with associate degree.

The chi-square value for those with associate degree of $X^2 = 15.4$ was significant at $p < .05$ (See Table 8).
The percentage of respondents with bachelor degree reporting “Highly Important” was 71.4% (n=45) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of respondents with bachelor degree reporting the item as “Fairly Important” was 15.9% (n=10) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage response was 87.3% (n=55) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors with bachelor degree.

The percentage of directors with bachelor degree reporting “Always” for level of implementation was 54.0% (n=34) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of respondents with bachelor degree reporting “Frequently” for level of implementation was 33.3% (n=21) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage response was 87.3% (n=55) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors with bachelor degree. The chi-square value for those with bachelor degree of $X^2 = 99.9$ was significant at $p < .05$ (See Table 8).

The percentage of respondents with graduate degree reporting “Highly Important” was 70.5% (n=67) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of respondents with graduate degree reporting the item as “Fairly Important” was 16.8% (n=16) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage response was 87.3% (n=83) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors with graduate degree.
The percentage of directors with graduate degree reporting “Always” for level of implementation was 36.8% (n=35) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of respondents with graduate degree reporting “Frequently” for level of implementation was 42.1% (n=40) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage response was 78.9% (n=75) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors with graduate degree. The chi-square value for those with graduate degree of $X^2 = 212.2$ was significant at $p < .05$ (See Table 8).
### Table 8

#### Education Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Goal</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1: Listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1: Provides opportunities for children to discriminate between sounds in their environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- High School</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 4 16.7 8 33.3 12 50.0 0 0 2 8.3 3 4.2 10 41.7 9 37.5 25.2*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Associate Degree</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 4 19.0 4 19.0 13 61.9 0 0 0 0 4 19.0 9 42.9 8 38.1 10.5*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>1 1.6 0 0 6 9.7 22 35.5 33 53.2 0 0 1 1.6 10 16.1 34 51.5 16 25.8 41.4*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Graduate Degree</td>
<td>2 2.1 0 0 13 13.5 18 18.8 63 65.6 0 0 0 0 13 13.5 56 58.3 27 28.1 46.2*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2: Provides opportunities for children to listen attentively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- High School</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 3 12.5 2 8.3 19 79.2 0 0 0 2 8.3 5 20.8 17 70.8 25.7*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Associate Degree</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 5 23.8 16 76.2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 10 47.6 11 52.4 7.2*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>1 1.6 0 0 2 3.2 12 19.0 48 76.2 0 0 0 3 4.8 26 41.3 34 54.0 19.5*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Graduate Degree</td>
<td>2 2.1 0 0 6 6.3 16 16.7 72 75.0 0 0 0 5 5.2 37 38.5 54 56.3 42.3*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3: Provides opportunities for children to listen for pleasure and enjoyment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- High School</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 8 33.3 16 66.7 0 0 1 4.2 0 0 10 41.7 13 54.2 9.0*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Associate Degree</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 2 9.5 19 90.5 0 0 0 0 0 0 11 52.4 10 47.6 2.0*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>1 1.6 0 0 2 3.2 14 22.2 46 73.0 0 0 1 1.6 4 6.3 27 42.9 31 49.2 53.7*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Graduate Degree</td>
<td>2 2.1 0 0 1 1.1 16 16.8 76 80.0 0 0 0 0 5 5.3 42 44.2 48 50.5 21.7*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Assessment Goal

**Goal 1: Listening Continued**

#### Item 4: Provides experiences for children to identify letter-sound relationship

| Degree            | N | %   | N | %   | N | %   | N | %   | N | %   | N | %   | N | %   | N | %   | 3 | %   | 12.5 | %   | 8 | %   | 33.3 | %   | 13 | %   | 54.2 | %   | 30.8* |
|-------------------|---|-----|---|-----|---|-----|---|-----|---|-----|---|-----|---|-----|---|-----|---|-----|-----|-----|---|-----|-----|-----|---|-----|-----|-----|---|-----|
| High School       | 0 | 0   | 0 | 0   | 2 | 8.3 | 6 | 25.0| 16 | 66.7| 0 | 0   | 0 | 0   | 3 | 12.5| 8 | 33.3| 13 | 54.2| 30.8* |
| Associate Degree  | 0 | 0   | 0 | 0   | 1 | 4.8 | 6 | 28.6| 14 | 66.7| 0 | 0   | 0 | 0   | 2 | 9.5 | 12 | 57.1| 7  | 33.3| 15.2* |
| Bachelor Degree   | 1 | 1.6 | 2 | 3.2 | 6 | 9.5 | 11| 17.5| 43 | 68.3| 0 | 0   | 0 | 0   | 2 | 9.5 | 28 | 44.4| 28 | 44.4| 96.4* |
| Graduate Degree   | 2 | 2.1 | 4 | 4.2 | 11| 11.5| 26| 27.1| 53 | 55.2| 0 | 0   | 0 | 2   | 2.1| 20  | 20.8| 43  | 44.8| 31  | 32.3| 67.9* |

**Item 7: Provides experiences for children to develop phonemic awareness**

| Degree            | N | %   | N | %   | N | %   | N | %   | N | %   | N | %   | N | %   | N | %   | 6 | %   | 25.0 | %   | 6 | %   | 25.0 | %   | 12 | %   | 50.0 | %   | 13.9* |
|-------------------|---|-----|---|-----|---|-----|---|-----|---|-----|---|-----|---|-----|---|-----|---|-----|-----|-----|---|-----|-----|-----|---|-----|-----|-----|---|-----|
| High School       | 0 | 0   | 1 | 4.2 | 1 | 4.2 | 7 | 29.2| 15 | 62.5| 0 | 0   | 0 | 0   | 6 | 25.0| 6 | 25.0| 12 | 50.0| 13.9* |
| Associate Degree  | 0 | 0   | 0 | 0   | 2 | 9.5 | 8 | 38.1| 11 | 52.4| 0 | 0   | 0 | 0   | 3 | 14.3| 12 | 57.1| 5  | 23.8| 14.7* |
| Bachelor Degree   | 1 | 1.6 | 0 | 0   | 3 | 4.8 | 18| 28.6| 41 | 65.1| 0 | 0   | 0 | 0   | 7 | 11.1| 34 | 54.0| 22 | 34.9| 24.2* |
| Graduate Degree   | 2 | 2.1 | 2 | 2.1 | 7 | 7.3 | 20| 20.8| 65 | 67.7| 0 | 0   | 0 | 0   | 24| 25.0| 37 | 38.5| 35 | 36.5| 31.1* |

**Goal 2: Complex Speech**

#### Item 5: Provides opportunities for children to experience a steady vocabulary growth

| Degree            | N | %   | N | %   | N | %   | N | %   | N | %   | N | %   | N | %   | N | %   | 2 | %   | 8.3 | %   | 33.3| %   | 14 | %   | 58.3 | %   | 6.2* |
|-------------------|---|-----|---|-----|---|-----|---|-----|---|-----|---|-----|---|-----|---|-----|---|-----|-----|-----|---|-----|-----|-----|---|-----|-----|-----|---|-----|
| High School       | 0 | 0   | 0 | 0   | 0 | 0   | 5 | 20.8| 19 | 79.2| 0 | 0   | 0 | 0   | 2 | 8.3 | 6 | 33.3| 14 | 58.3| 6.2* |
| Associate Degree  | 0 | 0   | 0 | 0   | 1 | 4.8 | 0 | 0   | 20| 95.2| 0 | 0   | 0 | 0   | 4 | 4.8 | 8 | 38.1| 12 | 57.1| 21.0* |
| Bachelor Degree   | 1 | 1.6 | 0 | 0   | 0 | 0   | 7 | 11.1| 55 | 87.3| 0 | 0   | 0 | 0   | 0 | 0   | 23| 36.5| 40 | 63.5| 14.0* |
| Graduate Degree   | 2 | 2.1 | 0 | 0   | 0 | 0   | 7 | 7.3 | 67 | 90.6| 0 | 0   | 0 | 0   | 5 | 5.2 | 33 | 34.4| 58 | 60.4| 11.9* |
### Assessment Goal

#### Goal 2: Complex Speech

**Item 6:** Provides experiences for children to increase their conversation skills

- **High School:**
  - 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 (20.8%) 19 79.2%
- **Associate Degree:**
  - 0 0 0 0 0 2 (9.5%) 19 90.5%
- **Bachelor Degree:**
  - 1 1.6 0 0 1 1.6 4 (6.3%) 57 90.5%
- **Graduate Degree:**
  - 2 2.1 0 0 1 1.0 11 (11.5%) 82 85.4%

#### Goal 3: Print Awareness

**Item 8:** Provides experiences for children to understand that print carries a message

- **High School:**
  - 0 0 0 0 2 (9.1%) 5 (22.7%) 15 68.2%
- **Associate Degree:**
  - 0 0 0 0 2 (10.5%) 12 63.2%
- **Bachelor Degree:**
  - 1 1.6 2 3.2 1 (1.6%) 10 15.9 49 77.8%
- **Graduate Degree:**
  - 2 2.1 2 2.1 3 (3.2%) 16 17.0 71 75.5%

**Item 9:** Provides experiences for children to develop grapheme awareness

- **High School:**
  - 1 4.5 1 4.5 4 (18.2%) 8 36.4 8 36.4%
- **Associate Degree:**
  - 0 0 0 0 2 (10.5%) 12 63.2%
- **Bachelor Degree:**
  - 2 3.2 0 0 10 (16.1%) 23 37.1 27 43.5%
- **Graduate Degree:**
  - 3 3.2 3 3.2 8 (8.6%) 33 35.5 46 49.5%
### Assessment Goal

**Goal 3: Print Awareness**
Continued

**Item 10:** Provides opportunities for children to develop book familiarity

- **High School:**
  - N = 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 5, 22.7, 17, 77.3, 0, 0, 0, 1, 4.5, 3, 13.6, 18, 81.8, 16.2*
- **Associate Degree:**
  - N = 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 4, 20.0, 16, 80.0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 7, 35.0, 13, 65.0, 9.2*
- **Bachelor Degree:**
  - N = 1, 1.6, 0, 0, 0, 8, 12.7, 54, 85.7, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 11, 17.5, 52, 82.5, 6.8*
- **Graduate Degree:**
  - N = 2, 2.1, 0, 0, 3, 3.2, 9, 9.5, 81, 85.3, 0, 0, 0, 0, 4, 4.2, 32, 33.7, 59, 62.1, 39.7*

**Goal 4: Story Structure**

**Item 11:** Provides experiences for children to become increasingly familiar with narrative story forms

- **High School:**
  - N = 0, 0, 0, 0, 4, 17.4, 8, 34.8, 11, 47.8, 0, 0, 1, 4.3, 6, 26.1, 8, 34.8, 34.8, 34.8, 20.8*
- **Associate Degree:**
  - N = 0, 0, 0, 0, 4, 19.0, 9, 42.9, 8, 38.1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 5, 23.8, 12, 57.1, 4, 19.0, 14.3*
- **Bachelor Degree:**
  - N = 1, 1.6, 1, 1.6, 6, 9.5, 24, 38.1, 31, 49.2, 1, 1.6, 0, 0, 13, 20.6, 24, 38.1, 25, 39.7, 41.7*
- **Graduate Degree:**
  - N = 2, 2.1, 1, 1.1, 14, 14.7, 24, 25.3, 54, 56.8, 0, 0, 1, 1.1, 22, 23.2, 41, 43.2, 31, 32.6, 55.1*

**Item 12:** Provides opportunities for children to identify story elements of setting, plot, characters and events

- **High School:**
  - N = 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 4.3, 10, 43.5, 12, 52.2, 1, 4.3, 1, 4.3, 4, 17.4, 10, 43.5, 7, 30.4, 16.1*
- **Associate Degree:**
  - N = 1, 4.8, 1, 4.8, 5, 23.8, 8, 38.1, 6, 28.6, 1, 4.8, 2, 9.5, 6, 28.6, 11, 52.4, 1, 4.8, 38.6*
- **Bachelor Degree:**
  - N = 2, 3.2, 3, 4.8, 9, 14.3, 20, 31.7, 29, 46.0, 2, 3.2, 3, 4.8, 16, 25.4, 24, 38.1, 16, 28.6, 82.7*
- **Graduate Degree:**
  - N = 2, 2.1, 6, 6.3, 23, 24.2, 27, 28.4, 37, 38.9, 0, 0, 6, 6.3, 35, 36.8, 39, 41.1, 15, 15.8, 55.2*
Assessment Goal

Goal 5: Beginning Writing Skills and Knowledge

Item 13: Provides opportunities for children to understand that writing has a purpose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NI N</th>
<th>SI N</th>
<th>MI N</th>
<th>FI N</th>
<th>HI N</th>
<th>N N</th>
<th>S N</th>
<th>O N</th>
<th>F N</th>
<th>A N</th>
<th>X²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates significance at the .05 level

Importance: NI = Not Important; SI = Slightly Important; MI = Moderately Important; FI = Fairly Important; HI = Highly Important
Implementation: N = Never; S = Seldom; O = Occasionally; F = Frequently; A = Always
Differences of Importance and Implementation of National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy and Years of Experience in Early Childhood Field

Goal 1: Listening

Survey items one, two, three, four and seven were derived from the objectives for Goal 1: Listening. The percentage of respondents with five years or less experience in early childhood field reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 50.0% (n=21) for item one (discriminate between sounds) to 69.0% (n=29) for item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment). The percentage of respondents with five years or less experience in early childhood field reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 23.8% (n=10) for item four (identify letter-sound relationship) to 31.0% (n=13) for both item two (listen attentively) and item seven (phonemic awareness). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 76.2% (n=32) on item one (discriminate between sounds) to 97.6% (n=41) on item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) for the directors with five years or less experience in early childhood field.

The percentage of respondents with five years or less experience in early childhood field reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 14.3% (n=6) on item one (discriminate between sounds) to 38.1% (n=16) on item four (identify letter-sound relationship). The percentage of respondents with five years or less experience in early childhood field reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 40.5% (n=17) on item seven (develop phonemic awareness) to 64.3% (n=27) on item one (discriminate between sounds). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 73.8%
(n=31) on item seven (develop phonemic awareness) to 92.9% (n=39) on item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) for the directors with five years or less experience in early childhood field.

The chi-square values for those with five years or less experience in early childhood field ranged from $X^2 = 10.1$ for item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) to $X^2 = 33.2$ for item two (listen attentively). All chi-square values were significant at $p<.05$ (see Table 9).

The percentage of respondents with six to eleven years experience in early childhood field reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 58.0% (n=29) for item one (discriminate between sounds) to 80.0% (n=40) for item two (listen attentively). The percentage of respondents with six to eleven years experience in early childhood field reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 12.0% (n=6) for item four (identify letter-sound relationship) to 24.0% (n=12) for item seven (develop phonemic awareness). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 76.0% (n=38) on item one (discriminate between sounds) to 100% (n=50) on item two (listen attentively) for the directors with six to eleven years experience in early childhood field.

The percentage of respondents with six to eleven years experience in early childhood field reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 26.0% (n=13) on item one (discriminate between sounds) to 62.1% (n=31) on item two (listen attentively). The percentage of respondents with six to eleven years experience in early childhood field reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 34.0% (n=17) on item four (identify letter-sound relationship) to 50.0% (n=25) on item one
(discriminate between sounds). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 80.0% (n=40) on item one (discriminate between sounds) to 98.0% (n=49) on both item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) and item seven (develop phonemic awareness) for the directors with six to eleven years experience in early childhood field.

The chi-square values for those with six to eleven years experience in early childhood field ranged from $X^2 = 12.9$ for item seven (develop phonemic awareness) to $X^2= 38.1$ for item four (identify letter-sound relationship). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 9).

The percentage of respondents with 12 – 17 years experience in early childhood field reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 58.5% (n=24) for item four (identify letter-sound relationship) to 85.4% (n=35) for item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment). The percentage of respondents with 12 – 17 years experience in early childhood field reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 12.2% (n=5) for item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) to 31.7% (n=13) for item one (discriminate between sounds). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 85.3% (n=35) on item four (identify letter-sound relationship) to 97.6% (n=40) on item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) for the directors with 12 – 17 years experience in early childhood field.

The percentage of respondents with 12 – 17 years experience in early childhood field reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 36.6% (n=15) on item one (discriminate between sounds) to 63.4% (n=26) on item two (listen attentively). The percentage of respondents with 12 – 17 years experience in early childhood field
reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 31.7% (n=13) for item two (listen attentively) to 46.3% (n=19) on item one (discriminate between sounds). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses range from 78.0% (n=32) on item seven (develop phonemic awareness) to 95.1% (n=39) on both item two (listen attentively) and item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) for the directors with 12 – 17 years experience in early childhood field.

The chi-square values for those with 12 – 17 years experience in early childhood field ranged from $X^2 = 11.6$ for item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) to $X^2 = 48.4$ for item four (identify letter-sound relationship). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 9).

The percentage of respondents with 18 – 23 years experience in early childhood field reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 55.6% (n=20) for item four (identify letter-sound relationship) to 80.6% (n=29) for item two (listen attentively). The percentage of respondents with 18 – 23 years experience in early childhood field reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 13.9% (n=5) for item two (listen attentively) to 30.6% (n=11) for both item one (discriminate between sounds) and item seven (develop phonemic awareness). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 83.4% (n=30) on item four (identify letter-sound relationship) to 100% (n=35) on item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) for the directors with 18 – 23 years experience in early childhood field.
The percentage of respondents with 18 – 23 years experience in early childhood field reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 27.8% (n=10) on item seven (develop phonemic awareness) to 51.4% (n=18) for item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment). The percentage of respondents with 18 – 23 years experience in early childhood field reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 38.9% (n=14) for item two (listen attentively) to 58.3% (n=21) on item one (discriminate between sounds). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses range from 69.5% (n=25) on item seven (develop phonemic awareness) to 94.4% (n=36) on item one (discriminate between sounds) for the directors with 18 – 23 years experience in early childhood field.

The chi-square values for those with 18 – 23 years experience in early childhood field ranged from $X^2 = 7.9$ for item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) to $X^2 = 51.7$ for item four (identify letter-sound relationship). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 9).

The percentage of respondents with 23 years or more experience in early childhood field reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 48.6% (n=17) for item four (identify letter-sound relationship) to 88.6% (n=31) for item two (listen attentively). The percentage of respondents with 23 years or more experience in early childhood field reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 5.7% (n=2) for item two (listen attentively) to 34.3% (n=12) for item four (identify letter-sound relationship). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 82.8% (n=29) on item seven (develop phonemic awareness) to
The percentage of respondents with 23 years or more experience in early childhood field reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 31.4% (n=11) on item four (identify letter-sound relationship) to 74.3% (n=26) for item two (listen attentively). The percentage of respondents with 23 or more years experience in early childhood field reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 25.7% (n=9) for item two (listen attentively) to 52.9% (n=18) on item one (discriminate between sounds). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 88.6% (n=31) on item seven (develop phonemic awareness) to 100% (n=35) on item two (listen attentively) for the directors with 23 or more years experience in early childhood field.

The chi-square values for those with 23 years or more experience in early childhood field ranged from $X^2 = 1.4$ for item two (listen attentively) to $X^2 = 48.1$ for item four (identify letter-sound relationship). All chi-square values were significant at p < .05 (see Table 9).

**Goal 2: Complex Speech**

Survey items five and six were derived from the objectives for Goal 2: Complex Speech. The percentage of respondents with five years or less experience in early childhood field reporting “Highly Important” were 85.7% (n=36) for both item five (vocabulary growth) and item six (conversation skills). The percentage of respondents with five years or less experience in early childhood field reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 9.5% (n=4) for item six (conversation skills) to 11.9% (n=5) for
item five (vocabulary growth). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses were 97.6% (n=41) for both item five (vocabulary growth) and item six (conversation skills) for the directors with five years or less experience in early childhood field.

The percentage of respondents with five years or less experience in early childhood field reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 45.2% (n=19) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 54.8% (n=23) on item six (conversation skills). The percentage of respondents with five years or less experience in early childhood field reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 38.1% (n=16) on item six (conversation skills) to 47.6% (n=20) on item five (vocabulary growth). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 92.8% (n=39) on item five (vocabulary growth) to 92.9% (n=39) on item six (conversation skills) for the directors with five years or less experience in early childhood field.

The chi-square values for those with five years or less experience in early childhood field ranged from $X^2 = 6.1$ for item five (vocabulary growth) to $X^2 = 20.9$ for item six (conversation skills). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 9).

The percentage of respondents with six to eleven years experience in early childhood field reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 90.0% (n=45) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 88.0% (n=44) for item six (conversation skills). The percentage of respondents with six to eleven years experience in early childhood field reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 8.0% (n=4) for item five (vocabulary growth) to
12.0% (n=6) for item six (conversation skills). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 98.0% (n=49) on item five (vocabulary growth) to 100% (n=50) on item six (conversation skills) for the directors with six to eleven years experience in early childhood field.

The percentage of respondents with six to eleven years experience in early childhood field reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 68.0% (n=34) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 76.0% (n=39) for item six (conversation skills). The percentage of respondents with six to eleven years experience in early childhood field reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 22.0% (n=11) on item six (conversation skills) to 28.0% (n=14) on item five (vocabulary growth). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 96.0% (n=48) on item five (vocabulary growth) to 98.0% (n=50) on item six (conversation skills) for the directors with six to eleven years experience in early childhood field.

The chi-square values for those with six to eleven years experience in early childhood field ranged from $X^2 = 14.9$ for item six (conversation skills) to $X^2=35.6$ for item five (vocabulary growth). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 9).

The percentage of respondents with 12 – 17 years experience in early childhood field reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 80.5% (n=33) for item six (conversation skills) to 95.1% (n=39) for item five (vocabulary growth). The percentage of respondents with 12 – 17 years experience in early childhood field reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 4.9% (n=2) on item five (vocabulary growth) to 17.1% (n=7) on
item six (conversation skills). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 97.6% (n=40) on item six (conversation skills) to 100% (n=41) on item five (vocabulary growth) for the directors with 12 – 17 years experience in early childhood field.

The percentage of respondents with 12 – 17 years experience in early childhood field reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 63.4% (n=26) on item five (vocabulary growth) to 73.2% (n=30) on item six (conversation skills). The percentage of respondents with 12 – 17 years experience in early childhood field reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 22.0% (n=9) on item six (conversation skills) to 31.7% (n=13) on item five (vocabulary growth). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 95.1% (n=39) on item five (vocabulary growth) to 95.2% (n=39) on item six (conversation skills) for the directors with 12 – 17 years experience in early childhood field.

The chi-square values for those with 12 – 17 years experience in early childhood field ranged from $X^2 = 4.5$ for item five (vocabulary growth) to $X^2 = 19.6$ for item six (conversation skills). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 9).

The percentage of respondents with 18 – 23 years experience in early childhood field reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 83.3% (n=30) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 94.4% (n=34) for item six (conversation skills). The percentage of respondents with 18 – 23 years experience in early childhood field reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 5.6% (n=2) for item six (conversation skills) to 16.7% (n=16) for item five (vocabulary growth). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important”
responses are combined, the percentage responses were 100% (n=36) on both item five (vocabulary growth) and item six (conversation skills) for the directors with 18 – 23 years experience in early childhood field.

The percentage of respondents with 18 – 23 years experience in early childhood field reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 61.1% (n=22) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 69.4% (n=25) for item six (conversation skills). The percentage of respondents with 18 – 23 years experience in early childhood field reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 30.6% (n=11) for item six (conversation skills) to 36.1% (n=13) for item five (vocabulary growth). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 97.2% (n=35) on item five (vocabulary growth) to 100% (n=36) on item six (conversation skills) for the directors with 18 – 23 years experience in early childhood field.

The chi-square values for those with 18 – 23 years experience in early childhood field ranged from $X^2 = 4.8$ for item six (conversation skills) to $X^2 = 6.9$ for item five (vocabulary growth). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 9).

The percentage of respondents with 23 years or more experience in early childhood field reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 85.7% (n=30) for item six (conversation skills) to 88.6% (n=31) for item five (vocabulary growth). The percentage of respondents with 23 years or more experience in early childhood field reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 5.7% (n=2) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 8.6% (n=3) for item six (conversation skills). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses were 94.3% (n=33) on both
item five (vocabulary growth) and item six (conversation skills) for the directors with 23 years or more experience in early childhood field.

The percentage of respondents with 23 years or more experience in early childhood field reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 65.7% (n=23) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 71.4% (n=25) for item six (conversation skills). The percentage of respondents with 23 or more years experience in early childhood field reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 25.7% (n=9) for item six (conversation skills) to 34.3% (n=12) for item five (vocabulary growth). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 97.1% (n=34) on item six (conversation skills) to 100% (n=35) on item five (vocabulary growth) for the directors with 23 or more years experience in early childhood field.

The chi-square values for those with 23 years or more experience in early childhood field ranged from $X^2 = 4.4$ for item six (conversation skills) to $X^2 = 12.1$ for item five (vocabulary growth). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 9).

