



School readiness

Last update: July 2017

Table of content

Synthesis	4
<hr/>	
School Entry Age	8
DEBORAH J. STIPEK, PHD, JUNE 2009	
<hr/>	
School Transitions/School Readiness: An Outcome of Early Childhood Development ~ Perspective: Children’s Social and Scholastic Development — Findings from the Pathways Project	13
GARY W. LADD, PHD, JUNE 2009	
<hr/>	
School Transition and School Readiness: An Outcome of Early Childhood Development	23
SARA RIMM-KAUFMAN, PHD & LIA SANDILOS, PHD, JULY 2017	
<hr/>	
School Transition. Commentary on Ladd and Stipek	31
CLANCY BLAIR, PHD, JUNE 2009	
<hr/>	
School Transitions/School Readiness: An Outcome of Early Childhood Development. Commentary on Ladd and Stipek	36
MARTHA J. COX, PHD, JUNE 2009	
<hr/>	
Services and Programs that Influence Young Children’s School Transitions	40
DIANE EARLY, PHD, JUNE 2009	
<hr/>	
Transitions Begin Early	44
JOHN M. LOVE, PHD, HELEN H. RAIKES, PHD, JUNE 2009	
<hr/>	
Role of Early Childhood Education Intervention Programs in Assisting Children With Successful Transitions to School	48
NICHOLAS ZILL, PHD, GARY RESNICK, PHD, JUNE 2009	
<hr/>	

School Readiness: Preparing Children for the Transition from Preschool to Grade School. Comments on Love and Raikes, Zill and Resnick, and Early	55
<hr/>	
The Role of Schools and Communities in Children’s School Transition	62
<hr/>	
School Readiness and International Developments in Early Childhood Education and Care	72
<hr/>	
The Role of Parents in Children’s School Transition	78
<hr/>	
Commentary on Rimm-Kaufman, Cowan and Cowan, Dockett and Perry, and Kamerman	84
<hr/>	

Synthesis

How important is it?

Children and their families experience a large discontinuity as they make the transition into kindergarten. This shift is notable despite the fact that more than 80% of North American children receive care on a regular basis from a non-parental caregiver prior to this transition. Many children are able to make this transition well, behaving skilfully with peers, interacting well with teachers in these new social settings, and appearing generally well adjusted, all of which predict success during the elementary school years. Other children do not make the transition as easily, either because they are not ready for schooling or because schools are not ready for them.

Researchers, policy-makers, educators and parents are trying to discover what it means for children to be ready for school. Important dimensions of school readiness include physical, motor, linguistic, cognitive, social and emotional development, as well as attitudes toward learning and general knowledge. An American survey of kindergarten teachers showed that teachers identified ready children as those who are physically healthy, well rested and well fed; able to communicate needs, wants and thoughts verbally; and curious and enthusiastic in approaching new activities. Parents, in contrast, typically define readiness in terms of academic abilities, such as the ability to count or knowing the alphabet. These two perspectives are complementary and need to be reconciled.

School readiness leads to school success. Accumulating evidence has revealed that children's performance during the primary school years (kindergarten through grade three) has an important bearing on later success in school and life; in response, understanding how young children are best prepared to enter and succeed in grade school has become a priority for parents, educators, legislators and researchers.

What do we know?

A child is seen as successful in school when a positive attitude about school and learning is developed; supportive social ties with teachers and classmates are formed; comfortable and positive emotions, as well as positive engagement and participation in the classroom, are experienced; and academic achievement and progress are shown.

Research on school readiness has focused on early markers that are closely related to children's school success. Thus, early signs of cognitive ability and maturity, children's work-related and learning-related social skills and self-regulatory skills have been identified as factors that contribute to and define "school readiness". Children's age is also a marker of school readiness insofar as it indicates maturity in the cognitive, social and self-regulatory domains. However, age per se is a poor predictor of later school success.