**Goal 3: Print Awareness**

Survey items eight, nine, and ten were derived from the objectives for Goal 3: Print Awareness. The percentage of respondents with five years or less experience in early childhood field reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 43.9% (n=18) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 78.6% (n=33) for item ten (book familiarity). The percentage of respondents with five years or less experience in early childhood field reporting the items as “Fairly Important” range from 16.7% (n=7) for both item eight
(understand print carries a message) and item ten (book familiarity) to 36.6% (n=15) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 80.5% (n=33) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 95.3% (n=40) on item ten (book familiarity) for the directors with five years or less experience in early childhood field.

The percentage of respondents with five years or less experience in early childhood field reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 17.1% (n=7) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 54.8% (n=23) on item ten (book familiarity). The percentage of respondents with five years or less experience in early childhood field reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 38.1% (n=16) on item ten (book familiarity) to 54.8% (n=23) on item eight (understand print carries a message). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 70.8% (n=29) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 92.9% (n=39) on item ten (book familiarity) for the directors with five years or less experience in early childhood field.

The chi-square values for those with five years or less experience in early childhood field ranged from $X^2 = 17.3$ for item eight (understand print carries a message) to $X^2 = 60.7$ for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 9).

The percentage of respondents with six to eleven years experience in early childhood field reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 37.5% (n=18) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 82.0% (n=41) for item ten (book familiarity). The percentage of respondents with six to eleven years experience in early childhood field
reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 16.3% (n=8) for item eight (understand print carries a message) to 43.8% (n=21) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 81.3% (n=39) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 100% (n=50) on item ten (book familiarity) for the directors with six to eleven years experience in early childhood field.

The percentage of respondents with six to eleven years experience in early childhood field reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 18.8% (n=9) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 80.0% (n=40) for item ten (book familiarity). The percentage of respondents with six to eleven years experience in early childhood field reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 16.3% (n=8) for item eight (understand print carries a message) to 43.8% (n=21) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses range from 62.6% (n=30) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 98.0% (n=49) on item ten (book familiarity) for the directors with six to eleven years experience in early childhood field.

The chi-square values for those with six to eleven years experience in early childhood field ranged from $X^2 = 23.6$ for item ten (book familiarity) to $X^2 = 80.6$ for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 9).

The percentage of respondents with 12 – 17 years experience in early childhood field reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 47.5% (n=19) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 90.0% (n=36) for item ten (book familiarity). The percentage of
respondents with 12 – 17 years experience in early childhood field reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 10.0% (n=4) for item ten (book familiarity) to 32.5% (n=13) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 80.0% (n=32) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 100% (n=40) on item ten (book familiarity) for the directors with 12 – 17 years experience in early childhood field.

The percentage of respondents with 12 – 17 years experience in early childhood field reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 22.5% (n=9) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 80.0% (n=32) for item ten (book familiarity). The percentage of respondents with 12 – 17 years experience in early childhood field reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 20.0% (n=8) for item ten (book familiarity) to 47.5% (n=9) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 70.0% (n=18) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 100% (n=40) on item ten (book familiarity) for the directors with 12 – 17 years experience in early childhood field.

The chi-square values for those with 12 – 17 years experience in early childhood field ranged from $X^2 = 8.4$ for item ten (book familiarity) to $X^2 = 56.4$ for item eight (understand print carries a message). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 9).

The percentage of respondents with 18 – 23 years experience in early childhood field reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 39.4% (n=13) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 91.2% (n=31) for item ten (book familiarity). The percentage of
respondents with 18 – 23 years experience in early childhood field reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 5.9% (n=2) for item ten (book familiarity) to 45.5% (n=15) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 84.9% (n=28) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 97.1% (n=33) on item ten (book familiarity) for the directors with 18 – 23 years experience in early childhood field.

The percentage of respondents with 18 – 23 years experience in early childhood field reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 18.2% (n=6) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 67.6% (n=23) for item ten (book familiarity). The percentage of respondents with 18 – 23 years experience in early childhood field reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 29.4% (n=10) for item ten (book familiarity) to 48.5% (n=16) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 66.7% (n=22) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 97.0% (n=33) on item ten (book familiarity) for the directors with 18 – 23 years experience in early childhood field.

The chi-square values for those with 18 – 23 years experience in early childhood field ranged from $X^2 = 11.1$ for item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to $X^2 = 39.0$ for item ten (book familiarity). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 9).

The percentage of respondents with 23 years or more experience in early childhood field reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 52.9% (n=18) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 79.4% (n=27) for item ten (book familiarity). The
percentage of respondents with 23 years or more experience in early childhood field reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 11.8% (n=4) for item ten (book familiarity) to 35.3% (n=12) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 88.2% (n=30) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 91.2% (n=31) on item ten (book familiarity) for the directors with 23 years or more experience in early childhood field.

The percentage of respondents with 23 years or more experience in early childhood field reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 32.4% (n=11) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 70.6% (n=24) for item ten (book familiarity). The percentage of respondents with 23 or more years experience in early childhood field reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 29.4% (n=10) for item ten (book familiarity) to 48.6% (n=17) for item eight (understand print carries a message). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 76.5% (n=26) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 100% (n=34) on item ten (book familiarity) for the directors with 23 or more years experience in early childhood field.

The chi-square values for those with 23 years or more experience in early childhood field ranged from $X^2 = 3.0$ for item ten (book familiarity) to $X^2 = 44.7$ for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 9).
Goal 4: Story Structure

Survey items eleven and twelve were derived from the objectives for Goal 4: Story Structure. The percentage of respondents with five years or less experience in early childhood field reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 23.8% (n=16) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 45.2% (n=19) for item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents with five years or less experience in early childhood field reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 35.7% (n=19) for item eleven (narrative story forms) to 38.1% (n=10) for item twelve (identify story elements). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses were 61.9% (n=26) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 80.9% (n=38) on item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors with five years or less experience in early childhood field.

The percentage of respondents with five years or less experience in early childhood field reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 11.9% (n=15) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 26.6% (n=19) for item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents with five years or less experience in early childhood field reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 31.0% (n=13) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 42.9% (n=18) for item eleven (narrative story forms). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 42.9% (n=18) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 69.5% (n=30) on item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors with five years or less experience in early childhood field.
The chi-square values for those with five years or less experience in early childhood field ranged from $X^2 = 18.1$ for item eleven (narrative story forms) to $X^2 = 58.6$ for item twelve (identify story elements). All chi-square values were significant at $p<.05$ (see Table 9).

The percentage of respondents with six to eleven years experience in early childhood field reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 44.0% (n=22) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 52.0% (n=26) for item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents with six to eleven years experience in early childhood field reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 32.0% (n=16) for item eleven (narrative story forms) to 34.0% (n=17) for item twelve (identify story elements). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 78.0% (n=39) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 84.0% (n=42) on item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors with six to eleven years experience in early childhood field.

The percentage of respondents with six to eleven years experience in early childhood field reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 26.0% (n=13) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 38.0% (n=19) for item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents with six to eleven years experience in early childhood field reporting items on “Frequently” implemented were 36.0% (n=18) for both item eleven (narrative story forms) and item twelve (identify story elements). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 62.0% (n=31) on item twelve (identify
story elements) to 74.0% (n=37) on item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors with six to eleven years experience in early childhood field.

The chi-square values for those with six to eleven years experience in early childhood field ranged from $X^2 = 37.9$ for item eleven (narrative story forms) to $X^2 = 81.9$ for item twelve (identify story elements). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 9).

The percentage of respondents with 12 – 17 years experience in early childhood field reporting “Highly Important” ranged were 47.5% (n=19) for both item eleven (narrative story forms) and item twelve (identify story elements). The percentage of respondents with 12 – 17 years experience in early childhood field reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 25.0% (n=10) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 37.5% (n=15) for item eleven (narrative story forms). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 72.5% (n=29) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 85.0% (n=34) on item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors with 12 – 17 years experience in early childhood field.

The percentage of respondents with 12 – 17 years experience in early childhood field reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 25.0% (n=10) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 27.5% (n=11) for item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents with 12 – 17 years experience in early childhood field reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 35.0% (n=14) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 55.0% (n=22) for item eleven (narrative story forms). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the
percentage responses ranged from 60.0% (n=24) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 82.5% (n=33) on item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors with 12 – 17 years experience in early childhood field.

The chi-square values for those with 12 – 17 years experience in early childhood field ranged from $X^2 = 30.6$ for item eleven (narrative story forms) to $X^2 = 52.4$ for item twelve (identify story elements). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 9).

The percentage of respondents with 18 – 23 years experience in early childhood field reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 48.6% (n=17) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 57.1% (n=20) for item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents with 18 – 23 years experience in early childhood field reporting the items as “Fairly Important” were 31.4% (n=11) for both item eleven (narrative story forms) and item twelve (identify story elements). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 80.0% (n=28) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 88.5% (n=31) on item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors with 18 – 23 years experience in early childhood field.

The percentage of respondents with 18 – 23 years experience in early childhood field reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 14.3% (n=5) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 31.4% (n=11) for item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents with 18 – 23 years experience in early childhood field reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 42.9% (n=15) for item eleven (narrative story forms) to 57.1% (n=20) for item twelve (identify story elements). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the
percentage responses ranged from 71.4% (n=25) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 74.3% (n=26) on item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors with 18 – 23 years experience in early childhood field.

The chi-square values for those with 18 – 23 years experience in early childhood field ranged from $X^2 = 15.6$ for item eleven (narrative story forms) to $X^2 = 17.5$ for item twelve (identify story elements). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 9).

The percentage of respondents with 23 years or more experience in early childhood field reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 45.7% (n=16) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 57.1% (n=20) for item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents with 23 years or more experience in early childhood field reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 22.9% (n=8) for item eleven (narrative story forms) to 31.4% (n=11) for item twelve (identify story elements). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 77.1% (n=27) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 80.0% (n=20) on item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors with 23 years or more experience in early childhood field.

The percentage of respondents with 23 years or more experience in early childhood field reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 22.9% (n=8) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 42.9% (n=15) for item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents with 23 or more years experience in early childhood field reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 34.3% (n=12) for item eleven (narrative story forms) to 54.3% (n=12) for item twelve (identify story...
elements). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses were 77.2% (n=16) on item eleven (narrative story forms) and 77.2% (n=27) on item twelve (identify story elements) for the directors with 23 or more years experience in early childhood field.

The chi-square values for those with 23 years or more experience in early childhood field ranged from $X^2 = 23.0$ for item twelve (identify story elements) to $X^2=33.5$ for item eleven (narrative story forms). All chi-square values were significant at $p<.05$ (see Table 9).

**Goal 5: Beginning Writing Skills and Knowledge**

Survey item thirteen was derived from the objectives for Goal 5: Beginning Writing Skills and Knowledge. The percentage of directors with five years or less experience in early childhood field responding “Highly Important” were 66.7% (n=28) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of respondents with five years or less experience in early childhood field reporting the item as “Fairly Important” were 19.0% (n=8) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Fairly Important” and Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage response 85.7% (n=36) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors with five years or less experience in early childhood field.

The percentage of directors with five years or less experience in early childhood field responding “Always” for level of implementation were 31.8% (n=16) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of respondents with five years or less experience in early childhood field reporting items on “Frequently” implemented were 35.7% (n=15) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose).
When the “Always” and “Frequently” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses were 73.8% (n=31) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors with five years or less experience in early childhood field. The chi square value of $X^2 = 44.7$ was significant at $p < .05$ (See Table 9).

The percentage of directors with six to eleven years experience in early childhood field responding “Highly Important” were 74.0% (n=37) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of respondents with six to eleven years experience in early childhood field reporting the item as “Fairly Important” were 16.0% (n=8) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage response 90.0% (n=45) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors with six to eleven years experience in early childhood field.

The percentage of directors with six to eleven years experience in early childhood field responding “Always” for level of implementation were 56.0% (n=28) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of respondents with six to eleven years experience in early childhood field reporting items on “Frequently” implemented were 28.0% (n=14) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Always” and “Frequently” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses were 84.0% (n=42) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors with six to eleven years experience in early childhood field. The chi square value of $X^2 = 38.9$ was significant at $p < .05$ (See Table 9).

The percentage of directors with 12 – 17 years experience in early childhood field responding “Highly Important” were 85.0% (n=34) on item thirteen (understand writing
has a purpose). The percentage of respondents with 12 – 17 years experience in early childhood field reporting the item as “Fairly Important” were 7.5% (n=3) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Fairly Important” and Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage response 92.5% (n=37) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors with 12 – 17 years experience in early childhood field.

The percentage of directors with 12 – 17 years experience in early childhood field responding “Always” for level of implementation were 56.0% (n=20) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of respondents with 12 – 17 years experience in early childhood field reporting items on “Frequently” implemented were 32.5% (n=13) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Always” and “Frequently” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses were 82.5% (n=33) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors with 12 – 17 years experience in early childhood field.

The chi square value of $X^2 = 63.4$ was significant at $p < .05$ (See Table 9).

The percentage of directors with 18 – 23 years experience in early childhood field responding “Highly Important” were 60.0% (n=21) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of respondents with 18 – 23 years experience in early childhood field reporting the item as “Fairly Important” were 25.7% (n=9) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Fairly Important” and Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage response 85.7% (n=30) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors with 18 – 23 years experience in early childhood field.
The percentage of directors with 18 – 23 years experience in early childhood field responding “Always” for level of implementation were 28.6% (n=10) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of respondents with 18 – 23 years experience in early childhood field reporting items on “Frequently” implemented were 54.3% (n=13) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Always” and “Frequently” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses were 82.9% (n=29) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors with 18 – 23 years experience in early childhood field.

The chi square value of $X^2 = 38.9$ was significant at $p < .05$ (See Table 9).

The percentage of directors with 23 years or more experience in early childhood field responding “Highly Important” were 68.6% (n=24) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of respondents with 23 years or more experience in early childhood field reporting the item as “Fairly Important” were 20.0% (n=7) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage response 88.6% (n=31) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors with 23 years or more experience in early childhood field.

The percentage of directors with 23 years or more experience in early childhood field responding “Always” for level of implementation were 42.9% (n=15) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of respondents with 23 years or more experience in early childhood field reporting items on “Frequently” implemented were 45.7% (n=16) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Always” and “Frequently” levels of implementation responses are combined, the
percentage responses were 88.6% (n=31) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors with 23 years or more experience in early childhood field.

The chi square value of $X^2 = 25.7$ was significant at $p < .05$ (See Table 9).


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 1: Listening</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1: Provides opportunities for children to discriminate between sounds in their environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years or less</td>
<td>1 2.4 0 0 9 21.4 11 26.2 21 50.0 0 0 0 0 9 21.4 27 64.3 6 14.3 31.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 -11 years</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 10 20.0 11 22.0 29 58.0 0 0 2 4.0 10 20.0 25 50.0 13 26.0 23.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 – 17 years</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 2 4.9 13 31.7 26 63.4 0 0 0 0 7 17.1 19 46.3 15 36.6 19.6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – 23 years</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 3 8.3 11 30.6 22 61.1 0 0 1 2.8 1 2.8 21 58.3 13 36.1 26.9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 years or more</td>
<td>2 5.9 0 0 3 8.8 6 17.6 23 67.6 0 0 0 0 3 8.8 18 52.9 13 38.2 20.1*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 2: Provides opportunities for children to listen attentively</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 years or less</td>
<td>1 2.4 0 0 2 4.8 13 31.0 26 61.9 0 0 0 0 4 9.5 23 54.8 15 35.7 33.2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 -11 years</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 3 6.0 7 14.0 40 80.0 0 0 0 0 0 0 19 38.0 31 62.0 14.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 – 17 years</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 4 9.8 8 19.5 29 70.7 0 0 0 0 2 4.9 13 31.7 26 63.4 18.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – 23 years</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 2 5.6 5 13.9 29 80.6 0 0 0 0 4 11.1 14 38.9 18 50.0 25.6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 years or more</td>
<td>2 5.7 0 0 0 0 2 5.7 31 88.6 0 0 0 0 0 0 9 25.7 26 74.3 1.4*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 3: Provides opportunities for children to listen for pleasure and enjoyment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 years or less</td>
<td>1 2.4 0 0 0 0 12 28.6 29 69.0 0 0 0 0 0 3 7.1 26 61.9 13 31.0 10.1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 -11 years</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 1 2.0 10 20.0 39 78.0 0 0 0 0 2 4.0 21 42.0 27 54.0 35.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 – 17 years</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 1 2.4 5 12.2 35 85.4 0 0 1 2.4 1 2.4 15 36.6 24 58.5 11.6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – 23 years</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 9 25.7 26 74.3 0 0 0 0 2 5.7 15 42.9 18 51.4 7.9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 years or more</td>
<td>2 5.7 0 0 1 2.9 4 11.4 28 80.0 0 0 1 2.9 1 2.9 13 37.1 20 57.1 47.4*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goal 1: Listening Continued

Item 4: Provides experiences for children to identify letter-sound relationship

- 5 years or less: 1 (2.4%), 2 (4.8%), 10 (23.8%), 28 (66.7%)
- 6 -11 years: 0 (0%), 1 (2.0%), 6 (12.0%), 37 (74.0%)
- 12 – 17 years: 0 (0%), 2 (4.9%), 11 (26.8%), 24 (58.5%)
- 18 – 23 years: 1 (2.8%), 0 (0%), 10 (27.8%), 20 (55.6%)
- 23 years or more: 1 (2.9%), 2 (5.7%), 12 (34.3%), 17 (48.6%)

Item 7: Provides experiences for children to develop phonemic awareness

- 5 years or less: 1 (2.4%), 0 (0%), 3 (7.1%), 25 (59.5%)
- 6 -11 years: 0 (0%), 1 (2.0%), 12 (24.0%), 37 (74.0%)
- 12 – 17 years: 0 (0%), 2 (4.9%), 11 (26.8%), 26 (63.4%)
- 18 – 23 years: 0 (0%), 1 (2.8%), 10 (27.8%), 16 (39.0%)
- 23 years or more: 2 (5.7%), 0 (0%), 6 (17.1%), 17 (48.6%)

Goal 2: Complex Speech

Item 5: Provides opportunities for children to experience a steady vocabulary growth

- 5 years or less: 1 (2.4%), 0 (0%), 5 (11.9%), 36 (85.7%)
- 6 -11 years: 0 (0%), 0 (0%), 2 (4.0%), 14 (28.0%)
- 12 – 17 years: 0 (0%), 0 (0%), 2 (4.9%), 13 (26.3%)
- 18 – 23 years: 0 (0%), 0 (0%), 1 (2.8%), 13 (26.1%)
- 23 years or more: 2 (5.7%), 0 (0%), 5 (14.3%), 20 (47.6%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NI N %</td>
<td>SI N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1: Listening Continued</td>
<td>Item 4: Provides experiences for children to identify letter-sound relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Goal 2: Complex Speech | Item 5: Provides opportunities for children to experience a steady vocabulary growth | 1 2.4 0 0 3 7.1 13 31.0 25 59.5 0 0 0 0 11 26.2 17 40.5 14 33.3 21.6* | 0 0 0 0 1 2.0 12 24.0 37 74.0 0 0 0 0 6 12.0 24 48.0 20 40.0 12.9* | 0 0 2 4.9 2 4.9 11 26.8 26 63.4 0 0 0 0 9 22.0 16 39.0 16 39.0 21.9* | 0 0 1 2.8 3 8.3 11 30.6 21 58.3 0 0 0 0 1 2.8 10 27.8 15 41.7 10 27.8 22.5* | 0 0 2 5.7 0 0 4 11.4 6 17.1 23 65.7 0 0 0 0 2 11.4 17 48.6 14 40.0 11.5* | 150
### Goal 2: Complex Speech

#### Item 6: Provides experiences for children to increase their conversation skills

| Age Group       | NI N | NI % | SI N | SI % | MI N | MI % | FI N | FI % | HI N | HI % | N N  | N % | N N  | N % | N N  | N % | N N  | N % | X²  |
|-----------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|
| 5 years or less | 1    | 2.4  | 0    | 0    | 1    | 2.4  | 4    | 9.5  | 36   | 85.7 | 0    | 0   | 0    | 0   | 3    | 7.1 | 16  | 38.1| 23  | 54.8| 20.9*|
| 6 - 11 years    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 6    | 12.0 | 44   | 88.0 | 0    | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0    | 0   | 11  | 22.0| 39  | 76.0| 14.9*|
| 12 – 17 years   | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 1    | 2.4  | 7    | 17.1 | 33   | 80.5 | 0    | 0   | 0    | 0   | 2    | 4.9 | 9   | 22.0| 30  | 73.2| 19.6*|
| 18 – 23 years   | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 2    | 5.6  | 34   | 94.4 | 0    | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0    | 0   | 11  | 30.6| 25  | 69.4| 4.8* |
| 23 years or more| 2    | 5.7  | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 3    | 8.6  | 30   | 85.7 | 0    | 0   | 0    | 0   | 1    | 2.9 | 9   | 25.7| 25  | 71.4| 12.1*|

### Goal 3: Print Awareness

#### Item 8: Provides experiences for children to understand that print carries a message

| Age Group       | NI N | NI % | SI N | SI % | MI N | MI % | FI N | FI % | HI N | HI % | N N  | N % | N N  | N % | N N  | N % | N N  | N % | X²  |
|-----------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|
| 5 years or less | 1    | 2.4  | 1    | 2.4  | 1    | 2.4  | 7    | 16.7 | 32   | 76.2 | 0    | 0   | 0    | 0   | 6    | 14.3| 23  | 54.8| 13  | 31.0| 17.3*|
| 6 - 11 years    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 1    | 2.0  | 8    | 16.3 | 40   | 81.6 | 0    | 0   | 1    | 2.0 | 2    | 4.1 | 21  | 30.6| 25  | 51.0| 66.5*|
| 12 – 17 years   | 0    | 0    | 2    | 5.1  | 1    | 2.6  | 5    | 12.8 | 31   | 79.5 | 0    | 0   | 2    | 5.1 | 3    | 7.7 | 13  | 33.3| 21  | 53.8| 56.4*|
| 18 – 23 years   | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 4    | 22.9 | 8    | 22.9 | 23   | 65.7 | 0    | 0   | 0    | 0   | 5    | 14.3| 15  | 42.9| 15  | 42.9| 16.4*|
| 23 years or more| 2    | 5.7  | 1    | 2.9  | 1    | 2.9  | 6    | 17.1 | 25   | 71.4 | 0    | 0   | 1    | 2.9 | 1    | 2.9 | 17  | 48.6| 16  | 45.7| 42.9*|

#### Item 9: Provides experiences for children to develop grapheme awareness

| Age Group       | NI N | NI % | SI N | SI % | MI N | MI % | FI N | FI % | HI N | HI % | N N  | N % | N N  | N % | N N  | N % | N N  | N % | X²  |
|-----------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|
| 5 years or less | 2    | 4.9  | 1    | 2.4  | 5    | 12.2 | 15   | 36.6 | 18   | 43.9 | 1    | 2.4 | 3    | 7.3 | 8    | 19.5| 22  | 53.7| 7   | 17.1| 60.7*|
| 6 - 11 years    | 2    | 4.2  | 0    | 0    | 7    | 14.6 | 21   | 43.8 | 18   | 37.5 | 2    | 4.2 | 4    | 8.3 | 12   | 25.0| 21  | 43.8| 9   | 18.8| 80.6*|
| 12 – 17 years   | 0    | 0    | 2    | 5.0  | 6    | 15.0 | 13   | 32.5 | 19   | 47.5 | 0    | 0   | 3    | 7.5 | 9    | 22.5| 19  | 47.5| 9   | 22.5| 51.9*|
| 18 – 23 years   | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 5    | 15.2 | 15   | 45.5 | 13   | 39.4 | 0    | 0   | 4    | 12.1| 7    | 21.2| 16  | 48.5| 6   | 18.2| 11.1*|
| 23 years or more| 2    | 5.9  | 1    | 2.9  | 1    | 2.9  | 12   | 35.3 | 18   | 52.9 | 0    | 0   | 1    | 2.9 | 7    | 20.6| 15  | 44.1| 11  | 32.4| 44.7*|
### Importance

**Goal 3: Print Awareness**

**Item 10:** Provides opportunities for children to develop book familiarity

- **5 years or less:** 1 2.4 0 0 1 2.4 7 16.7 33 78.6 0 0 0 0 3 7.1 16 38.1 23 54.8 21.6*
- **6 -11 years:** 0 0 0 0 0 9 18.0 41 82.0 0 0 0 0 1 2.0 9 18.0 40 80.0 23.6*
- **12 – 17 years:** 0 0 0 0 0 4 10.0 36 90.0 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 20.0 32 80.0 8.4*
- **18 – 23 years:** 0 0 0 0 1 2.9 2 5.9 31 91.2 0 0 0 0 1 2.9 10 29.4 23 67.6 39.0*
- **23 years or more:** 2 5.9 0 0 1 2.9 4 11.8 27 79.4 0 0 0 0 0 0 10 29.4 24 70.6 3.0*

### Implementation

**Goal 4: Story Structure**

**Item 11:** Provides experiences for children to become increasingly familiar with narrative story forms

- **5 years or less:** 1 2.4 0 0 7 16.7 15 35.7 19 45.2 0 0 0 0 12 28.6 18 42.9 12 26.6 18.1*
- **6 -11 years:** 0 0 0 0 8 16.0 16 32.0 26 52.0 1 2.0 0 0 12 24.0 18 36.0 19 38.0 37.9*
- **12 – 17 years:** 0 0 1 2.5 5 12.5 15 37.5 19 47.5 0 0 1 2.5 6 15.0 22 55.0 21.5 30.6*
- **18 – 23 years:** 0 0 1 2.5 3 8.6 11 31.4 20 57.1 0 0 0 0 9 25.7 15 42.9 11 31.4 15.6*
- **23 years or more:** 2 5.7 0 0 5 14.3 8 22.9 20 57.1 0 0 1 2.5 7 20.0 12 34.3 15 42.9 33.5*

**Item 12:** Provides opportunities for children to identify story elements of setting, plot, characters and events

- **5 years or less:** 2 4.8 2 4.8 12 28.6 16 23.8 10 38.1 1 2.4 6 14.3 17 40.5 13 31.0 5 11.9 58.6*
- **6 -11 years:** 1 2.0 2 4.0 8 16.0 17 34.0 22 44.0 1 2.4 4 8.0 14 28.0 18 36.0 13 26.0 81.9*
- **12 – 17 years:** 0 0 3 7.5 8 20.0 10 25.0 19 47.5 2 5.0 1 2.5 13 32.5 14 35.0 10 25.0 52.4*
- **18 – 23 years:** 0 0 2 5.7 5 14.3 11 31.4 17 48.6 0 0 1 2.9 9 25.7 20 57.1 5 14.3 17.5*
- **23 years or more:** 2 5.7 1 2.9 5 14.3 11 31.4 16 45.7 0 0 0 0 8 22.9 19 54.3 8 22.9 23.0*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years or less</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 11 years</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 – 17 years</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – 23 years</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 years or more</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates significance at the .05 level

Importance: NI = Not Important; SI = Slightly Important; MI = Moderately Important; FI = Fairly Important; HI = Highly Important

Implementation: N = Never; S = Seldom; O = Occasionally; F = Frequently; A = Always
Differences of Importance and Implementation of National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy and Program Director

Number of Years in Present Position

Goal 1: Listening

Survey items one, two, three, four and seven were derived from the objectives for Goal 1: Listening. The percentage of respondents with five years or less in present position reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 23.9% (n=26) for item two (listen attentively) to 76.1% (n=83) for item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment). The percentage of respondents with five years or less in present position reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 16.5% (n=18) for item four (identify letter-sound relationship) to 71.6% (n=78) for item two (listen attentively). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 83.5% (n=91) on both item one (discriminate between sounds) and item four (identify letter-sound relationship) to 97.2% (n=106) on item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) for the directors with five years or less in present position.