Other factors may influence children's success in school and life, including attributes of the child, family, previous child-care environments and the nature of relationships with teachers and peers. These factors seem to operate according to an interactive (i.e. multiplicative) and transactional (i.e. bi-directional) mode rather than an additive mode. To illustrate, children bring to school their own individual attributes, such as gender, age, aptitude, language, prior experiences and behavioural dispositions (e.g. aggressiveness, self-regulatory abilities, sociability and anxiety-withdrawal), all of which may affect the way they approach their classmates, teachers and the school environment. In turn, the nature of the relationships that children form with teachers and peers makes an independent contribution to their psychological and school adjustment, above and beyond children's own behavioural and cognitive dispositions. Chronic exposure to the negative (e.g. rejection/victimization by peers or teachers, friendlessness) or positive aspects of these social experiences (e.g. peer-group acceptance) has greater consequences for children's psychological and school adjustment than transient exposure.

Parents also have a role to play in determining their child's readiness for school. The quality of parent-child relationships, specifically parental sensitivity and stimulation, has a clear and frequently documented correlation with early school success, either as a main contributor or a protective factor. Also, the quality of the relationship between the parents before their child enters school has been shown to predict the child's social and academic competence throughout elementary and high school.

There is also research demonstrating that attributes of children's child-care environment directly affect a child's transition and adjustment to school. These effects appear even more pronounced among children exposed to high-risk conditions. Programs based on principles of quality care, higher caregiver training and smaller child-staff ratio all contribute positively to a child's readiness for school. Instructional needs and children's ability to profit from school depend on the types of instructional settings they encounter as they move from home to school and from grade to grade.

Schools and communities make also significant contributions to children’s connections with school, both in the transition process and in later school engagement.

In sum, a child’s initial experiences in school are critical. Research suggests that children’s school outcomes, especially achievement, remain remarkably stable after the first years of school; interventions are more likely to be successful in the early school years; and how children adapt to their earliest school experiences has long-term implications for cognitive and social development and for dropping out of high school.

What can be done?

Considering the strong links between school readiness and children’s later successes in school and life, attention is appropriately focused on optimizing children’s readiness. Appropriate nutrition, accessible health care, parents as children’s first teachers, and the availability of quality preschool and early education programs have been identified as critical conditions that support school readiness.

Indeed, good-quality infant-toddler programs have been shown to be effective in changing the environments babies experience in the early years in ways consistent with enhancing children’s development. Among the programs that have been thoroughly evaluated, Early Head Start was among the most impressive because it contributed to several aspects of young children’s (two- and three-year-olds) readiness and, at the same time, increased the quality of conditions that support growth in readiness (e.g. competent teaching by parents and appropriate nutrition and health care).

Extensive study of two model programs (the High/Scope Perry Preschool Program and the Carolina Abecedarian Study) has shown that high quality early childhood education can have significant and long-term positive effects on school readiness, and are significantly more beneficial to children from disadvantaged families. Although we know much less about the effects of the typical preschool programs experienced by most children, several studies in the U.S. and elsewhere have demonstrated positive benefits for school readiness.

For the positive benefits of early childhood programs to be long-lasting, programs must be of high quality and focus on didactic learning activities (letters and numbers), while encouraging play-oriented and discovery-learning activities in a language-rich and emotionally-supportive

environment. Many successful programs also include a family component. Programs designed to prepare children for kindergarten need to consider the ways in which they teach social and self-regulatory skills, as well as enhance cognitive abilities and engage parents in this process.

It is also desirable to focus on the school transition period to improve children's as well as schools' readiness. However, given that school readiness is multidimensional, parents and caregivers still disagree on what the term really means. Transition practices are therefore necessary to help families and schools agree on appropriate ages for school entry and develop congruent expectations for the kindergarten year.

Although opinions differ, certain practices have been shown to result in an optimal school transition experience for children. Preschool and school-age services that are integrated and coordinated maximize success as children enter school. Such practice, which likely results in greater public support and higher quality programs, is currently in place in Sweden, New Zealand, Spain, Scotland and the UK. Prior to the start of kindergarten, a rapport should already be established among the child, the kindergarten teacher, pre-kindergarten teachers, peers and the parent. Practices should be individualized and engage the child, family and preschool setting prior to the first day of school. Multiple aspects of the familial context, such as the couple's relationship quality, must be addressed in these interventions and should be introduced early, if possible before school entry. The quality of the classroom environment should be constructed to meet children's needs. There is evidence that teacher training in transition practices leads to increased use of transition practices of all types.