The percentage of respondents with five years or less in present position reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 26.6% (n=29) for item one (discriminate between sounds) to 38.1% (n=16) for item four (identify letter-sound relationship). The percentage of respondents with five years or less in present position reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 43.1% (n=47) for item four (identify letter-sound relationship) to 54.1% (n=59) for item one (discriminate between sounds). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 80.7% (n=88) on both item one
(discriminate between sounds) and item four (identify letter-sound relationship) to 93.5% 
(n=102) on item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) for the directors with five years 
or less in present position.

The chi-square values for those with five years or less in present position ranged 
from $X^2 = 32.9$ for item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) to $X^2 = 94.0$ for item 
four (identify letter-sound relationship). All chi-square values were significant at $p<.05$ 
(see Table 10).

The percentage of respondents with six to eleven years in present position 
reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 66.0% (n=31) for item one (discriminate 
between sounds) to 78.7% (n=37) for item two (listen attentively). The percentage of 
respondents with six to eleven years in present position reporting the items as “Fairly 
Important” ranged from 10.6% (n=5) for item two (listen attentively) to 25.2% (n=12) for 
item one (discriminate between sounds). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly 
Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 89.3% (n=42) 
on item two (listen attentively) to 100% (n=47) on item three (listen for pleasure and 
enjoyment) for the directors with six to eleven years in present position.

The percentage of respondents with six to eleven years experience in present 
position reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 29.8% (n=14) for 
item one (discriminate between sounds) to 70.2% (n=33) for item two (listen attentively). 
The percentage of respondents with six to eleven years experience in present position 
reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 27.7% (n=13) for item two 
(listen attentively) to 55.3% (n=26) for item one (discriminate between sounds). When 
the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the
percentage responses ranged from 83.0% (n=39) on item seven (phonemic awareness) to 97.9% (n=46) on item two (listen attentively) for the directors with six to eleven years in present position.

The chi-square values for those with six to eleven years in present position ranged from \(X^2 = 15.1\) for item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) to \(X^2 = 49.6\) for item four (identify letter-sound relationship). All chi-square values were significant at \(p < .05\) (see Table 10).

The percentage of respondents with 12 – 17 years experience in present position reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 47.8% (n=11) for item four (identify letter-sound relationship) to 82.6% (n=19) for item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment). The percentage of respondents with 12 – 17 years in present position reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 8.7% (n=2) for item two (listen attentively) to 39.1% (n=9) for item four (identify letter-sound relationship). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 78.3% (n=18) on item two (listen attentively) to 95.6% (n=22) on item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) for the directors with 12 – 17 years in present position.

The percentage of respondents with 12 – 17 years in present position reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 26.1% (n=6) for item four (identify letter-sound relationship) to 69.6% (n=14) for item two (listen attentively). The percentage of respondents with 12 – 17 years in present position reporting items on “Frequently” implemented range from 30.4% (n=7) for both item two (listen attentively) and item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) to 47.8% (n=11) for item four (identify letter-sound relationship). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation
responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 73.9% (n=17) on both item four (identify letter-sound relationship) and item seven (develop phonemic awareness) to 100% (n=23) on item two (listen attentively) for the directors with 12 – 17 years in present position.

The chi-square values for those with 12 – 17 years in present position ranged from $X^2 = 7.9$ for item two (listen attentively) to $X^2 = 38.4$ for item four (identify letter-sound relationship). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 10).

The percentage of respondents with 18 years or more in present position reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 36.0% (n=9) for item four (identify letter-sound relationship) to 80.0% (n=20) for item two (listen attentively). The percentage of respondents with 18 years or more in present position reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 8.0% (n=2) for item two (listen attentively) to 44.0% (n=11) for item four (identify letter-sound relationship). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 79.1% (n=19) on item one (discriminate between sounds) to 91.6% (n=22) on item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) for the directors with 18 years or more in present position.

The percentage of respondents 18 years or more in present position reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 24.0% (n=6) for item four (identify letter-sound relationship) to 64.0% (n=16) for item two (listen attentively). The percentage of respondents 18 years or more in present position reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 32.0% (n=8) for item two (listen attentively) to 64.0% (n=16) for item four (identify letter-sound relationship). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage
responses ranged from 61.7% (n=25) on item one (discriminate between sounds) to 100% (n=24) on item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) for the directors with 18 years or more in present position.

The chi-square values for those with 18 years or more in present position ranged from $X^2 = 4.2$ for item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) to $X^2 = 30.3$ for item two (listen attentively). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 10).

Goal 2: Complex Speech

Survey items five and six were derived from the objectives for Goal 2: Complex Speech. The percentage of respondents with five years or less in present position reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 87.2% (n=95) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 88.1% (n=96) for item six (conversation skills). The percentage of respondents with five years or less in present position reporting the items as “Fairly Important” were 11.0% (n=12) for both item five (vocabulary growth) and item six (conversation skills). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 98.2% (n=107) on item five (vocabulary growth) to 99.1% (n=108) on item six (conversation skills) for the directors with five years or less in present position.

The percentage of respondents with five years or less in present position reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 55.0% (n=60) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 69.7% (n=76) for item six (conversation skills). The percentage of respondents with five years or less in present position reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 26.6% (n=29) for item six (conversation skills) to 40.4% (n=44) for item five (vocabulary growth). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of
implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 95.4% (n=103) on item five (vocabulary growth) to 96.3% (n=105) on item six (conversation skills) for the directors with five years or less in present position.

The chi-square values for those with five years or less in present position ranged from \(X^2 = 13.1\) for item six (conversation skills) to \(X^2 = 39.7\) for item five (vocabulary growth). All chi-square values were significant at \(p < .05\) (see Table 10).

The percentage of respondents with six to eleven years in present position reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 83.0% (n=39) for item six (conversation skills) to 93.6% (n=44) for item five (vocabulary growth). The percentage of respondents with six to eleven years in present position reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 6.4% (n=3) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 14.9% (n=7) for item six (conversation skills). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 97.9% (n=46) on item six (conversation skills) to 100% (n=47) on item five (vocabulary growth) for the directors with six to eleven years in present position.

The percentage of respondents with six to eleven years experience in present position reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 63.8% (n=30) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 68.1% (n=32) on item six (conversation skills). The percentage of respondents with six to eleven years experience in present position reporting items on “Frequently” implemented range from 31.9% (n=15) for item six (conversation skills) to 34.0% (n=16) for item five (vocabulary growth). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 97.8% (n=46) on item five (vocabulary growth) to
100% (n=47) on item six (conversation skills) for the directors with six to eleven years in present position.

The chi-square values for those with six to eleven years in present position ranged from $X^2 = 6.2$ for item five (vocabulary growth) to $X^2 = 20.6$ for item six (conversation skills). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 10).

The percentage of respondents with 12 – 17 years in present position reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 91.3% (n=21) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 95.7% (n=22) for item six (conversation skills). The percentage of respondents with 12 – 17 years in present position reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 4.3% (n=1) for item six (conversation skills) to 8.7% (n=2) for item five (vocabulary growth). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses were 100% (n=23) on both item five (vocabulary growth) and item six (conversation skills) for the directors with 12 – 17 years in present position.

The percentage of respondents with 12 – 17 years in present position reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 73.9% (n=17) for item six (conversation skills) to 78.3% (n=18) for item five (vocabulary growth). The percentage of respondents with 12 – 17 years in present position reporting items on “Frequently” implemented range from 17.4% (n=4) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 21.7% (n=5) for item six (conversation skills). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 95.6% (n=22) on item six (conversation skills) to 95.7% (n=22) on item five (vocabulary growth) for the directors with 12 – 17 years in present position.
The chi-square values for those with 12 – 17 years in present position ranged from $X^2 = 10.4$ for item five (vocabulary growth) to $X^2 = 23.0$ for item six (conversation skills). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 10).

The percentage of respondents with 18 years or more in present position reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 80.0% ($n=20$) for item six (conversation skills) to 84.0% ($n=21$) for item five (vocabulary growth). The percentage of respondents with 18 years or more in present position reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 8.0% ($n=2$) for both item five (vocabulary growth) and item six (conversation skills). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 88.0% ($n=23$) on item six (conversation skills) to 92.0% ($n=23$) on item five (vocabulary growth) for the directors 18 years or more in present position.

The percentage of respondents with 18 years or more in present position reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 64.0% ($n=16$) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 68.0% ($n=17$) for item six (conversation skills). The percentage of respondents with 18 years or more in present position reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 28.0 ($n=7$) for item six (conversation skills) to 32.0% ($n=8$) for item five (vocabulary growth). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses were 96.0% ($n=24$) on both item five (vocabulary growth) and item six (conversation skills) for the directors with 18 years or more in present position.

The chi-square values for those 18 years or more in present position ranged from $X^2 = 1.5$ for item five (vocabulary growth) to $X^2 = 31.1$ for item six (conversation skills). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 10).
Survey items eight, nine, and ten were derived from the objectives for Goal 3: Print Awareness. The percentage of respondents with five years or less in present position reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 41.0% (n=43) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 83.3% (n=80) for item ten (book familiarity). The percentage of respondents with five years or less in present position reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 14.8% (n=16) for item ten (book familiarity) to 41.9% (n=44) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 82.9% (n=87) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 98.1% (n=96) on item ten (book familiarity) for the directors with five years or less in present position.

The percentage of respondents with five years or less in present position reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 18.1% (n=19) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 67.6% (n=73) for item ten (book familiarity). The percentage of respondents with five years or less in present position reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 29.6% (n=32) for item ten (book familiarity) to 48.6% (n=51) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 66.7% (n=70) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 97.2% (n=105) on item ten (book familiarity) for the directors with five years or less in present position.

The chi-square values for those with five years or less in present position ranged from $X^2 = 51.7$ for item eight (understand print carries a message) to $X^2 = 134.7$ for item
nine (develop grapheme awareness). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 10).

The percentage of respondents with six to eleven years in present position reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 51.1% ($n=24$) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 89.4% ($n=42$) for item ten (book familiarity). The percentage of respondents with six to eleven years in present position reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 8.5% ($n=4$) for item ten (book familiarity) to 34.0% ($n=16$) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 85.1% ($n=40$) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 97.9% ($n=46$) on item ten (book familiarity) for the directors with six to eleven years in present position.

The percentage of respondents with six to eleven years experience in present position reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 23.4% ($n=11$) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 78.7% ($n=37$) for item ten (book familiarity). The percentage of respondents with six to eleven years experience in present position reporting items on “Frequently” implemented range from 17.0% ($n=8$) for item ten (book familiarity) to 46.8% ($n=22$) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 70.2% ($n=33$) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 95.7% ($n=45$) on item ten (book familiarity) for the directors with six to eleven years in present position.
The chi-square values for those with six to eleven years in present position ranged from \(X^2 = 29.0\) for item ten (book familiarity) to \(X^2 = 97.4\) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). All chi-square values were significant at \(p < .05\) (see Table 10).

The percentage of respondents with 12 – 17 years in present position reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 43.5\% (\(n=10\)) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 87.0\% (\(n=20\)) for item ten (book familiarity). The percentage of respondents with 12 – 17 years in present position reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 8.7\% (\(n=2\)) for item ten (book familiarity) to 39.1\% (\(n=9\)) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 82.6\% (\(n=19\)) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 95.7\% (\(n=22\)) on item ten (book familiarity) for the directors with 12 – 17 years in present position.

The percentage of respondents with 12 – 17 years in present position reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 21.7\% (\(n=5\)) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 69.6\% (\(n=16\)) for item ten (book familiarity). The percentage of respondents with 12 – 17 years in present position reporting items on “Frequently” implemented range from 30.4\% (\(n=7\)) for item ten (book familiarity) to 43.5\% (\(n=10\)) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 65.2\% (\(n=15\)) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 100\% (\(n=23\)) on item ten (book familiarity) for the directors with 12 – 17 years in present position.
The chi-square values for those with 12 – 17 years in present position ranged from $X^2 = 2.9$ for item ten (book familiarity) to $X^2 = 45.5$ for item eight (understand print carries a message). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 10).

The percentage of respondents with 18 years or more in present position reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 42.9% ($n=9$) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 72.7% ($n=16$) for item ten (book familiarity). The percentage of respondents with 18 years or more in present position reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 16.7% ($n=4$) for item eight (understand print carries a message) to 33.3% ($n=7$) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 76.2% ($n=16$) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 90.9% ($n=20$) on item ten (book familiarity) for the directors 18 years or more in present position.

The percentage of respondents with 18 years or more in present position reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 33.3% ($n=7$) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 72.7% ($n=16$) for item ten (book familiarity). The percentage of respondents with 18 years or more in present position reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 27.3 ($n=6$) for item ten (book familiarity) to 47.6% ($n=10$) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 80.9% ($n=17$) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 100% ($n=22$) on item ten (book familiarity) for the directors with 18 years or more in present position.
The chi-square values for those 18 years or more in present position ranged from $X^2 = 5.9$ for item ten (book familiarity) to $X^2 = 11.7$ for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 10).

**Goal 4: Story Structure**

Survey items eleven and twelve were derived from the objectives for Goal 4: Story Structure. The percentage of respondents with five years or less in present position reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 35.2% (n=38) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 50.9% (n=55) for item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents with five years or less in present position reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 30.6% (n=33) for item eleven (narrative story forms) to 32.4% (n=35) for item twelve (identify story elements). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 67.6% (n=73) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 81.5% (n=88) on item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors with five years or less in present position.

The percentage of respondents with five years or less in present position reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 15.7% (n=17) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 33.3% (n=36) for item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents with five years or less in present position reporting items on “Frequently” implemented range from 35.2% (n=38) for item eleven (narrative story forms) to 37.0% (n=40) for item twelve (identify story elements). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 52.7% (n=57) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 68.5%
(n=74) on item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors with five years or less in present position.

The chi-square values for those with five years or less in present position ranged from $X^2 = 60.8$ for item eleven (narrative story forms) to $X^2 = 115.7$ for item twelve (identify story elements). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 10).

The percentage of respondents with six to eleven years in present position reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 51.1% (n=24) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 53.2% (n=25) for item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents with six to eleven years in present position reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 34.0% (n=16) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 38.3% (n=18) for item eleven (narrative story forms). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 85.1% (n=40) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 91.5% (n=43) on item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors with six to eleven years in present position.

The percentage of respondents with six to eleven years experience in present position reporting “Always” for level of implementation were 27.7% (n=13) for both item eleven (narrative story forms) and item twelve (identify story elements). The percentage of respondents with six to eleven years experience in present position reporting items on “Frequently” implemented range from 40.4% (n=19) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 63.8% (n=30) for item eleven (narrative story forms). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 68.1% (n=32) on item twelve (identify story elements)
to 91.5% (n=43) for item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors with six to eleven years in present position.

The chi-square values for those with six to eleven years in present position ranged from $X^2 = 34.5$ for item eleven (narrative story forms) to $X^2 = 66.1$ for item twelve (identify story elements). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 10).

The percentage of respondents with 12 – 17 years in present position reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 52.2% (n=12) for item eleven (narrative story forms) to 56.5% (n=13) for item twelve (identify story elements). The percentage of respondents with 12 – 17 years in present position reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 26.1% (n=6) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 34.8% (n=8) for item eleven (narrative story forms). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 82.6% (n=19) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 87.0% (n=20) on item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors with 12 – 17 years in present position.

The percentage of respondents with 12 – 17 years in present position reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 30.4% (n=7) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 43.5% (n=10) for item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents with 12 – 17 years in present position reporting items on “Frequently” implemented range from 34.8% (n=8) for item eleven (narrative story forms) to 43.5% (n=10) for item twelve (identify story elements). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 73.9% (n=17) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 78.3% (n=18) on item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors with 12 – 17 years in present position.
The chi-square values for those with 12 – 17 years in present position ranged from $X^2 = 19.7$ for item twelve (identify story elements) to $X^2 = 22.2$ for item eleven (narrative story forms). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 10).

The percentage of respondents with 18 years or more in present position reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 37.5% ($n=9$) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 50.0% ($n=12$) for item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents with 18 years or more in present position reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 25.0% ($n=6$) for item eleven (narrative story forms) to 33.3% ($n=7$) for item twelve (identify story elements). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 70.8% ($n=17$) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 75.0% ($n=18$) on item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors 18 years or more in present position.

The percentage of respondents with 18 years or more in present position reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 16.7% ($n=4$) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 37.5% ($n=9$) for item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents with 18 years or more in present position reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 37.5% ($n=9$) for item eleven (narrative story forms) to 62.5% ($n=15$) for item twelve (identify story elements). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 75.0% ($n=18$) on item eleven (narrative story forms) to 79.2% ($n=19$) on item twelve (identify story elements) for the directors with 18 years or more in present position. The chi-square values for those 18 years or more in present position ranged from $X^2 = 17.7$
for item eleven (narrative story forms) to \( X^2 = 23.4 \) for item twelve (identify story elements). All chi-square values were significant at \( p < .05 \) (see Table 10).

**Goal 5: Beginning Writing Skills**

Survey item thirteen was derived from the objectives for Goal 5: Beginning Writing Skills and Knowledge. The percentage of directors with five years or less in present position responding “Highly Important” were 70.4% (n=76) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of respondents with five years or less in present position reporting the item as “Fairly Important” were 17.6% (n=19) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage response 88.0% (n=95) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors with five years or less in present position.

The percentage of directors with five years or less in present position responding “Always” for level of implementation were 42.6% (n=46) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of respondents with five years or less in present position reporting items on “Frequently” implemented were 35.2% (n=38) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Always” and “Frequently” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses were 77.8% (n=84) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors with five years or less in present position.

The chi square value of \( X^2 = 226.5 \) was significant at \( p < .05 \) (See Table 10).

The percentage of directors with six to eleven years in present position responding “Highly Important” were 78.7% (n=37) on item thirteen (understand writing has a
purpose). The percentage of respondents with six to eleven years in present position reporting the item as “Fairly Important” were 14.9% (n=7) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Fairly Important” and Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage response 93.6% (n=44) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors with six to eleven years in present position.

The percentage of directors with six to eleven years in present position responding “Always” for level of implementation were 51.1% (n=24) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of respondents with six to eleven years in present position reporting items on “Frequently” implemented were 40.4% (n=19) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Always” and “Frequently” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses were 91.5% (n=43) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors with six to eleven years in present position.

The chi square value of $X^2 = 60.1$ was significant at $p < .05$ (See Table 10).

The percentage of directors with 12 – 17 years in present position responding “Highly Important” were 69.6% (n=16) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of respondents with 12 – 17 years in present position reporting the item as “Fairly Important” were 17.4% (n=4) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Fairly Important” and Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage response 87.0% (n=20) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors with 12 – 17 years in present position.

The percentage of directors with 12 – 17 years in present position responding “Always” for level of implementation were 38.1% (n=9) on item thirteen (understand
writing has a purpose). The percentage of respondents with 12 – 17 years in present position reporting items on “Frequently” implemented were 43.5% (n=10) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Always” and “Frequently” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses were 81.6% (n=19) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors with 12 – 17 years in present position. The chi square value of $X^2 = 24.2$ was significant at $p < .05$ (See Table 10).

The percentage of directors with 18 years or more in present position responding “Highly Important” were 62.5% (n=15) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of respondents with 18 years or more in present position reporting the item as “Fairly Important” were 20.8% (n=5) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Fairly Important” and Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage response were 83.3% (n=20) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors with 18 years or more in present position.

The percentage of directors with 18 years or more in present position responding “Always” for level of implementation were 41.7% (n=10) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of respondents with 18 years or more in present position reporting items on “Frequently” implemented were 41.7% (n=10) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Always” and “Frequently” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses were 83.3% (n=20) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors with 18 years or more in present position. The chi square value of $X^2 = 30.2$ was significant at $p < .05$ (See Table 10).
Table 10

Program Director Number of Years in Present Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IMPORTANCE</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1: Listening</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1: Provides opportunities for children to discriminate between sounds in their environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years or less</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 11 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 – 17 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 years or more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2: Provides opportunities for children to listen attentively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years or less</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 11 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 – 17 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 years or more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3: Provides opportunities for children to listen for pleasure and enjoyment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years or less</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 11 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 – 17 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 years or more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1: Listening Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4: Provides experiences for children to identify letter-sound relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 5 years or less</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 6 -11 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 12 – 17 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 18 years or more</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 2: Complex Speech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 5: Provides opportunities for children to experience a steady vocabulary growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 5 years or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 6 -11 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 12 – 17 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 18 years or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2: Complex Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6: Provides experiences for children to increase their conversation skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 5 years or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 6 -11 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 12 – 17 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 18 years or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 3: Print Awareness</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 8: Provides experiences for children to understand that print carries a message</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 5 years or less</td>
<td>1 0.9 1 0.9 5 4.7 17 15.9 53 77.6 0 0 1 0.9 11 10.3 50 46.7 45 42.1 51.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 6 -11 years</td>
<td>0 0 2 4.3 1 2.2 8 17.4 35 76.1 0 0 2 4.3 1 2.2 20 43.5 23 50.0 51.2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 12 – 17 years</td>
<td>0 0 1 4.3 1 4.3 5 21.7 16 69.6 0 0 2 4.3 2 8.7 8 34.8 12 52.2 45.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 18 years or more</td>
<td>2 6.2 0 0 1 4.2 4 16.7 17 70.8 0 0 0 0 3 12.5 11 45.8 10 41.7 11.4*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 9: Provides experiences for children to develop grapheme awareness</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 5 years or less</td>
<td>2 1.9 2 1.9 14 13.3 44 41.9 43 41.0 1 1.0 9 8.6 25 23.8 51 48.6 19 18.1 134.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 6 -11 years</td>
<td>2 4.3 1 2.1 4 8.5 16 34.0 24 51.1 2 4.3 4 8.5 8 17.0 22 46.8 11 23.4 97.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 12 – 17 years</td>
<td>0 0 1 4.3 3 13.0 9 39.1 10 43.5 0 0 2 8.7 6 26.1 10 43.5 5 21.7 27.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 18 years or more</td>
<td>2 9.5 0 0 3 14.3 7 33.3 9 42.9 0 0 0 0 4 19.0 10 47.6 7 33.3 11.7*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## IMPORTANCE

| Item 10: Provides opportunities for children to develop book familiarity |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | NI | SI | MI | FI | HI | N | S | O | F | A | X² |
| | N % | N % | N % | N % | N % | N % | N % | N % | N % | N % | N % | N % | N % | N % |
| 5 years or less | 1 | 0.9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.9 | 16 | 14.8 | 80 | 83.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2.8 | 32 | 29.6 | 73 | 67.6 | 62.1* |
| 6 -11 years | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2.1 | 4 | 8.5 | 42 | 89.4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.3 | 8 | 17.0 | 37 | 78.7 | 29.0* |
| 12 – 17 years | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4.3 | 2 | 8.7 | 20 | 87.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 30.4 | 16 | 69.6 | 2.9* |
| 18 years or more | 2 | 9.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 18.2 | 16 | 72.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 27.3 | 16 | 72.7 | 5.9* |

## IMPLEMENTATION

Goal 4: Story Structure

### Item 11: Provides experiences for children to become increasingly familiar with narrative story forms

| | NI | SI | MI | FI | HI | N | S | O | F | A | X² |
| | N % | N % | N % | N % | N % | N % | N % | N % | N % | N % | N % | N % | N % | N % |
| 5 years or less | 1 | 0.9 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 17.6 | 33 | 30.6 | 55 | 50.9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.9 | 33 | 30.6 | 38 | 35.2 | 36 | 33.3 | 60.8* |
| 6 -11 years | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2.1 | 3 | 6.4 | 18 | 38.3 | 25 | 53.2 | 1 | 2.1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6.4 | 30 | 63.8 | 13 | 27.7 | 34.5* |
| 12 – 17 years | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13.0 | 8 | 34.8 | 12 | 52.2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4.3 | 4 | 17.4 | 8 | 34.8 | 10 | 43.5 | 22.2* |
| 18 years or more | 2 | 8.3 | 1 | 4.2 | 3 | 12.5 | 6 | 25.0 | 12 | 50.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 25.0 | 9 | 37.5 | 9 | 37.5 | 17.7* |

### Item 12: Provides opportunities for children to identify story elements of setting, plot, characters and events

| | NI | SI | MI | FI | HI | N | S | O | F | A | X² |
| | N % | N % | N % | N % | N % | N % | N % | N % | N % | N % | N % | N % | N % | N % |
| 5 years or less | 3 | 2.8 | 5 | 4.6 | 27 | 25.0 | 35 | 32.4 | 38 | 35.2 | 3 | 2.8 | 9 | 66.7 | 39 | 36.1 | 40 | 37.0 | 17 | 15.7 | 115.7* |
| 6 -11 years | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.3 | 5 | 10.6 | 16 | 34.0 | 24 | 51.1 | 1 | 2.1 | 3 | 6.4 | 11 | 23.4 | 19 | 40.4 | 13 | 27.7 | 66.1* |
| 12 – 17 years | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4.3 | 3 | 13.0 | 6 | 26.1 | 13 | 56.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 26.1 | 10 | 43.5 | 7 | 30.4 | 19.7* |
| 18 years or more | 2 | 8.3 | 2 | 8.3 | 3 | 12.5 | 8 | 33.3 | 9 | 37.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 20.8 | 15 | 62.5 | 4 | 16.7 | 23.4* |
Goal 5: Beginning Writing Skills and Knowledge

Item 13: Provides opportunities for children to understand that writing has a purpose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>FI</th>
<th>HI</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>X²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years or less</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 -11 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 – 17 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 years or more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates significance at the .05 level

Importance: NI = Not Important; SI = Slightly Important; MI = Moderately Important; FI = Fairly Important; HI = Highly Important
Implementation: N = Never; S = Seldom; O = Occasionally; F = Frequently; A = Always
Differences of Importance and Implementation of National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy and Program Type

Goal 1: Listening

Survey items one, two, three, four and seven were derived from the objectives for Goal 1: Listening. The percentage of respondents in Head Start programs reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 20.0% (n=8) for item one (discriminate between sounds) to 85.0% (n=34) for item two (listen attentively). The percentage of respondents in Head Start programs reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 10.0% (n=4) for item two (listen attentively) to 67.5% (n=27) for item one (discriminate between sounds). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 87.5% (n=35) on item one (discriminate between sounds) to 100% (n=40) on item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) for the directors of Head Start programs.

The percentage of respondents in Head Start programs reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 35.0% (n=14) for item four (identify letter-sound relationship) to 72.5% (n=29) for item two (listen attentively). The percentage of respondents in Head Start programs reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 17.5% (n=7) for item two (listen attentively) to 47.5% (n=14) for item four (identify letter-sound relationship) and 47.5% (n=15) for item seven (develop phonemic awareness). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 82.5% (n=28) on item four (identify letter-sound relationship) to 99.0% (n=36) on item two (listen attentively) for the directors of Head Start programs.
The chi-square values for directors of Head Start programs ranged from $X^2 = 12.6$ for item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) to $X^2 = 32.7$ for item one (discriminate between sounds). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 11).

The percentage of respondents in Child Care Center programs reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 52.5% (n=42) for item one (discriminate between sounds) to 78.8% (n=63) for item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment). The percentage of respondents in Child Care Center programs reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 18.8% (n=15) for item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) to 31.3% (n=25) for item one (discriminate between sounds). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 83.8% (n=67) on item one (discriminate between sounds) to 97.6% (n=78) on item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) for the directors of Child Care Center programs.

The percentage of respondents in Child Care Center programs reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 28.8% (n=23) for item one (discriminate between sounds) to 52.5% (n=42) for item two (listen attentively). The percentage of respondents in Child Care Center programs reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 36.3% (n=29) for item four (identify letter sound relationship) to 52.6% (n=42) for item one (discriminate between sounds). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 81.4% (n=65) on item one (discriminate between sounds) to 96.3% (n=77) on item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) for the directors of Child Care Center programs.
The chi-square values for directors of Child Care Center programs ranged from $X^2 = 40.6$ for item one (discriminate between sounds) to $X^2 = 115.7$ for item four (identify letter-sound relationship). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 11).

The percentage of respondents in Private Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 80.0% (n=20) for item one (discriminate between sounds) to 76.9% (n=20) for both item two (listen attentively) and item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment). The percentage of respondents in Private Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 19.2% (n=5) for both item two (listen attentively) and item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) to 30.8% (n=8) for item seven (develop phonemic awareness). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 80.0% (n=20) on item one (discriminate between sounds) to 96.2% (n=25) on item seven (develop phonemic awareness) for the directors of Private Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs.

The percentage of respondents in Private Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 34.6% (n=9) for item seven (develop phonemic awareness) to 53.8% (n=14) for both item two (listen attentively) and item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment). The percentage of respondents in Private Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 40.0% (n=9) for item one (discriminate between sounds) to 53.8% (n=14) for both item four (identify letter-sound relationship) and item seven (develop phonemic awareness). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 88.4% (n=23) on item seven (develop
phonemic awareness) to 100% (n=26) on item two (listen attentively) for the directors of Private Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs.

The chi-square values for directors of Private Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs ranged from $X^2 = 9.10$ for item two (listen attentively) to $X^2 = 34.3$ for item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 11).

The percentage of respondents in Public Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 56.9% (n=33) for item four (identify letter-sound relationship) to 75.9% (n=44) for item two (listen attentively). The percentage of respondents Public Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 17.2% (n=10) for item two (listen attentively) to 20.7% (n=12) for item one (discriminate between sounds) and item four (identify letter-sound relationship) and item seven (develop phonemic awareness). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 86.2% (n=50) on item one (discriminate between sounds) to 94.7% (n=54) on item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) for the directors of Public Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs.

The percentage of respondents in Public Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 27.6% (n=16) for item four (identify letter-sound relationship) to 53.4% (n=31) for item two (listen attentively). The percentage of respondents in Public Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 44.8% (n=26) for item two (listen attentively) and item seven (develop phonemic awareness) to 53.4% (n=31) for item one
(discriminate between sounds). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 77.6% (n=45) on item four (letter-sound relationship) to 98.2% (n=57) on item two (listen attentively) for the directors of Public Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs.

The chi-square values for directors of Public Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs ranged from $X^2 = 11.9$ for item seven (develop phonemic awareness) to $X^2=40.4$ for item four (identify letter-sound relationship). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 11).

**Goal 2: Complex Speech**

Survey items five and six were derived from the objectives for Goal 2: Complex Speech. The percentage of respondents in Head Start programs reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 57.5% (n=35) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 90.0% (n=36) for item six (conversation skills). The percentage of respondents in Head Start programs reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 10.0% (n=4) for item six (conversation skills) to 12.5% (n=5) for item five (vocabulary growth). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 70.0% (n=40) on item five (vocabulary growth) to 100% (n=5) on item six (conversation skills) for the directors of Head Start programs.

The percentage of respondents in Head Start programs reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 62.5% (n=25) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 80.0% (n=32) for item six (conversation skills). The percentage of respondents in Head Start programs reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 7.5% (n=4) for item six (conversation skills) to 32.5% (n=13) for item five (vocabulary growth). When
the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 87.5% (n=36) on item six (conversation skills) to 95.0% (n=38) on item five (vocabulary growth) for the directors of Head Start programs.

The chi-square values for directors of Head Start programs ranged from \(X^2 = 11.9\) for item five (vocabulary growth) to \(X^2 = 20.9\) for item six (conversation skills). All chi-square values were significant at \(p < .05\) (see Table 11).

The percentage of respondents in Child Care Center programs reporting “Highly Important” ranged were 87.5% (n=70) for both item five (vocabulary growth) and item six (conversation skills). The percentage of respondents in Child Care Center programs reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 10.0% (n=8) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 11.3% (n=9) for item six (conversation skills). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 97.5% (n=78) on item five (vocabulary growth) to 98.8% (n=79) on item six (conversation skills) for the directors of Child Care Center programs.

The percentage of respondents in Child Care Center programs reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 62.5% (n=50) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 72.5% (n=58) for item six (conversation skills). The percentage of respondents in Child Care Center programs reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 23.8% (n=19) for item six (conversation skills) to 35.0% (n=28) for item five (vocabulary growth). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 96.3% (n=77) on item six (conversation skills) to 97.5% (n=78) on item five (vocabulary growth) for the directors of Child Care Center programs.
The chi-square values for directors of Child Care Center programs ranged from $X^2 = 16.5$ for item six (conversation skills) to $X^2 = 50.5$ for item five (vocabulary growth). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 11).

The percentage of respondents in Private Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 84.6% ($n=22$) for item six (conversation skills) to 96.2% ($n=25$) for item five (vocabulary growth). The percentage of respondents in Private Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 3.8% ($n=1$) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 15.4% ($n=4$) for item six (conversation skills). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses were 100% ($n=26$) on both item five (vocabulary growth) and item six (conversation skills) for the directors of Private Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs.

The percentage of respondents in Private Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 61.5% ($n=16$) for item six (conversation skills) to 73.1% ($n=19$) for item five (vocabulary growth). The percentage of respondents in Private Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 26.9% ($n=7$) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 34.6% ($n=9$) for item six (conversation skills). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 96.1% ($n=25$) on item six (conversation skills) to 100% ($n=26$) on item five (vocabulary growth) for the directors of Private Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs.
The chi-square values for directors of Private Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs ranged from $X^2 = 2.8$ for item five (vocabulary growth) to $X^2 = 10.6$ for item six (conversation skills). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 11).

The percentage of respondents in Public Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 84.5% (n=49) for item six (conversation skills) to 87.9% (n=51) for item five (vocabulary growth). The percentage of respondents Public Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 8.6% (n=5) for both item five (vocabulary growth) and item six (conversation skills). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 93.1% (n=54) on item six (conversation skills) to 96.5% (n=56) on item five (vocabulary growth) for the directors of Public Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs.

The percentage of respondents in Public Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 51.7% (n=30) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 56.9% (n=33) for item six (conversation skills). The percentage of respondents in Public Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 36.2% (n=21) for item six (conversation skills) to 41.4% (n=24) for item five (vocabulary growth). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses were 93.1% (n=54) on both item five (vocabulary growth) and item six (conversation skills) for the directors of Public Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs.
The chi-square values for directors of Public Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs ranged from $X^2 = 6.3$ for item five (vocabulary growth) to $X^2=12.1$ for item six (conversation skills). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 11).

Goal 3: Print Awareness

Survey items eight, nine, and ten were derived from the objectives for Goal 3: Print Awareness. The percentage of respondents in Head Start programs reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 46.2% (n=18) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 95.0% (n=38) for item ten (book familiarity). The percentage of respondents in Head Start programs reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 5.0% (n=2) for item ten (book familiarity) to 38.5% (n=15) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 84.7% (n=33) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 100% (n=40) on item ten (book familiarity) for the directors of Head Start programs.

The percentage of respondents in Head Start programs reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 20.5% (n=8) for item ten (book familiarity) to 87.5% (n=15) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). The percentage of respondents in Head Start programs reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 12.5% (n=5) for item ten (book familiarity) to 41.0% (n=16) for item eight (understand print carries a message). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 59.0% (n=23) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 100% (n=40) on item ten (book familiarity) for the directors of Head Start programs.
The chi-square values for directors of Head Start programs ranged from $X^2 = .301$ for item ten (book familiarity) to $X^2 = 20.2$ for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 11).

The percentage of respondents in Child Care Center programs reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 36.0% ($n=27$) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 80.5% ($n=62$) for item ten (book familiarity). The percentage of respondents in Child Care Center programs reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 16.9% ($n=13$) for item ten (book familiarity) to 42.7% ($n=32$) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 78.7% ($n=59$) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 97.4% ($n=75$) on item ten (book familiarity) for the directors of Child Care Center programs.

The percentage of respondents in Child Care Center programs reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 22.7% ($n=17$) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 74.0% ($n=57$) for item ten (book familiarity). The percentage of respondents in Child Care Center programs reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 23.4% ($n=18$) for item ten (book familiarity) to 44.0% ($n=33$) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 66.7% ($n=50$) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 97.4% ($n=75$) on item ten (book familiarity) for the directors of Child Care Center programs.

The chi-square values for directors of Child Care Center programs ranged from $X^2 = 63.6$ for item eight (understand print carries a message) to $X^2 = 113.2$ for item nine
(develop grapheme awareness). All chi-square values were significant at p < .05 (see Table 11).

The percentage of respondents in Private Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 53.8% (n=14) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 88.5% (n=23) for item eight (understand print carries a message). The percentage of respondents in Private Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 7.7% (n=2) for item eight (understand print carries a message) to 26.9% (n=7) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 80.7% (n=21) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 100% (n=26) on item ten (book familiarity) for the directors of Private Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs.

The percentage of respondents in Private Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 15.4% (n=4) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 69.2% (n=18) for item ten (book familiarity). The percentage of respondents in Private Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 30.8% (n=8) for item ten (book familiarity) to 57.7% (n=15) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 73.1% (n=19) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 100% (n=26) on item ten (book familiarity) for the directors of Private Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs.
The chi-square values for directors of Private Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs ranged from $X^2 = 4.3$ for item ten (book familiarity) to $X^2 = 10.6$ for item eight (understand print carries a message). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 11).

The percentage of respondents in Public Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 48.2% (n=27) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 80.7% (n=46) for item ten (book familiarity). The percentage of respondents Public Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 12.3% (n=7) for item ten (book familiarity) to 39.3% (n=22) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 87.5% (n=49) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 93.0% (n=53) on item ten (book familiarity) for the directors of Public Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs.

The percentage of respondents in Public Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 23.2% (n=13) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 56.1% (n=32) for item ten (book familiarity). The percentage of respondents in Public Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 38.6% (n=22) for item ten (book familiarity) to 55.4% (n=31) for item eight (understand print carries a message). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 76.8% (n=43) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 94.7% (n=54) on item ten (book familiarity) for the directors of Public Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs.
The chi-square values for directors of Public Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs ranged from $X^2 = 13.1$ for item ten (book familiarity) to $X^2 = 67.1$ for item eight (understand print carries a message). All chi-square values were significant at $p<.05$ (see Table 11).

**Goal 4: Story Structure**

Survey items eleven and twelve were derived from the objectives for Goal 4: Story Structure. The percentage of respondents in Head Start programs reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 42.5% ($n=17$) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 67.5% ($n=27$) for item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents in Head Start programs reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 20.0% ($n=8$) for item eleven (narrative story forms) to 25.0% ($n=10$) for item twelve (identify story elements). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 67.5% ($n=27$) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 87.5% ($n=35$) on item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors of Head Start programs.

The percentage of respondents in Head Start programs reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 20.0% ($n=8$) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 40.0% ($n=16$) for item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents in Head Start programs reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 32.5% ($n=13$) for item eleven (narrative story forms) to 35.0% ($n=14$) for item twelve (identify story elements). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 55.0%
(n=22) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 72.5% (n=29) for item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors of Head Start programs.

The chi-square values for directors of Head Start programs ranged from $X^2 = 27.2$ for item eleven (narrative story forms) to $X^2 = 39.0$ for item twelve (identify story elements). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 11).

The percentage of respondents in Child Care Center programs reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 40.5% (n=32) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 45.6% (n=36) for item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents in Child Care Center programs reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 40.5% (n=32) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 45.6% (n=36) for item eleven (narrative story forms). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 74.7% (n=59) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 81.0% (n=64) on item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors of Child Care Center programs.

The percentage of respondents in Child Care Center programs reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 24.1% (n=19) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 32.9% (n=26) for item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents in Child Care Center programs reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 36.7% (n=29) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 41.8% (n=33) for item eleven (narrative story forms). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 60.8% (n=48) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 74.7% (n=59) on item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors of Child Care Center programs.
The chi-square values for directors of Child Care Center programs ranged from $X^2 = 58.4$ for item eleven (narrative story forms) to $X^2 = 101.7$ for item twelve (identify story elements). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 11).

The percentage of respondents in Private Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 50.0% (n=13) for item eleven (narrative story forms) to 53.8% (n=14) for item twelve (identify story elements). The percentage of respondents in Private Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 38.5% (n=10) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 42.3% (n=11) for item eleven (narrative story forms). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses were 92.3% (n=24) on both item eleven (narrative story forms) and item twelve (identify story elements) for the directors of Private Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs.

The percentage of respondents in Private Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 26.9% (n=7) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 30.8% (n=8) for item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents in Private Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs reporting items on “Frequently” implemented were 50.0% (n=12) for item eleven (narrative story forms) and 50.0% (n=13) for item twelve (identify story elements). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 76.9% (n=20) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 80.8% (n=20) on item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors of Private Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs.
The chi-square values for directors of Private Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs ranged from $X^2 = 13.4$ for item eleven (narrative story forms) to $X^2 = 26.6$ for item twelve (identify story elements). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 11).

The percentage of respondents in Public Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 36.8% ($n=21$) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 49.1% ($n=28$) for item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents Public Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs reporting the items as “Fairly Important” were 31.6% ($n=18$) for both item eleven (narrative story forms) and item twelve (identify story elements). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 68.4% ($n=39$) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 80.7% ($n=46$) on item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors of Public Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs.

The percentage of respondents in Public Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 12.3% ($n=7$) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 31.6% ($n=18$) for item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents in Public Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 47.4% ($n=27$) for item eleven (narrative story forms) to 49.1% ($n=28$) for item twelve (identify story elements). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 61.4% ($n=35$) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 79.0% ($n=45$) on item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors of Public Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs.
The chi-square values for directors of Public Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs ranged from $X^2 = 29.1$ for item eleven (narrative story forms) to $X^2 = 40.3$ for item twelve (identify story elements). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 11).

**Goal 5: Beginning Writing Skills and Knowledge**

Survey item thirteen was derived from the objectives for Goal 5: Beginning Writing Skills and Knowledge. The percentage of directors in Head Start programs responding “Highly Important” were 77.5% (n=3) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of directors of Head Start programs reporting the item as “Fairly Important” were 12.5% (n=5) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage response 90.0% (n=8) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors of Head Start programs.

The percentage of directors of Head Start programs responding “Always” for level of implementation were 71.0% (n=22) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of directors of Head Start programs respondents reporting items on “Frequently” implemented were 20.0% (n=8) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Always” and “Frequently” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses were 91.0% (n=30) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors of Head Start programs.

The chi square value of $X^2 = 6.8$ was significant at $p < .05$ (See Table 11).

The percentage of directors of Child Care Center programs responding “Highly Important” were 73.4% (n=58) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). The
percentage of respondents in Child Care Center programs reporting the item as “Fairly Important” were 13.0% (n=11) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Fairly Important” and Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage response 86.4% (n=69) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors of Child Care Center programs.

The percentage of directors of Child Care Center programs responding “Always” for level of implementation were 48.1% (n=38) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of respondents in Child Care Center programs reporting items on “Frequently” implemented were 10.1% (n=8) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Always” and “Frequently” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses were 58.2% (n=46) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors of Child Care Center programs. The chi square value of $X^2 = 47.2$ was significant at $p < .05$ (See Table 11).

The percentage of directors in Private Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs responding “Highly Important” were 80.8% (n=21) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of respondents in Private Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs reporting the item as “Fairly Important” were 15.4% (n=4) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Fairly Important” and Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage response were 96.2% (n=25) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors in Private Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs.

The percentage of directors in Private Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs responding “Always” for level of implementation were 53.8% (n=14) on item thirteen
(understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of respondents in Private Pre-
Kindergarten Preschool programs reporting items on “Frequently” implemented were
7.7% (n=2) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Always” and
“Frequently” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses
were 61.5% (n=16) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors
in Private Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs. The chi square value of $X^2 = 15.8$ was
significant at $p < .05$ (See Table 11).

The percentage of directors of Public Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs
responding “Highly Important” were 59.6% (n=34) on item thirteen (understand writing
has a purpose). The percentage of respondents of Public Pre-Kindergarten Preschool
programs reporting the item as “Fairly Important” were 26.3% (n=15) on item thirteen
(understand writing has a purpose). When the “Fairly Important” and Highly Important”
responses are combined, the percentage response 85.9% (n=49) on item thirteen
(understand writing has a purpose) for the directors of Public Pre-Kindergarten Preschool
programs.

The percentage of directors in Public Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs
responding “Always” for level of implementation were 26.3% (n=15) on item thirteen
(understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of respondents in Public Pre-
Kindergarten Preschool programs reporting items on “Frequently” implemented were
19.3% (n=11) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Always”
and “Frequently” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage
responses were 45.6% (n=26) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the
directors of Public Pre-Kindergarten Preschool programs. The chi square value of $X^2 = 41.5$ was significant at $p < .05$ (See Table 11).
### Table 11

**Program Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IMPORTANCE</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal 1: Listening**

**Item 1: Provides opportunities for children to discriminate between sounds in their environment**

- **Head Start**
  
  |          | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 10.0 | 10 | 25.0 | 26 | 65.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 12.5 | 27 | 67.5 | 8 | 20.0 | 32.7* |
- **Child Care Center**
  
  |          | 1 | 1.3 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 15.0 | 25 | 31.3 | 42 | 52.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 16.3 | 42 | 52.6 | 23 | 28.8 | 40.6* |
- **Private Pre-K Preschool**
  
  |          | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 20.0 | 5 | 20.0 | 15 | 60.0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4.0 | 5 | 20.0 | 10 | 40.0 | 9 | 36.0 | 19.0* |
- **Public Pre-K Preschool**
  
  |          | 2 | 3.4 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 10.3 | 12 | 20.7 | 38 | 65.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 12.1 | 31 | 53.4 | 20 | 34.5 | 26.1* |

**Item 2: Provides opportunities for children to listen attentively**

- **Head Start**
  
  |          | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.0 | 4 | 10.0 | 34 | 85.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 10.0 | 7 | 17.5 | 29 | 72.5 | 21.2* |
- **Child Care Center**
  
  |          | 1 | 1.3 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 7.5 | 16 | 20.0 | 57 | 71.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6.3 | 33 | 41.3 | 42 | 52.5 | 50.6* |
- **Private Pre-K Preschool**
  
  |          | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.8 | 5 | 19.2 | 20 | 76.9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 46.2 | 14 | 53.8 | 9.10* |
- **Public Pre-K Preschool**
  
  |          | 2 | 3.4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3.4 | 10 | 17.2 | 44 | 75.9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.7 | 26 | 44.8 | 31 | 53.4 | 12.7* |

**Item 3: Provides opportunities for children to listen for pleasure and enjoyment**

- **Head Start**
  
  |          | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 22.5 | 31 | 77.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 10.0 | 13 | 32.5 | 23 | 57.5 | 12.6* |
- **Child Care Center**
  
  |          | 1 | 1.3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.3 | 15 | 18.8 | 63 | 78.8 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2.5 | 1 | 1.3 | 36 | 45.0 | 41 | 51.3 | 52.8* |
- **Private Pre-K Preschool**
  
  |          | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.8 | 5 | 19.2 | 20 | 76.9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.8 | 11 | 42.3 | 14 | 53.8 | 34.3* |
- **Public Pre-K Preschool**
  
  |          | 2 | 3.5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.8 | 11 | 19.3 | 43 | 75.4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.3 | 30 | 52.6 | 24 | 42.1 | 13.5* |
### Goal 1: Listening Continued

#### Item 4: Provides experiences for children to identify letter-sound relationship

- **Head Start**: 0 0 0 0 4 10.0 8 20.0 28 70.0 0 0 0 0 7 17.5 19 47.5 14 35.0 21.8*
- **Child Care Center**: 2 2.5 3 3.8 6 7.5 22 27.5 47 58.8 0 0 2 2.5 11 13.8 29 36.3 38 47.5 115.7*
- **Private Pre-K Preschool**: 0 0 0 0 1 3.8 7 26.9 18 69.2 0 0 0 0 1 3.8 14 53.8 11 42.3 32.5*
- **Public Pre-K Preschool**: 1 1.7 3 5.2 9 15.5 12 20.7 33 56.9 0 0 1 1.7 12 20.7 29 50.0 16 27.6 40.4*

#### Item 7: Provides experiences for children to develop phonemic awareness

- **Head Start**: 0 0 0 0 2 5.0 9 22.5 29 72.5 0 0 0 0 6 15.0 19 47.5 15 37.5 16.4*
- **Child Care Center**: 1 1.3 3 3.8 7 8.8 24 30.0 45 56.3 0 0 1 1.3 20 25.0 30 37.5 29 36.3 46.2*
- **Private Pre-K Preschool**: 0 0 0 0 1 3.8 8 30.8 17 65.4 0 0 0 0 3 11.5 14 53.8 9 34.6 16.1*
- **Public Pre-K Preschool**: 2 3.4 0 0 3 5.2 12 20.7 41 70.7 0 0 0 0 11 19.0 26 44.8 21 36.2 11.9*

### Goal 2: Complex Speech

#### Item 5: Provides opportunities for children to experience a steady vocabulary growth

- **Head Start**: 0 0 0 0 0 5 12.5 35 57.5 0 0 0 0 2 5.0 13 32.5 25 62.5 11.9*
- **Child Care Center**: 1 1.3 0 0 1 1.3 8 10.0 70 87.5 0 0 0 0 2 2.5 28 35.0 50 62.5 50.5*
- **Private Pre-K Preschool**: 0 0 0 0 0 1 3.8 25 96.2 0 0 0 0 7 26.9 19 73.1 2.8*
- **Public Pre-K Preschool**: 2 3.4 0 0 0 5 8.6 51 87.9 0 0 0 0 4 6.9 24 41.4 30 51.7 6.3*
### Goal 2: Complex Speech

**Item 6:** Provides experiences for children to increase their conversation skills

- **Head Start:** 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 4, 10.0, 36, 90.0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 2.5, 4, 7.5, 32, 80.0, 20.9*
- **Child Care Center:** 1, 1.3, 0, 0, 0, 0, 9, 11.3, 70, 87.5, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 19, 23.8, 58, 72.5, 16.5*
- **Private Pre-K Preschool:** 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 4, 15.4, 22, 84.6, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 3.8, 9, 34.6, 16, 61.5, 10.6*
- **Public Pre-K Preschool:** 2, 3.4, 0, 0, 2, 3.4, 5, 8.6, 49, 84.5, 0, 0, 0, 0, 4, 6.9, 21, 36.2, 33, 56.9, 12.1*

### Goal 3: Print Awareness

**Item 8:** Provides experiences for children to understand that print carries a message

- **Head Start:** 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 2.6, 6, 15.4, 32, 82.1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 3, 7.7, 16, 41.0, 20, 51.3, 14.1*
- **Child Care Center:** 1, 1.3, 2, 2.5, 4, 5.1, 17, 21.5, 55, 69.6, 0, 0, 2, 2.5, 8, 10.1, 31, 39.2, 38, 48.1, 63.6*
- **Private Pre-K Preschool:** 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 3.8, 2, 7.7, 23, 88.5, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 3.8, 11, 42.3, 14, 53.8, 28.8*
- **Public Pre-K Preschool:** 2, 3.6, 2, 3.6, 2, 3.6, 9, 16.1, 41, 73.2, 0, 0, 2, 3.6, 5, 8.9, 31, 55.4, 18, 32.1, 67.1*

**Item 9:** Provides experiences for children to develop grapheme awareness

- **Head Start:** 0, 0, 0, 0, 6, 15.4, 15, 38.5, 18, 46.2, 0, 0, 0, 0, 3, 7.7, 13, 33.3, 15, 38.5, 8, 20.5, 20.2*
- **Child Care Center:** 4, 5.3, 2, 2.7, 10, 13.3, 32, 42.7, 27, 36.0, 3, 4.0, 7, 9.3, 15, 20.0, 33, 44.0, 17, 22.7, 113.2*
- **Private Pre-K Preschool:** 0, 0, 0, 0, 5, 19.2, 7, 26.9, 14, 53.8, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 3.8, 6, 23.1, 15, 57.7, 4, 15.4, 20.4*
- **Public Pre-K Preschool:** 2, 3.6, 2, 3.6, 3, 5.4, 22, 39.3, 27, 48.2, 0, 0, 4, 7.1, 9, 16.1, 30, 53.6, 13, 23.2, 60.7*
### Goal 3: Print Awareness

**Item 10:** Provides opportunities for children to develop book familiarity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>FI</th>
<th>HI</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>X²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head Start</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Pre-K Preschool</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Pre-K Preschool</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal 4: Story Structure**

**Item 11:** Provides experiences for children to become increasingly familiar with narrative story forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>FI</th>
<th>HI</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>X²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head Start</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Pre-K Preschool</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Pre-K Preschool</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Item 12:** Provides opportunities for children to identify story elements of setting, plot, characters and events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>FI</th>
<th>HI</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>X²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head Start</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Center</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Pre-K Preschool</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Pre-K Preschool</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** * indicates statistical significance.
Goal 5: Beginning Writing Skills and Knowledge

Item 13: Provides opportunities for children to understand that writing has a purpose

- Head Start
  - NI: 0
  - SI: 0
  - MI: 0
  - FI: 4
  - HI: 10.0
  - N: 1
  - %: 5
  - N: 0
  - %: 12.5
  - N: 3
  - %: 77.5

- Child Care Center
  - NI: 3
  - SI: 3.8
  - MI: 2
  - FI: 5
  - HI: 6.3
  - N: 1
  - %: 11
  - N: 13.0
  - N: 58
  - %: 73.4

- Private Pre-K Preschool
  - NI: 0
  - SI: 0
  - MI: 0
  - FI: 1
  - HI: 3.8
  - N: 4
  - %: 4
  - N: 15.4
  - N: 21
  - %: 80.8

- Public Pre-K Preschool
  - NI: 2
  - SI: 3.5
  - MI: 0
  - FI: 6
  - HI: 10.5
  - N: 15
  - %: 26.3
  - N: 34
  - %: 59.6

*Indicates significance at the .05 level

Importance: NI = Not Important; SI = Slightly Important; MI = Moderately Important; FI = Fairly Important; HI = Highly Important
Implementation: N = Never; S = Seldom; O = Occasionally; F = Frequently; A = Always
Differences of Importance and Implementation of National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy and Number of Four-Year Olds in the Program

Goal 1: Listening

Survey items one, two, three, four and seven were derived from the objectives for Goal 1: Listening. The percentage of respondents with 1 – 20 four year olds in the program reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 48.5% (n=50) for item one (discriminate between sounds) to 73.8% (n=76) for item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment). The percentage of respondents with 1 - 20 four year olds in the program reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 20.4% (n=21) for item two (listen attentively) to 33.0% (n=34) for item seven (develop phonemic awareness). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 80.5% (n=83) on item one (discriminate between sounds) to 98.1% (n=101) on item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) for the directors with 1 - 20 four year olds in the program.

The percentage of respondents with 1 - 20 four year olds in the program reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 28.2% (n=29) for item one (discriminate between sounds) to 53.4% (n=55) for item two (listen attentively). The percentage of respondents with 1 – 20 four year olds in the program reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 39.8% (n=41) for item four (identify letter-sound relationship) to 49.5% (n=51) for item one (discriminate between sounds). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 73.7% (n=76) on item seven (develop phonemic
awareness) to 95.1% (n=98) on item two (listen attentively) for the directors with 1 – 20 four year olds in the program.

The chi-square values for those with 1 - 20 four year olds in the program ranged from $X^2 = 45.8$ for item two (listen attentively) to $X^2 = 118.7$ for item four (identify letter-sound relationship). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 12).

The percentage of respondents with 21 - 60 four year olds in the program reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 60.0% (n=27) for item four (identify letter-sound relationship) to 86.7% (n=39) for item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment). The percentage of respondents with 21 - 60 four year olds in the program reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 6.7% (n=3) for item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) to 29.5% (n=13) for item one (discriminate between sounds). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 86.7% (n=50) on item four (identify letter-sound relationship) to 95.6% (n=43) on item two (listen attentively) for the directors with 21 - 60 four year olds in the program.

The percentage of respondents with 21 - 60 four year olds in the program reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 31.8% (n=14) for item one (discriminate between sounds) to 60.0% (n=27) for item two (listen attentively). The percentage of respondents with 21 - 60 four year olds in the program reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 37.8% (n=17) for item two (listen attentively) to 61.4% (n=27) for item one (discriminate between sounds). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 77.8% (n=35) on item four (identify letter-sound relationship) to 97.8%
(n=44) on both item two (listen attentively) and item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) for the directors with 21 - 60 four year olds in the program.

The chi-square values for those with 21 - 60 four year olds in the program ranged from $X^2 = 17.3$ for item one (discriminate between sounds) to $X^2 = 80.5$ for item four (identify letter-sound relationship). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 12).

The percentage of respondents with 61 or more four year olds in the program reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 65.5% (n=36) for item four (identify letter-sound relationship) to 83.6% (n=46) for item seven (develop phonemic awareness). The percentage of respondents with 61 or more four year olds in the program reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 10.9% (n=6) for item one (discriminate between sounds) to 22.2% (n=12) for item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 80.9% (n=37) on item two (listen attentively) to 98.1% (n=53) on item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) and 98.1% (n=54) on item seven (develop phonemic awareness) for the directors with 61 or more four year olds in the program.

The percentage of respondents with 61 or more four year olds in the program reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 30.9% (n=17) on item one (discriminate between sounds) to 60.0% (n=33) on item two (listen attentively). The percentage of respondents with 61 or more four year olds in the program reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 32.7% (n=18) on item two (listen attentively) to 58.2% (n=32) on item four (identify letter-sound relationship). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage
responses ranged from 87.3% (n=48) on item one (discriminate between sounds) to 92.7% (n=51) on item two (listen attentively) for the directors with 60 or more four year olds in the program.

The chi-square values for those with 61 or more four year olds in the program ranged from $X^2 = 8.4$ for item seven (develop phonemic awareness) to $X^2 = 36.3$ for item one (discriminate between sounds). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 12).

**Goal 2: Complex Speech**

Survey items five and six were derived from the objectives for Goal 2: Complex Speech. The percentage of respondents with 1 – 20 four year olds in the program reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 87.4% (n=90) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 88.3% (n=91) for item six (conversation skills). The percentage of respondents with 1 - 20 four year olds in the program reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 9.7% (n=10) for item six (conversation skills) to 10.7 (n=11) for item five (vocabulary growth). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 98.0% (n=101) on item six (conversation skills) to 98.1% (n=101) on item five (vocabulary growth) for the directors with 1 - 20 four year olds in the program.

The percentage of respondents with 1 - 20 four year olds in the program reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 57.3% (n=59) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 70.9% (n=55) for item six (conversation skills). The percentage of respondents with 1 – 20 four year olds in the program reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 26.2% (n=27) for item six (conversation skills) to 37.9%
(n=39) for item five (vocabulary growth). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 95.2% (n=98) on item five (vocabulary growth) to 97.1% (n=100) on item six (conversation skills) for the directors with 1 – 20 four year olds in the program.

The chi-square values for those with 1 - 20 four year olds in the program ranged from \(X^2 = 28.5 \) for item six (conversation skills) to \(X^2 = 34.9 \) for item five (vocabulary growth). All chi-square values were significant at \(p < .05 \) (see Table 12).

The percentage of respondents with 21 - 60 four year olds in the program reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 86.7% (n=39) for item six (conversation skills) to 88.9% (n=40) for item five (vocabulary growth). The percentage of respondents with 21 - 60 four year olds in the program reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 8.9% (n=4) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 11.1% (n=5) for item six (conversation skills). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses were 97.8% (n=44) on both item five (vocabulary growth) and on item six (conversation skills) for the directors with 21 - 60 four year olds in the program.

The percentage of respondents with 21 - 60 four year olds in the program reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 71.1% (n=32) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 77.8% (n=35) for item six (conversation skills). The percentage of respondents with 21 - 60 four year olds in the program reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 22.2% (n=10) for item six (conversation skills) to 26.7% (n=12) for item five (vocabulary growth). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 97.8%
(n=44) on item five (vocabulary growth) to 100% (n=45) on item six (conversation skills) for the directors with 21 - 60 four year olds in the program.

The chi-square values for those with 21 - 60 four year olds in the program ranged from $X^2 = 4.8$ for item six (conversation skills) to $X^2 = 20.4$ for item five (vocabulary growth). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 12).

The percentage of respondents with 61 or more four year olds in the program reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 83.6% (n=46) for item six (conversation skills) to 90.9% (n=50) for item five (vocabulary growth). The percentage of respondents with 61 or more four year olds in the program reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 7.3% (n=4) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 12.7% (n=7) for item six (conversation skills). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 96.3% (n=53) on item six (conversation skills) to 98.2% (n=54) on item five (vocabulary growth) for the directors with 61 or more four year olds in the program.

The percentage of respondents with 61 or more four year olds in the program reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 58.2% (n=32) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 60.0% (n=33) for item six (conversation skills). The percentage of respondents with 61 or more four year olds in the program reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 34.5% (n=19) for item six (conversation skills) to 38.2% (n=21) for item five (vocabulary growth). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 94.5% (n=52) on item six (conversation skills) to 96.4% (n=53) on item five (vocabulary growth) for the directors with 61 or more four year olds in the program.
The chi-square values for those with 61 or more four year olds in the program ranged from $X^2 = 7.6$ for item five (vocabulary growth) to $X^2 = 33.0$ for item six (conversation skills). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 12).

**Goal 3: Print Awareness**

Survey items eight, nine, and ten were derived from the objectives for Goal 3: Print Awareness. The percentage of respondents with 1 – 20 four year olds in the program reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 36.7% (n=36) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 80.8% (n=80) for item ten (book familiarity). The percentage of respondents with 1 - 20 four year olds in the program reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 16.2% (n=16) for item ten (book familiarity) to 40.8% (n=40) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 77.5% (n=96) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 97.0% (n=96) on item ten (book familiarity) for the directors with 1 - 20 four year olds in the program.

The percentage of respondents with 1 - 20 four year olds in the program reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 41.0% (n=41) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 69.7% (n=69) for item ten (book familiarity). The percentage of respondents with 1 – 20 four year olds in the program reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 27.3% (n=27) for item ten (book familiarity) to 43.9% (n=43) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 63.3% (n=62) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 97.0% (n=69) on item ten (book familiarity) for the directors with 1 – 20 four year olds in the program.
The chi-square values for those with 1 - 20 four year olds in the program ranged from $X^2 = 41.8$ for item ten (book familiarity) to $X^2 = 145.5$ for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 12).

The percentage of respondents with 21 - 60 four year olds in the program reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 45.0% (n=59) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 86.7% (n=39) for item ten (book familiarity). The percentage of respondents with 21 - 60 four year olds in the program reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 11.1% (n=5) for item ten (book familiarity) to 40.5% (n=17) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 85.0% (n=26) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 97.8% (n=44) on item ten (book familiarity) for the directors with 21 - 60 four year olds in the program.

The percentage of respondents with 21 - 60 four year olds in the program reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 23.8% (n=10) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 77.8% (n=35) for item ten (book familiarity). The percentage of respondents with 21 - 60 four year olds in the program reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 22.2% (n=10) for item ten (book familiarity) to 50.0% (n=21) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 73.8% (n=31) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 100% (n=45) on item ten (book familiarity) for the directors with 21 - 60 four year olds in the program.
The chi-square values for those with 21 - 60 four year olds in the program ranged from $X^2 = 8.7$ for item ten (book familiarity) to $X^2 = 41.6$ for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 12).

The percentage of respondents with 61 or more four year olds in the program reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 54.5% (n=30) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 87.3% (n=48) for item ten (book familiarity). The percentage of respondents with 61 or more four year olds in the program reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 9.1% (n=5) for item ten (book familiarity) to 34.5% (n=19) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 89.0% (n=49) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 96.4% (n=53) on item ten (book familiarity) for the directors with 61 or more four year olds in the program.

The percentage of respondents with 61 or more four year olds in the program reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 23.6% (n=13) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 67.3% (n=37) for item ten (book familiarity). The percentage of respondents with 61 or more four year olds in the program reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 29.1% (n=16) for item ten (book familiarity) to 52.7% (n=29) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 76.3% (n=42) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 96.4% (n=53) on item ten (book familiarity) for the directors with 61 or more four year olds in the program.
The chi-square values for those with 61 or more four year olds in the program ranged from $X^2 = 8.7$ for item eight (understand print carries a message) to $X^2 = 34.3$ for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 12).

**Goal 4: Story Structure**

Survey items eleven and twelve were derived from the objectives for Goal 4: Story Structure. The percentage of respondents with 1 – 20 four year olds in the program reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 37.6% (n=38) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 44.6% (n=45) for item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents with 1 - 20 four year olds in the program reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 36.6% (n=37) for item eleven (narrative story forms) to 37.6% (n=38) for item twelve (identify story elements). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 75.2% (n=76) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 81.2% (n=82) on item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors with 1 - 20 four year olds in the program.

The percentage of respondents with 1 - 20 four year olds in the program reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 20.8% (n=21) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 28.7% (n=29) for item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents with 1 – 20 four year olds in the program reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 37.6% (n=38) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 41.6% (n=42) for item eleven (narrative story forms). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 58.4% (n=59) on item twelve (identify story elements)
to 70.3% (n=71) on item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors with 1–20 four year olds in the program.

The chi-square values for those with 1-20 four year olds in the program ranged from $X^2 = 57.9$ for item eleven (narrative story forms) to $X^2 = 115.3$ for item twelve (identify story elements). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 12).

The percentage of respondents with 21-60 four year olds in the program reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 42.2% (n=19) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 48.9% (n=19) for item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents with 21-60 four year olds in the program reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 26.7% (n=12) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 31.1% (n=14) for item eleven (narrative story forms). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 68.9% (n=31) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 80.0 (n=36) on item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors with 21-60 four year olds in the program.

The percentage of respondents with 21-60 four year olds in the program reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 17.8% (n=8) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 33.3 (n=15) for item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents with 21-60 four year olds in the program reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 42.2% (n=19) for item eleven (narrative story forms) to 44.4% (n=20) for item twelve (identify story elements). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 62.2% (n=28) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 75.5%
(n=34) on item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors with 21 - 60 four year olds in the program.

The chi-square values for those with 21 - 60 four year olds in the program ranged from $X^2 = 30.8$ for item eleven (narrative story forms) to $X^2 = 40.5$ for item twelve (identify story elements). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 12).

The percentage of respondents with 61 or more four year olds reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 47.3% (n=26) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 65.5% (n=36) for item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents with 61 or more four year olds reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 25.5% (n=14) for item eleven (narrative story forms) to 27.3% (n=15) for item twelve (identify story elements). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 74.6% (n=41) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 91.0% (n=50) on item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors with 61 or more four year olds in the program.

The percentage of respondents with 61 or more four year olds reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 20.0% (n=11) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 41.8% (n=23) for item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents with 61 or more four year olds reporting “Frequently” implemented ranged from 43.6% (n=24) for item eleven (narrative story forms) to 47.3% (n=26) for item twelve (identify story elements). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 67.3% (n=37) on item twelve (identify story elements)
to 85.4% (n=47) on item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors with 61 or more four year olds in the program.

The chi-square values for those with 61 or more four year olds in the program ranged from $X^2 = 26.8$ for item twelve (identify story elements) to $X^2 = 39.3$ for item eleven (narrative story forms). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 12).

**Goal 5: Beginning Writing Skills and Knowledge**

Survey item thirteen was derived from the objectives for Goal 5: Beginning Writing Skills and Knowledge. The percentage of respondents with 1 – 20 four year olds in the program reporting “Highly Important” was 69.3% (n=70) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of respondents with 1 – 20 four year olds in the program reporting the item as “Fairly Important” was 18.8% (n=19) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage response was 88.1% (n=89) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors with 1 – 20 four year olds in the program.

The percentage of directors with 1 – 20 four year olds in the program reporting “Always” for level of implementation was 44.6% (n=45) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of respondents with 1 – 20 four year olds in the program reporting “Frequently” for level of implementation was 36.6% (n=37) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage response was 81.2% (n=82) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors with 1 – 20 four year olds in the program.
olds in the program. The chi-square value of $X^2 = 56.1$ for directors with 1 – 20 four year olds in the program was significant at $p < .05$ (See Table 12).

The percentage of respondents with 21 - 60 four year olds in the program reporting “Highly Important” was 68.9% ($n=31$) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of respondents with 21 - 60 four year olds in the program reporting the item as “Fairly Important” was 20.0% ($n=9$) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage response was 88.9% ($n=40$) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors with 21 - 60 four year olds in the program.

The percentage of directors with 21 - 60 four year olds in the program reporting “Always” for level of implementation was 44.4% ($n=20$) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of respondents with 21 - 60 four year olds in the program reporting “Frequently” for level of implementation was 40.0% ($n=18$) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage response was 84.4% ($n=38$) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors with 21 - 60 four year olds in the program. The chi-square value of $X^2 = 20.2$ for directors with 21 - 60 four year olds in the program was significant at $p < .05$ (See Table 12).

The percentage of respondents with 61 or more four year olds in the program reporting “Highly Important” was 76.4% ($n=42$) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of respondents with 61 or more four year olds in the program reporting the item as “Fairly Important” was 12.7% ($n=7$) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses
are combined, the percentage response was 89.1% (n=49) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors with 61 or more four year olds in the program.

The percentage of directors with 61 or more four year olds in the program reporting “Always” for level of implementation was 41.8% (n=23) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of respondents with 61 or more four year olds in the program reporting “Frequently” for level of implementation was 40.0% (n=12) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage response was 81.8% (n=35) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors with 61 or more four year olds in the program. The chi-square value of $X^2 = 6.8$ for directors with 61 or more four year olds in the program was significant at $p < .05$ (See Table 12).
Table 12

Number of Four-Year Olds Enrolled in the Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPORTANCE</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goal 1: Listening
Item 1: Provides opportunities for children to discriminate between sounds in their environment
- 1-20 four year olds: 1.0, 18.4, 32.0, 50, 48.5, 3, 2.9, 20, 19.4, 51, 49.5, 29, 28.2, 55.1*
- 21-60 four year olds: 2.3, 4.5, 13, 29.5, 28, 63.6, 3, 6.8, 27, 61.4, 14, 31.8, 17.3*
- 61 or more four year olds: 1.8, 10.9, 6, 10.9, 42, 76.4, 0, 0, 0, 7, 12.7, 31, 56.4, 17, 30.9, 36.3*

Item 2: Provides opportunities for children to listen attentively
- 1-20 four year olds: 1.0, 6.8, 21, 20.4, 74, 71.8, 0, 0, 0, 5, 4.9, 43, 41.7, 55, 53.4, 45.8*
- 21-60 four year olds: 2.2, 2.2, 7, 15.6, 36, 80.0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 2.2, 17, 37.8, 27, 60.0, 55.1*
- 61 or more four year olds: 1.8, 5.5, 7, 12.7, 30, 68.2, 0, 0, 0, 4, 7.3, 18, 32.7, 33, 60.0, 22.0*

Item 3: Provides opportunities for children to listen for pleasure and enjoyment
- 1-20 four year olds: 1.0, 1.0, 25, 24.3, 76, 73.8, 0, 0, 2, 1.9, 4, 3.9, 49, 47.6, 48, 46.6, 71.6*
- 21-60 four year olds: 2.2, 4.4, 3, 6.7, 39, 86.7, 0, 0, 1, 2.2, 18, 40.0, 26, 57.8, 29.6*
- 61 or more four year olds: 1.9, 0, 0, 0, 12, 22.2, 41, 75.9, 0, 0, 4, 7.4, 23, 42.6, 27, 50.0, 16.0*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPORTANCE</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>olds</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1: Listening Continued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4: Provides experiences for children to identify letter-sound relationship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1-20 four year olds</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 21-60 four year olds</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 61 or more four year olds</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7: Provides experiences for children to develop phonemic awareness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1-20 four year olds</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 21-60 four year olds</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 61 or more four year olds</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2: Complex Speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5: Provides opportunities for children to experience a steady vocabulary growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1-20 four year olds</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 21-60 four year olds</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 61 or more four year olds</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## IMPORTANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>FI</th>
<th>HI</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>X²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Goal 2: Complex Speech

#### Item 6: Provides experiences for children to increase their conversation skills

- **1-20 four year olds**
  - 1.0
  - 9.7
  - 91.8
  - 0
  - 0
  - 9.7
  - 88.3
  - 3
  - 2.9
  - 27.3
  - 26.2
  - 73
  - 70.9
  - 28.5*

- **21-60 four year olds**
  - 2.2
  - 5
  - 11.1
  - 39
  - 67
  - 0
  - 0
  - 0
  - 0
  - 0
  - 10
  - 22.2
  - 35
  - 77.8
  - 4.8*

- **61 or more four year olds**
  - 1.8
  - 1.8
  - 12.7
  - 46
  - 83.6
  - 0
  - 0
  - 0
  - 0
  - 3
  - 5.5
  - 19
  - 34.5
  - 33
  - 60.0
  - 33.0*

### Goal 3: Print Awareness

#### Item 8: Provides experiences for children to understand that print carries a message

- **1-20 four year olds**
  - 1.0
  - 4.0
  - 4.0
  - 4.0
  - 19
  - 72
  - 72.0
  - 0
  - 4
  - 4.0
  - 9
  - 9.0
  - 46
  - 46.0
  - 41
  - 41.0
  - 91.2*

- **21-60 four year olds**
  - 2.2
  - 2.2
  - 2.2
  - 2.2
  - 8
  - 17.8
  - 34
  - 75.6
  - 0
  - 0
  - 0
  - 3
  - 6.7
  - 17
  - 37.8
  - 25
  - 55.6
  - 15.8*

- **61 or more four year olds**
  - 1.9
  - 2.7
  - 3.7
  - 7
  - 13.0
  - 44
  - 81.5
  - 0
  - 0
  - 0
  - 5
  - 9.3
  - 26
  - 48.1
  - 23
  - 42.6
  - 8.7*

#### Item 9: Provides experiences for children to develop grapheme awareness

- **1-20 four year olds**
  - 3
  - 3.1
  - 3.1
  - 16
  - 16.3
  - 40
  - 40.8
  - 36
  - 36.7
  - 2
  - 2.0
  - 9
  - 9.2
  - 25
  - 25.5
  - 43
  - 43.9
  - 19
  - 19.4
  - 145.5*

- **21-60 four year olds**
  - 2.4
  - 2.4
  - 2.4
  - 3.7
  - 7.1
  - 17
  - 40.5
  - 45.0
  - 0
  - 0
  - 2
  - 4.8
  - 9
  - 21.4
  - 21
  - 50.0
  - 10
  - 23.8
  - 41.6*

- **61 or more four year olds**
  - 1.8
  - 0
  - 0
  - 5
  - 19
  - 34.5
  - 30
  - 54.5
  - 0
  - 0
  - 4
  - 7.3
  - 9
  - 16.4
  - 29
  - 52.7
  - 13
  - 23.6
  - 34.3*
Goal 3: Print Awareness
Continued
Item 10: Provides opportunities for children to develop book familiarity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>FI</th>
<th>HI</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>X²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-20 four year olds</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-60 four year olds</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 or more four year olds</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goal 4: Story Structure

Item 11: Provides experiences for children to become increasingly familiar with narrative story forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>FI</th>
<th>HI</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>X²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-20 four year olds</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-60 four year olds</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 or more four year olds</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 12: Provides opportunities for children to identify story elements of setting, plot, characters and events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>FI</th>
<th>HI</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>X²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-20 four year olds</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-60 four year olds</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 or more four year olds</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goal 5: Beginning Writing Skills and Knowledge

Item 13: Provides opportunities for children to understand that writing has a purpose

- 1-20 four year olds
  - NI: 3 (3.0%), SI: 1 (1.0%), MI: 8 (7.9%), FI: 19 (18.8%), HI: 70 (69.3%)
  - N: 2 (2.0%), S: 5 (5.0%), O: 12 (11.9%), F: 37 (36.6%), A: 45 (44.6%)  
  - X²: 56.1*

- 21-60 four year olds
  - NI: 1 (2.2%), SI: 1 (2.2%), MI: 3 (6.7%), FI: 9 (20.0%), HI: 31 (68.9%)
  - N: 0 (0%), S: 0 (0%), O: 7 (15.6%), F: 18 (40.0%), A: 20 (44.4%)  
  - X²: 20.2*

- 61 or more four year olds
  - NI: 1 (1.8%), SI: 0 (0%), MI: 5 (9.1%), FI: 7 (12.7%), HI: 42 (76.4%)  
  - N: 0 (0%), S: 0 (0%), O: 10 (18.2%), F: 22 (40.0%), A: 23 (41.8%)  
  - X²: 6.8*

*Indicates significance at the .05 level

Importance: NI = Not Important; SI = Slightly Important; MI = Moderately Important; FI = Fairly Important; HI = Highly Important

Implementation: N = Never; S = Seldom; O = Occasionally; F = Frequently; A = Always
Differences of Importance and Implementation of National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy and Program Size – Number of Children Enrolled in the Program

The sixth demographic question asked respondents to indicate the total number of all students enrolled in their early childhood program based on the State of West Virginia Board of Education classification types for early childhood centers. Program Type I description is 30 or less students. Program Type II description is 31 to 60 students. Program Type III description is 61 or more students.

Goal 1: Listening

Survey items one, two, three, four and seven were derived from the objectives for Goal 1: Listening. The percentage of respondents with Type I – 30 or less students in the program reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 50.9% (n=29) for item one (discriminate between sounds) to 80.7% (n=46) for item two (listen attentively). The percentage of respondents with Type I – 30 or less students in the program reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 14.0% (n=8) for item two (listen attentively) to 31.6% (n=18) for item one (discriminate between sounds). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 82.4% (n=47) on item four (identify letter-sound relationship)) to 98.2% (n=56) on item two (listen attentively) for the directors with Type I – 30 or less students in the program.

The percentage of respondents with Type I – 30 or less students in the program reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 28.1% (n=16) for both item one (discriminate between sounds) and item seven (develop phonemic awareness) to 57.9% (n=33) for item two (listen attentively). The percentage of respondents with Type
I – 30 or less students in the program reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 36.9% (n=21) for item two (listen attentively) to 50.9% (n=29) for item one (discriminate between sounds). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 66.7% (n=38) on item seven (develop phonemic awareness) to 95.9% (n=50) on item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) for the directors with Type I – 30 or less students in the program.

The chi-square values for directors with Type I – 30 or less students in the program ranged from $X^2 = 17.3$ for item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) to $X^2 = 36.9$ for item one (discriminate between sounds). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 13).

The percentage of respondents with Type II - 31 - 60 students in the program reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 60.9% (n=28) for item one (discriminate between sounds) to 78.7% (n=37) for item four (identify letter-sound relationship). The percentage of respondents with Type II - 31 - 60 students in the program reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 14.9% (n=7) for item four (identify letter-sound relationship) to 28.3% (n=13) for item one (discriminate between sounds). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 89.2% (n=41) on item one (discriminate between sounds) to 97.9% (n=46) on item two (listen attentively) for the directors with Type II - 31 - 60 students in the program.

The percentage of respondents with Type II - 31 - 60 students in the program reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 30.4% (n=14) for item one
(discriminate between sounds) to 61.7% (n=29) for item two (listen attentively). The percentage of respondents with Type II - 31 - 60 students in the program reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 36.2% (n=17) for item two (listen attentively) to 54.3% (n=25) for item one (discriminate between sounds). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 84.7% (n=39) on item one (discriminate between sounds) to 97.9% (n=46) on item two (listen attentively) for the directors with Type II - 31 - 60 students in the program.

The chi-square values for directors with Type II - 31 - 60 students in the program ranged from $X^2 = 27.5$ for item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) to $X^2 = 62.7$ for item two (listen attentively). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 13).

The percentage of respondents with Type III - 61 or more students in the program reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 57.0% (n=57) for item four (identify letter-sound relationship) to 79.8% (n=79) for item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment). The percentage of respondents with Type III - 61 or more students in the program reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 17.0% (n=17) for item two (listen attentively) to 27.0% (n=27) for both item four (identify letter-sound relationship) and item seven (develop phonemic awareness). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 84.0% (n=84) on item four (identify letter-sound relationship) to 98.0% (n=97) on item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) for the directors with Type III - 61 or more students in the program.
The percentage of respondents with Type III - 61 or more students in the program reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 30.4% (n=14) on item one (discriminate between sounds) to 54.0% (n=54) on item two (listen attentively). The percentage of respondents with Type III - 61 or more students in the program reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 40.0% (n=40) on item two (listen attentively) to 46.0% (n=46) on item four (identify letter-sound relationship). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 83.0% (n=83) on item four (identify letter-sound relationship) to 94.0% (n=94) on item two (listen attentively) for the directors with Type III - 61 or more students in the program.

The chi-square values for directors with Type III - 61 or more students in the program ranged from \(X^2 = 26.0\) for item three (listen for pleasure and enjoyment) to \(X^2 = 87.0\) for item four (identify letter-sound relationship). All chi-square values were significant at \(p < .05\) (see Table 13).

**Goal 2: Complex Speech**

Survey items five and six were derived from the objectives for Goal 2: Complex Speech. The percentage of respondents with Type I – 30 or less students in the program reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 84.2% (n=48) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 89.5% (n=51) for item six (conversation skills). The percentage of respondents with Type I – 30 or less students in the program reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 8.8% (n=5) for item six (conversation skills) to 12.3% (n=7) for item five (vocabulary growth). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 96.5% (n=55)
on item five (vocabulary growth) to 98.3% (n=56) on item six (conversation skills) for the directors with Type I – 30 or less students in the program.

The percentage of respondents with Type I – 30 or less students in the program reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 52.8% (n=30) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 73.7% (n=42) for item six (conversation skills). The percentage of respondents with Type I – 30 or less students in the program reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 24.6% (n=14) for item six (conversation skills) to 38.6% (n=22) for item five (vocabulary growth). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 91.4% (n=52) on item six (conversation skills) to 98.3% (n=56) on item five (vocabulary growth) for the directors with Type I – 30 or less students in the program.

The chi-square values for directors with Type I – 30 or less students in the program ranged from $X^2 = 9.3$ for item six (conversation skills) to $X^2 = 21.9$ for item five (vocabulary growth). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 13).

The percentage of respondents with Type II - 31 - 60 students in the program reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 89.4% (n=42) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 87.2% (n=41) for item six (conversation skills). The percentage of respondents with Type II - 31 - 60 students in the program reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 10.6% (n=5) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 12.8% (n=6) for item six (conversation skills). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses were 100% (n=46) on both item five (vocabulary growth) and item six (conversation skills) for the directors with Type II - 31 - 60 students in the program.
The percentage of respondents with Type II - 31 - 60 students in the program reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 59.6% (n=28) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 68.1% (n=32) for item six (conversation skills). The percentage of respondents with Type II - 31 - 60 students in the program reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 29.8% (n=14) for item six (conversation skills) to 40.4% (n=19) for item five (vocabulary growth). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 97.9% (n=46) on item six (conversation skills) to 100% (n=47) on item five (vocabulary growth) for the directors with Type II - 31 - 60 students in the program.

The chi-square values for directors with Type II - 31 - 60 students in the program ranged from $X^2 = 3.6$ for item five (vocabulary growth) to $X^2 = 8.9$ for item six (conversation skills). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 13).

The percentage of respondents with Type III - 61 or more students in the program reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 68.0% (n=66) for item six (conversation skills) to 91.0% (n=91) for item five (vocabulary growth). The percentage of respondents with Type III - 61 or more students in the program reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 7.0% (n=7) for item five (vocabulary growth) to 11.0% (n=11) for item six (conversation skills). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 79.0% (n=84) on item six (conversation skills) to 98.0% (n=98) on item five (vocabulary growth) for the directors with Type III - 61 or more students in the program.

The percentage of respondents with Type III - 61 or more students in the program reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 66.0% (n=66) for item five
(vocabulary growth) to 68.0% (n=68) for item six (conversation skills). The percentage of respondents with Type III - 61 or more students in the program reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 28.0% (n=28) for item six (conversation skills) to 31.0% (n=98) for item five (vocabulary growth). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 96.0% (n=96) on item six (conversation skills) to 97.0% (n=97) on item five (vocabulary growth) for the directors with Type III - 61 or more students in the program.

The chi-square values for directors with Type III - 61 or more students in the program ranged from $X^2 = 17.5$ for item five (vocabulary growth) to $X^2 = 40.7$ for item six (conversation skills). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 13).

Goal 3: Print Awareness

Survey items eight, nine, and ten were derived from the objectives for Goal 3: Print Awareness. The percentage of respondents with Type I – 30 or less students in the program reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 39.6% (n=21) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 87.0% (n=47) for item ten (book familiarity). The percentage of respondents with Type I – 30 or less students in the program reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 11.1% (n=6) for item ten (book familiarity) to 39.6% (n=21) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 79.2% (n=55) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 98.1% (n=53) for item ten (book familiarity) for the directors with Type I – 30 or less students in the program.

The percentage of respondents with Type I – 30 or less students in the program reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 17.0% (n=9) for item nine
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(develop grapheme awareness) to 74.1% (n=40) for item ten (book familiarity). The percentage of respondents with Type I – 30 or less students in the program reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 24.1% (n=13) for item ten (book familiarity) to 44.4% (n=24) for item eight (understand print carries a message). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 58.5% (n=31) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 98.2% (n=53) on item ten (book familiarity) for the directors with Type I – 30 or less students in the program.

The chi-square values for directors with Type I – 30 or less students in the program ranged from $X^2 = 10.1$ for item ten (book familiarity) to $X^2 = 55.5$ for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 13).

The percentage of respondents with Type II - 31 - 60 students in the program reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 51.1% (n=23) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 78.7% (n=37) for item eight (understand print carries a message). The percentage of respondents with Type II - 31 - 60 students in the program reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 12.8% (n=8) for item eight (understand print carries a message) to 33.3% (n=15) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 84.4% (n=38) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 100% (n=46) on item ten (book familiarity) for the directors with Type II - 31 - 60 students in the program.
The percentage of respondents with Type II - 31 - 60 students in the program reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 24.4% (n=11) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 67.4% (n=31) for item ten (book familiarity). The percentage of respondents with Type II - 31 - 60 students in the program reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 30.4% (n=14) for item ten (book familiarity) to 51.1% (n=23) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 89.3% (n=42) on item eight (understand print carries a message) to 97.8% (n=45) on item ten (book familiarity) for the directors with Type II - 31 - 60 students in the program.

The chi-square values for directors with Type II - 31 - 60 students in the program ranged from $X^2 = 9.9$ for item ten (book familiarity) to $X^2 = 92.2$ for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 13).

The percentage of respondents with Type III - 61 or more students in the program reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 42.9% (n=42) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 85.0% (n=85) for item ten (book familiarity). The percentage of respondents with Type III - 61 or more students in the program reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 10.0% (n=10) for item ten (book familiarity) to 40.8% (n=40) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 83.7% (n=82) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 95.0% (n=95) on item ten (book familiarity) for the directors with Type III - 61 or more students in the program.
The percentage of respondents with Type III - 61 or more students in the program reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 22.4% (n=22) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 71.0% (n=71) for item ten (book familiarity). The percentage of respondents with Type III - 61 or more students in the program reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 26.0% (n=26) for item ten (book familiarity) to 49.0% (n=48) for item nine (develop grapheme awareness). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 71.4% (n=70) on item nine (develop grapheme awareness) to 97.0% (n=97) on item ten (book familiarity) for the directors with Type III - 61 or more students in the program.

The chi-square values for directors with Type III - 61 or more students in the program ranged from $X^2 = 61.6$ for item ten (book familiarity) to $X^2 = 133.1$ for item eight (understand print carries a message). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 13).

**Goal 4: Story Structure**

Survey items eleven and twelve were derived from the objectives for Goal 4: Story Structure. The percentage of respondents with Type I – 30 or less students in the program reporting “Highly Important” were 41.8% (n=23) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 47.3% (n=26) for item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents with Type I – 30 or less students in the program reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 34.5% (n=19) for item eleven (narrative story forms) to 36.4% (n=20) for item twelve (identify story elements). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from
78.2% (n=43) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 81.8% (n=45) on item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors with Type I – 30 or less students in the program.

The percentage of respondents with Type I – 30 or less students in the program reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 20.0% (n=11) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 23.6% (n=13) for item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents with Type I – 30 or less students in the program reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 40.0% (n=22) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 47.3% (n=26) for item eleven (narrative story forms). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 60.0% (n=33) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 70.9% (n=39) on item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors with Type I – 30 or less students in the program.

The chi-square values for directors with Type I – 30 or less students in the program ranged from $X^2 = 32.4$ for item eleven (narrative story forms) to $X^2 = 60.4$ for item twelve (identify story elements). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 13).

The percentage of respondents with Type II - 31 - 60 students in the program reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 38.3% (n=18) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 51.1% (n=24) for item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents with Type II - 31 - 60 students in the program reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 34.0% (n=16) for item eleven (narrative story forms) to 38.3% (n=13) for item twelve (identify story elements). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from
76.6% (n=36) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 85.1% (n=40) on item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors with Type II - 31 - 60 students in the program.

The percentage of respondents with Type II - 31 - 60 students in the program reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 19.1% (n=9) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 34.0% (n=16) for item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents with Type II - 31 - 60 students in the program reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 40.4% (n=19) for item eleven (narrative story forms) to 44.7% (n=21) for item twelve (identify story elements). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 89.3% (n=42) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 74.4% (n=35) on item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors with Type II - 31 - 60 students in the program.

The chi-square values for directors with Type II - 31 - 60 students in the program ranged from $X^2 = 29.5$ for item eleven (narrative story forms) to $X^2 = 44.8$ for item twelve (identify story elements). All chi-square values were significant at $p < .05$ (see Table 13).

The percentage of respondents with Type III - 61 or more students in the program reporting “Highly Important” ranged from 43.0% (n=2) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 54.0% (n=54) for item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents with Type III - 61 or more students in the program reporting the items as “Fairly Important” ranged from 27.0% (n=27) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 30.0% (n=30) for item eleven (narrative story forms). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from
70.0% (n=70) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 84.0% (n=84) on item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors with Type III - 61 or more students in the program.

The percentage of respondents with Type III - 61 or more students in the program reporting “Always” for level of implementation ranged from 21.0% (n=21) for item twelve (identify story elements) to 39.0% (n=84) for item eleven (narrative story forms). The percentage of respondents with Type III - 61 or more students in the program reporting items on “Frequently” implemented ranged from 40.0% (n=40) for item eleven (narrative story forms) to 41.0% (n=41) for item twelve (identify story elements). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage responses ranged from 62.0% (n=62) on item twelve (identify story elements) to 79.0% (n=79) on item eleven (narrative story forms) for the directors with Type III - 61 or more students in the program.

The chi-square values for directors with Type III - 61 or more students in the program ranged from \( X^2 = 69.9 \) for item eleven (narrative story forms) to \( X^2 = 73.2 \) for item twelve (identify story elements). All chi-square values were significant at \( p < .05 \) (see Table 13).

**Goal 5: Beginning Writing Skills and Knowledge**

Survey item thirteen was derived from the objectives for Goal 5: Beginning Writing Skills and Knowledge. The percentage of respondents with Type I – 30 or less students in the program reporting “Highly Important” was 67.3% (n=37) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of respondents with Type I – 30 or less students in the program reporting the item as “Fairly Important” was 23.6% (n=13).
on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Fairly Important” and
“Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage response was 90.9% (n=50)
on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors with Type I – 30 or
less students in the program.

The percentage of directors with Type I – 30 or less students in the program
reporting “Always” for level of implementation was 41.8% (n=23) on item thirteen
(understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of respondents with Type I – 30 or
less students in the program reporting “Frequently” for level of implementation was
36.4% (n=20) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the
“Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the
percentage response was 78.2% (n=43) on item thirteen (understand writing has a
purpose) for the directors with Type I – 30 or less students in the program. The chi-
square value of $X^2 = 10.7$ for directors with Type I – 30 or less students in the program
was significant at $p < .05$ (See Table 13).

The percentage of respondents with Type II - 31 - 60 students in the program
reporting “Highly Important” was 68.1% (n=32) on item thirteen (understand writing has
a purpose). The percentage of respondents with Type II - 31 - 60 students in the program
reporting the item as “Fairly Important” was 21.3% (n=10) on item thirteen (understand
writing has a purpose). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses
are combined, the percentage response was 89.4% (n=42) on item thirteen (understand
writing has a purpose) for the directors with Type II - 31 - 60 students in the program.

The percentage of directors with Type II - 31 - 60 students in the program
reporting “Always” for level of implementation was 34.0% (n=16) on item thirteen
(understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of respondents with Type II - 31 - 60 students in the program reporting “Frequently” for level of implementation was 46.8% (n=22) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage response was 80.8% (n=38) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors with Type II - 31 - 60 students in the program. The chi-square value of $X^2 = 78.7$ for directors with Type II - 31 - 60 students in the program was significant at $p < .05$ (See Table 13).

The percentage of respondents with Type III - 61 or more students in the program reporting “Highly Important” was 75.0% (n=75) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of respondents with Type III - 61 or more students in the program reporting the item as “Fairly Important” was 12.0% (n=12) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Fairly Important” and “Highly Important” responses are combined, the percentage response was 87.0% (n=87) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors with Type III - 61 or more students in the program.

The percentage of directors with Type III - 61 or more students in the program reporting “Always” for level of implementation was 50.0% (n=50) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). The percentage of respondents with Type III - 61 or more students in the program reporting “Frequently” for level of implementation was 35.0% (n=35) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose). When the “Frequently” and “Always” levels of implementation responses are combined, the percentage response was 85.0% (n=85) on item thirteen (understand writing has a purpose) for the directors with Type III - 61 or more students in the program.
The chi-square value of $X^2 = 33.9$ for directors with Type III - 61 or more students in the program was significant at $p < .05$ (See Table 13).
Table 13

Program Size – Number of Children Enrolled in the Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IMPORTANCE</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NI N %</td>
<td>SI N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1: Listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1: Provides opportunities for children to discriminate between sounds in their environment</td>
<td>Type I - 30 or less students</td>
<td>1 1.8 0 0 9 15.8 18 31.6 29 50.9 0 0 2 3.5 10 17.5 29 50.9 16 28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Type II - 31 – 60 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Type III - 61 or more students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2: Provides opportunities for children to listen attentively</td>
<td>Type I - 30 or less students</td>
<td>1 1.8 0 0 2 3.5 8 14.0 46 80.7 0 0 0 0 3 5.3 21 36.9 33 57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Type II - 31 – 60 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Type III - 61 or more students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3: Provides opportunities for children to listen for pleasure and enjoyment</td>
<td>Type I - 30 or less students</td>
<td>1 1.8 0 0 0 0 13 22.8 43 75.4 0 0 0 0 2 3.5 27 47.4 28 49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Type II - 31 – 60 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Type III - 61 or more students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Goal 1: Listening Continued

**Item 4: Provides experiences for children to identify letter-sound relationship**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>FI</th>
<th>HI</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>X^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type I - 30 or less students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type II - 31 – 60 students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type III - 61 or more students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Item 7: Provides experiences for children to develop phonemic awareness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>FI</th>
<th>HI</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>X^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type I - 30 or less students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type II - 31 – 60 students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type III - 61 or more students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Goal 2: Complex Speech

**Item 5: Provides opportunities for children to experience a steady vocabulary growth**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>FI</th>
<th>HI</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>X^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type I - 30 or less students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type II - 31 – 60 students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type III - 61 or more students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goal 2: Complex Speech
Continued

Item 6: Provides experiences for children to increase their conversation skills

| Type I - 30 or less students | 1 | 1.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8.8 | 51 | 89.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2.0 | 14 | 24.6 | 42 | 73.7 | 9.3* |
| Type II - 31 – 60 students | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 12.8 | 41 | 87.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2.1 | 14 | 29.8 | 32 | 68.1 | 8.9* |
| Type III - 61 or more students | 2 | 2.0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2.0 | 11 | 11.0 | 66 | 68.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4.0 | 28 | 28.0 | 68 | 68.0 | 40.7* |

Goal 3: Print Awareness

Item 8: Provides experiences for children to understand that print carries a message

| Type I - 30 or less students | 1 | 1.9 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3.7 | 14 | 25.9 | 37 | 68.5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.9 | 6 | 11.1 | 24 | 44.4 | 23 | 42.6 | 38.9* |
| Type II - 31 – 60 students | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2.1 | 3 | 6.4 | 6 | 12.8 | 37 | 78.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10.6 | 23 | 48.9 | 19 | 40.4 | 22.8* |
| Type III - 61 or more students | 2 | 2.0 | 3 | 3.0 | 3 | 3.0 | 14 | 14.1 | 77 | 77.8 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3.0 | 6 | 6.1 | 42 | 42.4 | 48 | 48.5 | 133.1* |

Item 9: Provides experiences for children to develop grapheme awareness

| Type I - 30 or less students | 2 | 3.8 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 17.0 | 21 | 39.6 | 21 | 39.6 | 1 | 1.9 | 4 | 7.5 | 17 | 32.1 | 22 | 41.5 | 9 | 17.0 | 55.5* |
| Type II - 31 – 60 students | 1 | 2.2 | 1 | 2.2 | 5 | 11.1 | 15 | 33.3 | 23 | 51.1 | 1 | 2.2 | 2 | 4.4 | 8 | 17.8 | 23 | 51.1 | 11 | 24.4 | 92.2* |
| Type III - 61 or more students | 3 | 3.1 | 3 | 3.1 | 10 | 10.2 | 40 | 40.8 | 42 | 42.9 | 1 | 1.0 | 9 | 9.2 | 18 | 18.4 | 48 | 49.0 | 22 | 22.4 | 116.3* |
### Goal 3: Print Awareness
Continued

**Item 10:** Provides opportunities for children to develop book familiarity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Type I - 30 or less students</th>
<th>Type II - 31 – 60 students</th>
<th>Type III - 61 or more students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>10.1*</td>
<td>9.9*</td>
<td>61.6*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Goal 4: Story Structure

**Item 11:** Provides experiences for children to become increasingly familiar with narrative story forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Type I - 30 or less students</th>
<th>Type II - 31 – 60 students</th>
<th>Type III - 61 or more students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>23.6*</td>
<td>29.5*</td>
<td>69.9*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Item 12:** Provides opportunities for children to identify story elements of setting, plot, characters and events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Type I - 30 or less students</th>
<th>Type II - 31 – 60 students</th>
<th>Type III - 61 or more students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>20.0*</td>
<td>44.8*</td>
<td>73.2*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goal 5: Beginning Writing
Skills and Knowledge

Item 13: Provides opportunities for children to understand that writing has a purpose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>FI</th>
<th>HI</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>X²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type I - 30 or less students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type II - 31 – 60 students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type III - 61 or more students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates significance at the .05 level
Importance: NI = Not Important; SI = Slightly Important; MI = Moderately Important; FI = Fairly Important; HI = Highly Important
Implementation: N = Never; S = Seldom; O = Occasionally; F = Frequently; A = Always
Summary

The purpose of this chapter is to present and analyze data gathered through the administration of a questionnaire mailed to the 440 Pre-Kindergarten program directors in the state of West Virginia. Program directors of 210 private and public pre-kindergartens participated in this study by returning copies of The Early Childhood Education Language and Literacy Survey (ECELLS). The instrument collected data about the program directors importance and perceptions of the degree of implementation of the National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy at their pre-kindergarten program and data relative to six demographic factors. A geographically representative sample from all regions of West Virginia was acquired.

Analysis of the demographic data revealed that respondents most frequently reported their education level as post-baccalaureate and their program classification as Type III- 61 or more students. The respondents’ mean years of total experience in early childhood field was 14.27 and the mean years of tenure were 7.8 at his/her current position. The respondents most frequently identified their program as early childhood childcare center and group home. The mean number of four year old enrollment in the early childhood programs was 15.

Responses from The Early Childhood Education Language and Literacy Survey (ECELLS) were used to address the two research questions, which provided the parameters of this study. Chi Square analysis of the data produced statistical significance at an alpha level of .05 or greater between actual frequencies and expected frequencies in all of the comparisons.
CHAPTER FIVE

Introduction

This chapter reviews the purpose of the study, the procedures employed, and the demographic data. Summaries of the study findings and conclusions are then presented. This chapter ends with a presentation of study conclusions discussion and recommendations for further research.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to assess the differences between the importance and level of implementation of the National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy, as perceived by directors of licensed pre-kindergarten programs for four year old children in West Virginia. The study further investigated the differences in the importance and level of implementation as perceived by program directors based on selected pre-kindergarten program and director demographics including, director’s highest level of education, director experience in the early childhood field, director tenure in their present position, program type, and program size. The following specific research questions guided the study.

1. What are the differences between the importance and the level of implementation of the National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy in four year old programs as perceived by West Virginia directors of licensed pre-kindergarten programs?

2. What are the differences, based on the director’s education level, years of experience in early childhood field, years in present position, program type, number of four year olds in the program, and program size, in the relationship
between the importance and level of implementation of the National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy in four year old programs as perceived by West Virginia directors of licensed pre-kindergarten programs?

Methodology

This study was a non-experimental quantitative study of a heterogeneous population sampling of all licensed childcare, private and public school programs serving four year olds in the state of West Virginia. The study used an “ex post facto” research design. This was a descriptive research study, which used a researcher developed survey instrument.

The population for this study was the directors of 440 licensed pre-kindergarten centers in West Virginia. The population was reduced by 45 when the State of West Virginia placed pre-kindergartens for four-year-old children in with the public school system and the West Virginia Multi-Cap Head Start Program collapsed. The result was that 45 previously identified pre-kindergarten programs were removed from the list of West Virginia’s list of 440 pre-kindergarten programs. The remaining 395 licensed pre-kindergarten programs included Head Start, childcare centers, private and public pre-kindergarten programs. All of the 395 program directors were included in the study sample.

The instrument, The Early Childhood Education Language and Literacy Survey (ECELLS), was developed from The National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy (2004). The National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy (2004) were developed by education experts under the direction of Dr. Sharon Kagan and endorsed by the NAEYC. The National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and
Literacy (2004) guidelines are research based and serve as the national standards for language and literacy for young children. These guideline statements served as the dependent variables.

The Early Childhood Education Language and Literacy Survey (ECELLS) consisted of two parts and had a framework similar to that used by Likert (1967) in his Profile of Organizational Characteristics. The first part of the survey focused on demographic information and the second part of the survey instrument focused on The National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy (2004) guidelines. Part I sought information on the following demographic variables: the highest level of director education, director experience, director tenure, program type, number of four year olds in the program, and program size. Part II sought information based on statements based on The National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy (2004) guidelines and goals. Respondents were asked to indicate their perceived level of importance and implementation for each item. The Likert rating scale for level of importance consisted of a continuum of importance from (NI) not important, (SI) slightly important, (MI) moderately important, (FI) fairly important, to (HI) highly important. For level of implementation, the Likert rating scale consisted of a continuum of implementation from (N) never, (S) seldom, (O) occasionally, (F) frequently, to (A) always.

Instrument validity was determined by administering The Early Childhood Education Language and Literacy Survey (ECELLS) to two separate panels of experienced practitioners and professionals in the early childhood field and educational research fields. The panel of early childhood professionals consisted of persons in a similar population to the one being studied. The reviewers examined specific items for
content and face validity, readability, and completeness. The final instrument reflected the experts’ comments and suggestions for readability, content and face validity, survey directions, and recording procedures.

Two mailings of the survey instrument produced a response rate of 53% (n=210) useable surveys. Data from the returned surveys were recorded into a database and analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The Chi Square analysis was used to determine if the differences in importance and implementation were statistically significant. A minimum confidence interval was established at the .05 significance level.

Demographics

Demographic data collected by The Early Childhood Education Language and Literacy Survey (ECELLS) consisted of data describing the program director and the early childhood center. The data collected on the program director was highest level of education, years of experience in the early childhood field, and years of experience in his/her present position. The data collected on the early childhood center included program type, the number of four year olds in the program, and the number of students enrolled at the early childhood center.

Twenty-four (11.6%) of the responding directors held a high school diploma, 11.6% (n=24) held an associate degree, 30.4% (n=63) held a bachelor degree, and 45.7% (n=96) held a graduate degree. Forty-two (20.2%) of the responding directors reported their number of years of experience in the early childhood field as 5 years or less. Fifty-one (24.5%) of the responding directors reported their number of years of experience in the early childhood field as 6 – 11 years and 42 (20.2%) reported 12 – 17 years. Thirty-
seven (17.8%) of the responding directors reported 18 – 23 years of experience in the early childhood field and 36 (17.3%) reported 23 years or more. The range of years of experience in the early childhood field reported was one year to forty years and the mean years of early childhood experience was 14.

One hundred eleven (53.4%) respondents reported 5 years or less as the number of years in their present position. Forty-eight (23.1%) of the responding directors reported 6 – 11 years as the number of years in their present position and 23 (11.1%) reported 12 – 17 years. Twenty-six (12.5%) responding directors reported 18 years or more in their present position. The number of years in present position reported ranged from 3 weeks to 30 years with the mean number of years in his/her current position as seven.

Eighty-three (39.9%) respondents described their program type as an early childcare center, 27.9% (n=58) described their program type as a public pre-kindergarten program, 19.2% (n=40) reported their program as Head Start, and 13.0% (n=27) described their program type as a private pre-kindergarten program. The largest percentage 51.2% (n=106) of the directors reported they administered programs that served 1-20 four year olds. Forty-six respondents (22.2%) served 21 – 60 four year olds and 26.6% (n=55) respondents served 61 or more four year olds. The largest percentage (48.6%) of the respondents directed Type III (61 or more students) programs. The smallest percentage, 23.6% (n=49) of the respondents, reported they directed Type II (31 to 60 students) programs. Fifty-eight (27.9%) respondents were directors of Type I (30 or less students) programs.
Summary of Findings

The summary of the findings for the research questions was framed according to the National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy Guidelines and Goals and the demographic variables.

Survey items one, two, three, four and seven were derived from the objectives for Goal 1: Listening. The respondents perceived Goal 1 to be “fairly important” or “highly important” and implemented it “frequently” or “always”. The difference between levels of importance and levels of implementation for Goal 1 were minimal. All relationships were significant at the 0.05 level.

Survey items five and six were derived from the objectives for Goal 2: Complex Speech. The respondents perceived Goal 2 to be “fairly important” or “highly important” and implemented them “frequently” or “always”. Difference between levels of importance and levels of implementation for Goal 2 were minimal. All relationships were significant at the 0.05 level.

Survey items eight, nine, and ten were derived from the objectives for Goal 3: Print Awareness. The respondents perceived Goal 3 to be “fairly important” or “highly important” and implemented them “frequently” or “always”. Difference between levels of importance and levels of implementation for Goal 3 were minimal. All relationships were significant at the 0.05 level.

Survey items eleven and twelve were derived from the objectives for Goal 4: Story Structure. Respondent scores for Goal 4 were lower for importance and implementation than for Goals 1, 2, 3, and 5. The differences between levels of
importance and levels of implementation were greater for Goal 4 than Goals 1, 2, 3, and 5. All relationships were significant at the 0.05 level.

Survey item thirteen was derived from the objectives for Goal 5: Beginning Writing Skills and Knowledge. The respondents perceived Goal 5 to be “fairly important” or “highly important” and implemented them “frequently” or “always”. Differences between levels of importance and levels of implementation for Goal 5 were minimal. All relationships were significant at the 0.05 level.

Generally, respondents perceived Goals 1, 2, 3, and 5 to be “fairly important” or “highly important” and implemented them “frequently” or “always”. Respondent scores for Goal 4 (story structure) were lower for importance and implementation. Goals 1, 2, 3, and 5 had little difference between levels of importance and the levels of implementation. Goal 4 had a greater difference between level of importance and level of implementation for the survey items than Goals 1, 2, 3, and 5.

Survey items 1, 4, and 7 in Goal 1, survey item 9 in Goal 3, survey items 11 and 12 in Goal 4, and survey item 13 in Goal 5, are related to providing opportunities and experiences for developing reading skills and experiences with printed materials. Importance and implementation scores were lower across all demographic factors except director education, program type, and program size. Directors with a bachelor degree reported higher levels of importance and implementation and smaller differences between importance and implementation on these survey items than did directors with a high school diploma, associate degree, or graduate degree. Head Start directors reported the highest scores for importance, the lowest scores for implementation, and the greatest differences between levels of importance and levels of implementation for these survey
items than did directors of childcare centers, private pre-kindergartens, or public pre-kindergartens.

Differences between levels of importance and implementation for program size reflected some differences in importance and implementation for individual survey items. Directors of Program Type I (30 students or fewer) centers reported the lowest scores for perceived levels of importance and implementation and the greatest differences between levels of importance and levels of implementation. Program Type II (31 - 60 students) directors reported the highest scores on levels of importance and implementation with only slight differences between levels of importance and implementation. Program Type III (61 students or more) directors reported the second highest score levels on importance and implementation and the smallest differences between levels of importance and implementation.

Directors of Type III (61 or more students) reported the highest levels of importance and implementation for survey items 1, 4, 7 (Goal 1), 9 (Goal 3), 11, 12 (Goal 4), and 13 (Goal 5) and had less differences between levels of importance and implementation.

Conclusions

The analysis of the data collected for this study provided sufficient evidence to support the following conclusions.

RQ1. What are the differences between the level of importance and the level of implementation of the National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy in four year old programs as perceived by West Virginia directors of licensed pre-kindergarten programs?
That were no difference between the level of importance and the level of implementation of the National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy in four year old programs as perceived by West Virginia directors of licensed pre-kindergarten programs. Overall, directors perceived the five goals to be important for the development of effective programs. In general, directors perceived Goals 1 (Listening), 2 (Complex Speech), 3 (Print Awareness), and 5 (Beginning Writing Skills and Knowledge) to be more fully implemented than Goal 4 (Story Structure). The difference between perceived levels of importance and perceived levels of implementation were greater for Goal 4 (Story Structure) than for Goals 1 (Listening), 2 (Complex Speech), 3 (Print Awareness), and 5 (Beginning Writing Skills and Knowledge).

RQ2: What are the differences, based on the director education, director experience, director tenure, program type, number of four year olds in the program, and program size between the importance and level of implementation of the National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy in four year old programs as perceived by West Virginia directors of licensed pre-kindergarten programs?

Education Levels

The differences between perceived level of importance and level of implementation based on the director’s highest level of education were consistently smaller for those directors holding a bachelor degree than for those holding a high school diploma, associate or a graduate degree. The directors with an associate degree as the highest level of education consistently reported the lowest perceived level of importance and level of implementation for each survey item and the largest differences between levels of importance and implementation.
Survey items 1, 4, 7 (Goal 1), 9 (Goal 3), 11, 12 (Goal 4), and 13 (Goal 5) had lower perceived levels of importance and levels of implementation by directors holding a high school diploma, associate or a graduate degree than directors with a bachelor degree. Survey items 1, 4, 7 (Goal 1), 9 (Goal 3), 11, 12 (Goal 4), and 13 (Goal 5) had a smaller difference between perceived levels of importance and implementation by directors holding a bachelor degree than directors holding a high school diploma, associate or a graduate degree.

*Years of Experience in Early Childhood Field*

The differences between perceived levels of importance and implementation based on the director years of experience in early childhood were greater for those directors with 5 years or less, 12-17 years, and 23 years or more of experience than for those directors with 6-11 years and 23 years or more experience. The directors with 5 years or less experience consistently reported the lowest levels of importance and implementation for each survey item. The directors with 23 years or more of experience in early childhood reported higher levels of implementation and lower levels of importance for each survey item.

*Number of Years in Present Position*

The differences between perceived levels of importance and implementation based on the director years in present position were greater for those directors with 5 years or less, 6-11 years and 18 years or more than for those with 12-17 years in present position. Directors with 5 years or less in present position had reported the highest importance and lowest levels of implementation for each survey item. The directors with 18 years or more years of experience in their present positions reported lower importance
and higher levels of implementation for each survey item. Directors with 6 - 11 years of experience in their present position reported the highest levels of importance and implementation for all survey items.

*Program Type*

The differences between perceived levels of importance and implementation based on program type were consistently smaller for those directors of childcare centers and public or private pre-kindergartens than for Head Start directors. The Head Start directors consistently reported the highest levels of importance and the lowest levels of implementation for each survey item, and the largest differences between levels of importance and implementation.

Survey items 1, 4, 7 (Goal 1), 9 (Goal 3), 11, 12 (Goal 4), and 13 (Goal 5) had lower perceived levels of importance and implementation by directors of all program types. Survey items 1, 4, 7 (Goal 1), 9 (Goal 3), 11, 12 (Goal 4), and 13 (Goal 5) had smaller differences between perceived levels of importance and implementation by directors of childcare centers and private or public pre-kindergarten than for directors of Head Start.

*Number of Four Years Olds Enrolled in the Program*

The differences between perceived levels of importance and implementation based on the number of four year olds in the program were smaller for programs with 61 or more four year olds than for programs with 1 - 20 four year olds and 21 -60 four year olds. Directors with 1 - 20 four year olds reported the lowest levels of importance and implementation for each survey item and the largest differences between levels of
importance and implementation. Directors with 61 or more four year olds reported the smallest differences between levels of importance and levels of implementation.

Program Size

Differences between perceived levels of importance and implementation on survey items 1, 4, 7 (Goal 1), 9 (Goal 3), 11, 12 (Goal 4), and 13 (Goal 5) based on program size were smaller for programs with 61 or more students than for programs with 30 or less students and 31 - 60 students. Directors with 30 or less students reported the lowest perceived levels of importance and implementation and the largest differences between levels of importance and implementation for survey items 1, 4, 7 (Goal 1), 9 (Goal 3), 11, 12 (Goal 4), and 13 (Goal 5).

Summary

Overall, the highest level of director education, director years of experience in the early childhood field, director years in present position, number of four year olds in the program, program type and program size had little effect on the differences between perceived levels of importance and implementation for the thirteen survey items. The data indicated that the demographic factors of highest level of director education, program type, and program size had a slight effect on the differences between perceived levels of importance and implementation for individual survey items 1, 4, and 7 (Goal 1), 9 (Goal 3), 11, 12 (Goal 4), and 13 (Goal 5).

Implications and Discussion

Since the eighties, policy makers, researchers, and educators have placed strong emphasis on ensuring successful entry into formal schooling. The passage of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB, 2001) legislation required all states to establish a standardized
plan for teaching content and shifted the responsibility and accountability for success in
school to early education in pre-kindergarten. In 2002, West Virginia adopted the *West
Virginia Pre-Kindergarten Standards: Guidelines for Teaching and Learning* document
based on the federal *National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy*
(2002) goals, defining what four year olds should know and be able to do before entering
kindergarten. Beginning July 1, 2003, all licensed West Virginia pre-kindergartens were
required to use the new standards, objectives and performance descriptors under each

This study examined West Virginia directors of licensed early childhood centers
perceived importance and levels of implementation for the newly enacted *West Virginia
Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy* (2002). The results of this study
indicate that the directors perceived the five goals, based on the *West Virginia Pre-
Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy* (2002) goals and guidelines, to be
generally important. The directors perceive Goals 1, 2, 3, and 5 to be more fully
implemented than Goal 4 (story structure). Overall, there did not appear to be a
substantial difference between the importance and the level of implementation for each of
the five goal areas.

With the exception of Goal 4, the national goals for language and literacy are
important to directors and these directors reported they are being well implemented. This
supports the findings of Cryer, Hurwitz, and Wolery (2000) who found that agreement
with a practice is associated with implementation of that practice and with Bryant,
Clifford, & Peisner’s (1989) study findings that teachers who agree with developmentally
appropriate practices are more likely to provide classrooms that are more
developmentally appropriate. The findings of this study further support the findings of Peisner-Feinberg, et al (1995, 1999) that administrators are strong determinants of quality and the findings of Marvin, Lacost, and Grady (2002) that administrators are keys to policy and practice.

Even though there did not appear to be a substantial difference between the level of importance and the level of implementation for Goal 1, 2, 3, and 5, there were some differences in levels of importance and levels of implementation for individual survey items. The individual survey items that were directly related to providing experiences for reading skills and printed material were relatively lower in importance and the lowest in terms of implementation for the demographic factors of years of experience in early childhood field, years in present position, and number of four year olds in the program. The individual survey items that were directly related to providing experiences for reading skills and printed material were not relatively lower in importance and implementation for the demographic factors of director education, program type and program size. The levels of implementation for the survey items are not consistent, but the directors are implementing the guidelines to at least minimal levels. This study’s findings suggest the directors do perceive the *West Virginia Pre-Kindergarten Standards: Guidelines for Teaching and Learning* document based on the federal *National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy* (2002) guidelines as important, but the directors may not be able to put them into place in their programs due to financial or time constraints. Directors with more experience in early childhood, more work experience, and more four year olds in their program may know the importance of these survey items but may have difficulty finding the time to provide these experiences. The
more four year olds in the program, the greater the cost and the more time needed to provide each reading skill opportunity. To provide these four year old reading skills and printed material experiences, a program would need to accommodate separate age groups, which would require more time and more training for teachers. Although the directors may understand the importance of these reading skills, programs may have little time to provide the experiences and may be less likely to implement them.

To provide these reading skills and printed material experiences require trained staff for administration and smaller programs may be less likely to afford qualified personnel for their administration. Dozier’s (2003) indicated that the directors of childcare centers reported most often that expense was a major inhibitor of quality in their program. An implication of this study is West Virginia should provide adequate funding for the administration of the National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy (2002).

The respondents perceived survey items 12 (identify story elements) and 9 (develop grapheme awareness) to be least in importance and implementation. Survey items 1 (discrimination between sounds), 11 (familiarity with narrative story forms), 7 (develop phonemic awareness), and 4 (identify letter-sound relationship) respectively were the lowest on perceived importance and level of implementation across all demographic variables but director education, program type and program size.

The purpose and goal of The National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy (2002) is for children to gain literacy learning in pre-kindergarten to prepare them to enter school “ready to learn” (NCLB, 2001). The Pre-Kindergarten Standards: Guidelines for Teaching and Learning (2002) state that language and literacy learning are
to be emphasized throughout early childhood programs by providing a literacy rich environment that includes vocabulary development (survey item 1), phonemic awareness (survey item 7), grapheme awareness (survey item 9), and interactive book reading activities (Goal 4 - survey items 11 and 12). Additionally, in the explanation of how the standards should be implemented *The Pre-Kindergarten Standards: Guidelines for Teaching and Learning* (2002) state that children should be taught the relationship between letters and sounds (survey item 7).

The literacy research that influenced the defining of goals and objectives for *The National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy* (2002), the federal document that West Virginia adopted in the *West Virginia Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy* (2002), was compiled directly from the research findings of the National Reading Panel (NRP, 1999, 2000). The National Reading Panel (NRP) research findings in *Report of the National Reading Panel (1999), Report of the National Reading Panel: Reports of the Subgroup, and Teaching Children to Read: An Evidence Based Assessment of the Scientific Research Literature on Teaching and Its Implications for Reading Instruction* (National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 2000), identified a list of reading achievement predictors that produced positive results. Several of these reading predictors for pre-kindergartners were the same survey items that received lower scores on importance and implementation, (i.e. survey items 1, 4, 7, 9, 11, and 12).

The National Reading Panel (1999) and the National Research Committee (2000) identified phonics instruction that produced significant results in reading achievement for early education to sixth grade and for children with reading difficulties. The NRP (1999)
and NRC (2000) further concluded that the ability to read was enhanced in early education that began with phonics instruction. The National Reading Panel (2000) found that the most influential variable in kindergartners’ reading achievement was early phonics instruction. This variable is included in survey items 1, 4, 7, 9, 11 and 12. Brady, et al (1994) concluded that phonological awareness (survey item 7) begins to develop around age 3 and is pivotal in learning to read.

This study’s findings of lower levels of importance and implementation for teaching of formal reading skills are contrary to the National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy (2002) goals and the research that defined the goals and objectives for the federal document that West Virginia adopted in the West Virginia Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy (2002). An implication for West Virginia is that further education and in-service training should focus on the West Virginia goal of successful entry into formal schooling (WV Department of Education, 2002). The focused in-service training should further delineate the role the West Virginia Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy (2002) document plays in identifying what “a four year old should know and be able to do before entering kindergarten” (WV Department of Education, 2002).

The goal for the West Virginia Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy (2002) is to prepare children to enter school with the necessary language, cognitive, and early reading skills to prevent reading difficulties and ensure school retention and success. The respondents’ lower scores on the literacy survey items, written notes, and telephone calls pertaining to these literacy survey items illustrated a low importance for reading skill opportunities and experiences being provided in four year
old pre-kindergarten programs. West Virginia should provide more education and training to directors to fully understand the stated purpose of the West Virginia early education pre-kindergarten program is to prepare four year olds to be “ready to learn” in kindergarten (West Virginia Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy, 2002).

Wixson and Dutro’s (1999) descriptive study revealed that documents that do not provide standards missed important content that is unique to that academic year. Schumacher, Greenberg, and Lombardi’s (2001) concluded that one effective standardized educational system is more efficient than several separate ones with regulatory, administrative and other gaps, overlaps and inconsistencies. Since the purpose and objectives of *The National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy* (2002) and the *West Virginia Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy* (2002) are to provide opportunities for teaching reading skills and experiences with printed material, this study’s findings suggest a weakness in the implementation of the *West Virginia Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy* (2002). It can be conjectured that the *West Virginia Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy* (2002) adoption will not produce the intended significant reading achievement because the directors do not understand the importance of the reading objectives and have not implemented them on a regular basis. The implication is that further education through targeted in-service training, workshops, and staff development should focus on the importance of these pre-reading skills and the part they play in reading achievement and school retention and success.
Survey items 1, 4, 7, 9, 11, and 12 included formal reading skills and had greater reported levels of importance and implementation in director education, program type, and program size demographics. The data indicated that the demographic factors of years of experience in early childhood field, years in present position, and number of four year olds in the program had an impact on importance and implementation of the survey items 1, 4, 7, 9, 11, and 12 as perceived by the respondents. There may be some confusion about the program director’s perception in the relationship between importance and levels of implementation to professional standards that are necessary to comply with the West Virginia Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy (2002). An implication for West Virginia pre-kindergarten’s governing body is the monitoring of the programs for compliance with West Virginia Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy (2002).

An unanticipated outcome of this study was the larger the program size, the higher the scores for perceived importance and implementation and smaller differences between importance and implementation for survey items related to reading skills and printed material. This study’s findings are inconsistent with the research on school and program size. Zahorik (1999) found that smaller programs had fewer discipline problems, teachers were more knowledgeable about the students, and teachers were more enthusiastic about teaching. McCluskey’s (2002) claims that decreasing school size is more advantageous than smaller classes and resulted in improved student achievement, improved student behavior, and increased student engagement. The NAEYC (2002) research has established that teachers in small programs encourage language and literacy by individually talking with children throughout the day and that caregivers in small
programs know students personally and understand the child’s individual learning cycle, generating a more developmentally appropriate environment for learning. Dozier’s (2003) research on West Virginia’s pre-kindergarten assessment practices found that Type III programs with 61 or more students participated less in developmentally appropriate assessment practices than Type I (30 students or less) or Type II (31 – 60 students) programs. In contrast, this study’s findings found that Type III programs with 61 or more students had higher levels of importance and implementation for survey items than the Type I (30 students or less). Type II (31 - 60 students) had the highest levels of importance and implementation on the survey items.

The inference from the literature is that a smaller program size would make a positive difference in importance and levels of implementation on the thirteen survey items. This study’s findings do not support that premise. The small programs reported less importance and less implementation of the survey items than the larger programs. This study’s findings indicated that programs serving 30 students or less were not implementing developmentally appropriate practices on a daily basis. An implication for this finding is the curriculum specialist should provide training to smaller programs on developmentally appropriate activities.

The conventional wisdom in childcare is that quality is determined by the directors’ highest level of education (Hayes, Palmer, & Zaslow, 1990). Findings from this study support this premise. The research supported by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (1996) found the effects of director training in early childhood education to be robust but quality of care was not related to caregivers’ age, experience, or professionalism. This is consistent with the findings of this study that
years of experience in the early childhood field and years in present position did not
appear to influence importance and implementation. The years of experience in the early
childhood field and years in present position produced only slight differences in
importance and implementation for the five goals. Director demographics of years of
experience in the early childhood field and years in present position produced slightly
lower scores for perceived importance and implementation for survey items 1, 4, 7 (Goal
1), 9 (Goal 3), 11 and 12 (Goal 4), and 13 (Goal 5).

Whitebrook, et al (1990) found that director education level influenced quality of
teaching, but only college level training was associated with effective teaching.
Whitebrook, et al (1990) predicted that even with favorable class size, an untrained
teacher with only a high school diploma would not have developmentally appropriate
beliefs nor implement developmentally appropriate practices. This study’s findings
support the work of Whitebrook, et al (1990) as the data indicted that the lower the
education level, the lower the scores were on importance and implementation, and the
greater the differences were between importance and implementation. The one exception
to this pattern was with those respondents holding a graduate degree. The directors with a
graduate degree reported lower scores for importance and greater differences between
importance and implementation than the directors with a bachelor degree. This study’s
finding supports the National Day Care Study (Blau, 2000) conclusions that teacher age,
childcare experience, and job tenure have negligible effects on quality of care, but
attending college increases quality substantially, but graduating from college and
attending graduate school provides no additional productive increases. An implication of
this study would be for West Virginia to review educational requirements for employment as a pre-kindergarten director.

The West Virginia Training and Registry System, the governing body for director and teacher certification, allows a person who is 18 years old with a high school diploma or equivalent with 0-1 year experience and possess “the ability to understand and practice the core competencies with direction and instruction or through sponsorship” to teach in pre-kindergarten (WV STARS, 2002). This person is to receive a lifetime requirement of 18 hours of staff development.

Galinsky’s (1994) research on family childcare found that providers who received additional childcare training and education produced the most nurturing and educational environment. The empirical results in the Cost, Quality, and Child Outcomes in Child Care Centers (1995) study indicated that teacher education and training have statistically significant effects, even accounting for unobserved differences across centers. This study’s results are generally supportive and consistent with research findings that teachers with more education are more likely to implement developmentally appropriate practice (Phillips & Howes, 1987; Whitebook, Howes, & Phillips, 1989; Cost, Quality and Outcomes Study Team, 1995).

Howes, Phillips, Whitebrook (1992) found that the childcare teacher, in the context of teaching, emerged as important to quality for childcare centers. Stipek & Pyler (1997) found a significant relationship between teacher beliefs of how children learn and their views on the goals of early childhood education, and their positions on policies and practices. Blau’s National Day Care Study (2000) found that attending training workshops increased director quality. An implication from this study would be more
training workshops required for persons with a high school diploma and associate degree. In West Virginia, directors are required to attend a limited number of workshops over the course of their career. Learning should be considered an ongoing process as a means to ensure that prospective directors acquire not only adequate knowledge of the developmentally appropriate practices but also instruction on how to teach developmentally appropriately.

The West Virginia Training and Registry System requirement for a person seeking an associate degree in early childhood is to attain twelve credit hours in early care and education or an associate degree and two years of relevant occupational field experience. This field experience may or may not be supervised by a knowledgeable person in the early childhood field (STARS, 2003). The person receiving an associate degree may not have enough early childhood educational experience to maintain a quality program. Another implication for this study would be stronger supervision and mentoring by well-trained directors for pre-kindergarten directors with a high school diploma or associate degree. For this implication to be implemented, programs must be adequately funded and staffed. Additionally, an implication from this study may be to raise the educational requirements for directors in licensed pre-kindergarten programs. However, as some rural areas have a director shortage, such measures would improve quality of childcare but could exacerbate the already staffing shortage.

In West Virginia, academic pre-kindergarten programs use Head Start, childcare centers, private and public schools to deliver pre-kindergarten programs. There were some differences between these program types and an unexpected pattern emerged. Head Start, the government’s flagship early childhood program, had the highest scores for
importance of all the program types on the literacy survey items, but the lowest implementation scores of all program types. The other program types had zero differences between importance and implementation on many of the survey items, but Head Start had two digit number differences between importance and implementation on survey items 1, 4, 7 (Goal 1), 9 (Goal 3), 11, 12 (Goal 4), and 13 (Goal 5).

Head Start’s highest importance and implementation score of 100 on a scale of 100 was on survey item 3 (provides opportunities for children to listen for pleasure and enjoyment) and their second highest score of 99 was on survey item 2 (provides opportunities for children to listen attentively). These two survey items are a low priority in a developmentally appropriate classroom that prides itself on child participation, movement, and exploration. This study’s findings that director highest education level did influence implementation of practices, coupled with the fact that Head Start directors are only required to have an associate degree in child development, could be a possible explanation for this outcome.

Head Start was the only program type that received government funding for director and teacher training in early literacy instructional techniques. Head Start directors and teachers assisted in the development of the pre-kindergarten literacy standards with the accountability measure of quality as defined by a student’s performance level on pre-reading skills (Hatch, 2002). In the designing of the West Virginia Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy (2002), the Head Start Child Outcomes (1999) document was used extensively and the final document used the Head Start Performance Standards (1999) language. The West Virginia Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy (2002) curriculum content standards
and objectives are aligned with the Head Start curriculum, standards, and outcomes framework. Since no other program type received government funding nor assisted in the designing of the document, and no other program type reported implementation scores on the literacy survey items as low as Head Start, an implication for this study would be a need for further investigation of the implementation of developmentally appropriate practices in Head Start programs.

In the sixties, Head Start was developed to increase literacy in early childhood for children living below the poverty level, through state funding and federal Title I programs (WV Department of Education, 2002). In 1985, White and Casto and Ramey, et. al., found Head Start had a developmentally appropriate curriculum that produced immediate effects on reading achievement. In 1994, Bryant, et. al., found the Head Start developmentally appropriate curriculum approach produced positive effects that declined over time and were negligible several years after children exited the programs. In 2001, The National Center for Early Development and Learning (2002) gave West Virginia failing grades in reading readiness. Head Start is required to meet all federal performance standards for all areas of operation including accountability of child outcomes, and at the end of 2003; West Virginia lost its Head Start grant. According to West Virginia’s Early Childhood Education Director, the loss of the Head Start grant was due to being out of compliance with federal and state regulations and alleged misappropriate of funds (WV ECE, 2004). A post hoc multiple regression analysis study to determine factors that would account for Head Start’s poor ratings may be advisable.
Recommendations for Further Research

This study provided sufficient data to conclude that West Virginia directors of licensed four year old pre-kindergarten programs feel that The National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy (2002) are important and that directors are implementing them at various levels. Based on this study's finding the following are presented as recommendations for further research.

1. The first literacy content and performance standards for four year olds were developed in 1999, but there has been little research on the academic effects. Studies of pre-kindergartener providers on how they are meeting the literacy standards, the effects of standards on instruction, the effects of standards on teaching practices, the effects of standards on curriculum, and the effects of standards on reading achievement of children are recommended.

2. Further study of the program directors lack of importance and implementation to survey items relating to formal reading skills and printed material experience is warranted.

3. This study highlighted the role of directors in the implementation of pre-kindergarten standards, but since the four year pre-kindergartens programs have moved into the public school arena, an examination of the relationship between the standards and the priority placed on these standards by the school’s district office would provide valuable insight into the role of the district office in pre-kindergarten standards.

4. Additional studies of the four year old pre-kindergarten teachers’ perception of levels of importance and implementation to the West Virginia Per-Kindergarten
Standards for Language and Literacy compared with the present study of directors would provide a more comprehensive descriptive picture of daily implementations.

5. A comparison study of West Virginia implementation of the National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy to other four year old pre-kindergarten programs in similar states would provide a current measure of progress.

6. An examination of the effect of highest level of education to philosophical orientation or other demographic factors of directors or teachers compared to their self-reported beliefs and developmentally appropriate practices should be performed as the findings of this study suggest there may be other factors that influence these patterns.

7. A longitudinal study that examined the relationship between the length of time a pre-kindergarten program has been attempting to implement the pre-kindergarten standards and the degree of implementation would provide those persons involved in the leadership of pre-kindergarten programs insight into what would be reasonable in terms of level of implementation at various stages during the change process.
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APPENDIX A

Guideline IV Goal 1

Objectives, Experiences, and Benchmarks
### Guideline IV Goal 1

### Objectives, Experiences, and Benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Experiences</th>
<th>Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children will discriminate between sounds in their environment</td>
<td>Listening to sounds in their environment</td>
<td>Identify sounds in their environment such as animal sounds, traffic noises, music, human speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creating sounds</td>
<td>Create sounds by singing and making music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singing and listening to music</td>
<td>Listen to each other with attention, and by age five, without distraction or interruption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Make judgments about what they hear, telling parts of stories they liked or that frightened them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recognize the purpose of listening, noting details by using new ideas and information in their play.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children will listen attentively</td>
<td>An environment in which free expression of ideas, feelings, and emotions is fostered and children are encouraged to talk, listen, discuss, and even argue with each other.</td>
<td>Request specific stories, poems, songs, and other music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listen to a variety of stories, poetry, songs, and chants. Arrangements for family members to read, sign, recite the same stories, poetry, songs, and chants</td>
<td>Repeat parts of stories and poems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Show pleasure and enjoyment during listening activities, smiling, laughing, and responding in appropriate ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Talk about and discuss familiar stories, poems, and chants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase their listening attention span from a moment or two to listening to an entire story, poem, or chant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children will listen for pleasure and enjoyment</td>
<td>Listening as others read and tell, and reread a variety of stories, poems, songs, and chants. Teachers who engage children in talking about repeatedly read or told stories, poems, and chants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listen to a variety of types of music including songs, chants, and instrumental music.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>Experiences</td>
<td>Benchmarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children will develop Phonemic Awareness</td>
<td>Listening to and learning a great many nursery rhymes, chants, and poems. Teachers who themselves play with language, making up chants and rhymes. Singing songs that segment words or accent beginning sounds, and with the teacher, clapping to the syllables. Listening to stories, poems, and songs that use alliteration.</td>
<td>Fill in the rhyming words in familiar poems, songs, stories, and informational books. Hear specific letter sounds (such as the beginning, middle, and end of words). Be aware of syllables by clapping these in words, songs, or poems. Be able to recite nursery rhymes, poems, or sing songs. Make up and chant their own rhymes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children will be able to identify Letter-Sound Relationships</td>
<td>Listening to alphabet books. Explicit teaching of letter names and sounds in a meaningful context. Hearing and recalling numerous rhymes, poems, chants, and alliteration.</td>
<td>Identify the letter that begins their name and its sound. Pick out other words that begin with the same letter/sound as their names. Begin to identify a few consonant letter/sound correspondences in words in familiar rhymes, poems, and chants, including those with alliteration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy

Corresponded to West Virginia Pre-Kindergarten Standards
National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy

Corresponded to West Virginia Pre-Kindergarten Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Pre-K Standard – Children will gain literacy and language learning Goals</th>
<th>West Virginia Pre-Kindergarten Standards and Content Standard Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 1: Listening</strong></td>
<td><strong>Standard 3 - Listening and Speaking</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Children will discriminate between sounds in their environment</td>
<td><strong>Understanding</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Children will listen attentively</td>
<td>Children will progress in:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Children will listen for pleasure and enjoyment</td>
<td>• Following directions with two or more steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 See below</td>
<td>• <em>Understanding increasingly complex and varied vocabulary</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Children will be able to identify letter-sound relationship</td>
<td>• Attending to and understanding conversations, stories, songs, poems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 2 - Complex Speech</strong></td>
<td>• Non-English speaking children will progress in speaking English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Children will experience steady vocabulary growth</td>
<td><strong>Communicating</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Children will increase conversation skills</td>
<td>Children will progress in:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Children will develop phonemic awareness</td>
<td>• Initiating and responding appropriately in conversation and discussion with peers and adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <em>Using increasing complex and varied vocabulary</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <em>Using sentences with more than six words to express his/her ideas, feelings, opinions, needs, questions, and for other varied purposes</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <em>Non-English speaking children will progress in speaking English</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard 1: Reading**

*Phonological Awareness*

Children will progress in:

- Recognizing and matching and rhyming sounds in spoken words
- *Discriminating and identifying beginning sounds of spoken words*
- Discriminating and identifying separate words in spoken sentences
- Discriminating and identifying separate syllables in spoken words
- Listening and identifying sounds
National Pre-K Standard – Children will gain literacy and language learning Goals

Goal 3 - Print Awareness

3.1 Children will understand that print carries a message

3.2 Children will develop grapheme awareness

3.3 Children will develop book familiarity

West Virginia Pre-Kindergarten Standards and Content Standard Objectives

Standard 1: Reading

*Concept of Print
Children will progress in:
- Using symbols to represent an object or event
- *Recognizing a word as a unit of print, or awareness that letters are grouped to form words and words are separated by spaces
- Recognizing that the spoken word can be written down and read
- Recognizing that print is used for a variety of purposes

*Visual Letter Recognition
Children will progress in:
- *Recognizing that letters of the alphabet are a special category of visual graphics that can be individually named
- *Recognizing and naming many letters such as those in his/her name, names of some family and friends and those frequently occur in environmental print

*Conventions of Reading
Children will progress in:
- Appropriately handling and caring for books
- Recognizing that books are viewed one page at a time, in sequence that a book has a title, author, and illustrator
- Recognizing that reading in English moves from top to bottom and left to right

Sight Word Recognition
Children will progress in:
- Recognizing that letters can be grouped together to form words and that words have meaning
- Reading a few words such as their name, names of some family and friends, and familiar environmental print
- Associating sounds with written letters and words
National Pre-K Standard – Children will gain literacy and language learning Goals

**Goal 4 – Story Structure**

4.1 Children will become increasingly familiar with narrative story forms

4.2 Children will be able to identify story elements of setting, plot, characters, and events

**Goal 5 – Beginning writing skills and knowledge**

5.1 Children will understand that writing has a purpose

**Standard 1: Reading**

*Appreciation of Literature*
Children will progress in:

- Listening to and discussing a variety of fiction and non-fiction books and poetry
- Showing interest in related reading, such as acting out their own stories and stories they have heard, creating a picture or object that represents something from a book, connecting information and events in a story to real life experiences

*Comprehension*
Children will progress in:

- Understanding that a story has a beginning, middle, and an end
- Understanding that there is a sequence of events in a story
- Connecting events in a story to real life experiences
- Identifying with characters in a story

**Standard 2: Writing**

*Purpose of Writing*
Children will progress in understanding that writing is a way of communicating for a variety of purposes

*Conventions of Writing*
Children will progress in:

- Using a variety of writing tools and materials, such as pencils, crayons, and computers
- Progressing from using scribbles, shapes or pictures to represent ideas to using letter-like symbols, to copying or writing letters and/or words such as their own name on unlined paper
- Using preferred hand consistently

* Used in several standard areas
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The National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy Goals

Matched With Corresponding Survey Items
# The National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy Goals

## Matched With Corresponding Survey Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Survey Question Number</th>
<th>Survey Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1 – Listening</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provides opportunities for children to discriminate between sounds in their environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provides opportunities for children to listen attentively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Provides opportunities for children to listen for pleasure and enjoyment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Provides experiences for children to identify letter-sound relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Provides experiences for children to develop phonemic awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2 – Complex Speech</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Provides opportunities for children to experience a steady vocabulary growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Provides experiences for children to increase their conversation skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3 – Print Awareness</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Provides experiences for children to understand that print carries a message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Provides experiences for children to develop grapheme awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Provides opportunities for children to develop book familiarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 4 – Story Structure</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Provides experiences for children to become increasingly familiar with narrative story forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Provides opportunities for children to identify story elements of setting, plot, characters and events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 5 – Beginning writing skills and knowledge</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Provides opportunities for children to understand that writing has a purpose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

IRB Cover Letter
July 8, 2004

Pre-Kindergarten Program Director
West Virginia

Dear Program Director,

My name is Judaea “Judy” Hodge and I am pursuing a doctoral degree in Early Childhood in the Marshall University Doctoral Program in Curriculum and Instruction. I am in the dissertation stage of my program and am writing to ask your support in this process.

The focus of my dissertation is to determine the importance and level of implementation of National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy in West Virginia’s licensed preschool programs for four year olds. The enclosed questionnaire is designed to obtain information about your perceptions as to the importance and level of implementation for these standards. Participation in this study is voluntary and there is no penalty for choosing not to participate. However, by returning this survey you are consenting to participate. Your responses will be confidential. I will provide you a summary of the survey results. This study has been approved by the West Virginia University Institutional Review Board.

I realize that your schedule is busy and your time is valuable. However, I hope that the 15 minutes it will take you to complete the questionnaire will help lead to better West Virginia pre-kindergarten programs and provide a useful service to school administrators.

Thank you in advance for your participation. If you have any questions about the study, you can contact me at judaea2004@yahoo.com or 304-757-4748. For any questions concerning your rights as a research participant, you can contact the Marshall University IRB #2 Chairman, Dr. Stephen Cooper, at 696-7320.

Yours truly,

Judaea “Judy” Hodge, Ed.S.
Marshall University Graduate College
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Cover Letter I
Office of Research Integrity  
Institutional Review Board

Wednesday, June 22, 2005

Ronald Childress, Ed.D.  
MU Graduate College  
100 Angus E. Peyton Dr.  
South Charleston, WV. 25303-1600

RE: IRB Study # 4057 At: Marshall IRB 2

Dear Dr. Childress:

Protocol Title:
A Study of the Importance & Implementation of National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language & Literacy as Perceived by WV Directors of Early Childhood Centers

Expiration Date: 12/21/2005
Our Internal #: 1581
Type of Change: Annual Report Expedited Approval
Expedited ?:
Date of Change: 6/22/2005
Date Received: 6/22/2005
On Meeting Date: 7/20/2005

Description: In accordance with 45CFR46.110, the above listed study was granted an expedited continuing review for a period of six months. This study is for graduate student Jadae Hodge. A progress report of this study will be due prior to the anniversary date of December 21, 2005 or upon completion and or closure of the study if prior to the anniversary date.

Respectfully yours,

Steven D. Cooker  
Marshall University IRB#2 Chairperson
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Cover Letter II
September 8, 2004

Pre-Kindergarten Program Director
West Virginia

Dear Program Director,

My name is Judaea "Judy" Hodge and I am pursuing a doctoral degree in Early Childhood in the Marshall University Doctoral Program in Curriculum and Instruction. I am in the dissertation stage of my program and am writing to ask your support in this process.

The focus of my dissertation is to determine the importance and level of implementation of National Pre-Kindergarten Standards for Language and Literacy in West Virginia’s licensed preschool programs for four year olds. The enclosed questionnaire is designed to obtain information about your perceptions as to the importance and level of implementation for these standards. Participation in this study is voluntary and there is no penalty for choosing not to participate. However, by returning this survey you are consenting to participate. Your responses will be confidential. I will provide you a summary of the survey results. This study has been approved by the West Virginia University Institutional Review Board.

I realize that your schedule is busy and your time is valuable. However, I hope that the 15 minutes it will take you to complete the questionnaire will help lead to better West Virginia pre-kindergarten programs and provide a useful service to school administrators.

Thank you in advance for your participation. If you have any questions about the study, you can contact me at judaeaz2004@yahoo.com or 304-757-4748. For any questions concerning your rights as a research participant, you can contact the Marshall University IRB#2 Chairman, Dr. Stephen Cooper, at 696-7320.

Yours truly,

Judaea "Judy" Hodge, Ed.S.
Marshall University Graduate College
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The Early Childhood Language and Literacy Survey (ECELLS)
The Early Childhood Education Language and Literacy Survey (ECELLS)

Part I
Please provide the following information.

1. Please enter your highest level of education.
   ___ High School Diploma
   ___ Associate degree
   ___ Bachelor’s degree
   ___ Master’s degree
   ___ Doctoral degree
   ___ Other –
       Explain_________________

2. Please enter how many years of experience you have in the early childhood field.
   __________

3. Please enter how many years you have been in your present position.
   __________

4. Please enter the type of pre-kindergarten program you direct.
   ___ Head Start
   ___ Child Care Center
   ___ Group Child Care Home Center
   ___ Private Pre-Kindergarten Preschool
   ___ Public Pre-Kindergarten Preschool

5. Please enter how many four year olds are in your pre-kindergarten program.
   __________

6. Please enter the size of your early childhood program.
   ___ Type I – 30 or less students
   ___ Type II – 31-60 students
   ___ Type III – 61 or more students
Part II
Following are 13 statements describing the national pre-kindergarten language and literacy standards and school experiences for 4-year-old pre-kindergarten programs. Using the “IMPORTANCE” rating scale, rate each statement and circle its level of importance for an effective pre-kindergarten program. Using the “LEVEL OF IMPLEMENTATION” scale, rate each statement in regard to your pre-kindergarten program’s level of implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practices</th>
<th>COLUMN A</th>
<th>COLUMN B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LEVEL OF IMPORTANCE</td>
<td>LEVEL OF IMPLEMENTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NI = Not Important</td>
<td>N = Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SI = Slightly Important</td>
<td>S = Seldom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MI = Moderately Important</td>
<td>O = Occasionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FI = Fairly Important</td>
<td>F = Frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI = Highly Important</td>
<td>A = Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Provides opportunities for children to discriminate between sounds in their environment</td>
<td>NI SI MI FI HI</td>
<td>N S O F A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Provides opportunities for children to listen attentively</td>
<td>NI SI MI FI HI</td>
<td>N S O F A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provides opportunities for children to listen for pleasure and enjoyment</td>
<td>NI SI MI FI HI</td>
<td>N S O F A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Provides experiences for children to identify letter-sound relationship</td>
<td>NI SI MI FI HI</td>
<td>N S O F A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Provides opportunities for children to experience a steady vocabulary growth</td>
<td>NI SI MI FI HI</td>
<td>N S O F A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Provides experiences for children to increase their conversation skills</td>
<td>NI SI MI FI HI</td>
<td>N S O F A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN A</td>
<td>COLUMN B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL OF IMPORTANCE</strong></td>
<td><strong>LEVEL OF IMPLEMENTATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI = Not Important</td>
<td>N = Never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI = Slightly Important</td>
<td>S = Seldom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI = Moderately Important</td>
<td>O = Occasionally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI = Fairly Important</td>
<td>F = Frequently</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI = Highly Important</td>
<td>A = Always</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Practices**

7. Provides experiences for children to develop phonemic awareness
   - NI SI MI FI HI N S O F A

8. Provides experiences for children to understand that print carries a message
   - NI SI MI FI HI N S O F A

9. Provides experiences for children to develop grapheme awareness
   - NI SI MI FI HI N S O F A

10. Provides opportunities for children to develop book familiarity
    - NI SI MI FI HI N S O F A

11. Provides experiences for children to become increasingly familiar with narrative story forms
    - NI SI MI FI HI N S O F A

12. Provides opportunities for children to identify story elements of setting, plot, characters and events
    - NI SI MI FI HI N S O F A

13. Provides opportunities for children to understand that writing has a purpose
    - NI SI MI FI HI N S O F A
VITA
JUDAEA “JUDY” Hodge
judaea2004@yahoo.com

EDUCATION
Marshall University Doctoral Program
  Doctor of Education in Curriculum and Instruction, 2005
Marshall University Doctoral Program
  Education Specialist in Early Childhood and Curriculum and
  Instruction, 2003
Widener University
  Master of Arts, Elementary Education and Early Childhood, 1996
Wingate University
  Math Specialist, 1990
West Virginia State University
  Bachelor of Arts, Elementary Education, Early Childhood, Social
  Studies, 1982

CERTIFICATION
State of West Virginia, Early Childhood Education, Permanent
State of West Virginia, Elementary Education, Permanent
State of West Virginia, Social Studies (4-8), Permanent

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE
2005-Present  Assistant Professor, Virginia State University
2002–2004     Instructor, Marshall University Graduate College
2001–2003     Student Teacher Supervisor and School Board Member
1999–2002     Assistant Professor, West Virginia State University
1997-1998     Principal, Bethany Christian School, New Jersey
1995-1997     Assistant Director of Student Teacher, Widener University
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