In reality, however, most children receive little in the way of formal assistance before they enter school, and many of the services that are provided are perfunctory in nature and tend to be implemented belatedly, just before children enter kindergarten. Despite greatly expanded investment in preschool programs, the achievement gap between advantaged and disadvantaged children remains. More research is needed to better understand the transition process beginning in the first years of life. From a policy perspective, consensus about the importance of and best practices for maximizing school readiness for all children is lacking.

School Entry Age

Deborah J. Stipek, PhD

Stanford University School of Education, USA

June 2009, 2e éd.

Introduction

At what age should children enter formal schooling? Practices vary widely across countries and localities within countries, and even among families within small communities. The empirical question concerns the age at which children are emotionally and intellectually ready for a formal school program.

Subject

Policy-makers debate the age at which school entry should be allowed, and when it should be required. Many parents struggle with the question of whether they should send their children to school as soon as they are eligible, or keep them out for another year to increase their likelihood of success. This report summarizes evidence on the effects of the age at which children enter school on their social and academic development.

Problems

Identifying the appropriate age for children to enter school is complicated by the fact that children do not all develop at the same pace. Substantial variation in “readiness” will be found regardless of the age at which children are allowed to enter school. Readiness for school also varies as a function of children’s experiences proper to school entry. Children who have had extensive experience in group day care or other early childhood education programs may be more comfortable and better prepared to handle school than their age-mates who have had little experience in such settings. Age, therefore, will always be a weak predictor of readiness.

Research Context

Three strategies have been used to assess the effects of the age of school entry on children's academic achievement, and occasionally on social-emotional or motivational outcomes. First, studies have compared outcomes for children who have delayed entry by a year with children who

entered school when they were eligible. A second methodological strategy is to simply compare children in the same grade with different birth dates. In any one grade, there is at least a 12-month spread in ages. Assuming that children's birth dates are randomly distributed, associations between this natural variation in age of entry and child outcomes suggest an age effect. Few of the studies using this methodology assess change in achievement over the school year; they therefore cannot be used to determine whether older children benefit relatively more from schooling (i.e. make greater gains) than do younger children. They do, however, provide information on whether older children perform better on average than younger children. The third and most powerful strategy compares children who are the same age but in different grades, as well as children who are a year apart in age but in the same grade. This strategy provides information on the relative effects of an additional year of time (maturation and general out-of-school experience) versus an additional year of schooling.

Research Results

Delayed entry. Studies examining children who have delayed their entry into school by a year are difficult to interpret because there is a selection bias in which children parents decide to hold out of school for a year. The findings of studies that compared children who were held out to those who began school when they were eligible are not consistent. If differences between the groups in child outcomes are found, whatever the direction, the differences are modest.

Age differences. The findings of studies that compare children who are relatively old versus young for their grade also vary somewhat, although a fairly clear picture emerges. Most studies report differences in the beginning grades of school that favour older children,^{2,3} and some studies report differences in the later elementary grades.²⁻⁴ But a few studies found no difference in some or all achievement tests, even in kindergarten.^{5,6} In most of the studies that found significant age differences in the early grades, the differences were weaker⁷⁻⁹ or disappeared altogether by the upper elementary grades.^{6,10-13}

In summary, these studies suggest some small advantage in being relatively older than classmates, but the advantage diminishes or disappears with age. The findings do not suggest that being older is better in some absolute sense. All of these studies used relative age as the independent variable. Depending on the birth-date cut-off in the state or community, a relatively old child in one study could have been an average-aged child in another study. The findings also do not suggest that older children learn more in school than younger children. The age differences, when found, were usually stronger at the beginning of school than in the later grades,

indicating that the younger children actually tended to learn more, often catching up with their older peers after a few years in school. Even in the early elementary grades, the magnitude of the effect of age appears to be small. Most studies do not compare age to other factors influencing student achievement, but in one that did, the proportion of risk of poor achievement attributed to race and socioeconomic factors was 13 times larger than that contributed by age.⁹

School versus time to mature. Most relevant to the question of school entry age are studies comparing children who are the same age but in different grades *and* children who are in the same grade but approximately a year apart in age. The first comparison provides information on the effect of a year of schooling, holding age constant. The second comparison provides information on the effect of chronological age, holding the number of years of schooling constant.

Findings from studies using these methods suggest that schooling is the more potent variable in most of the cognitive skills measured. In math and most aspects of reading and literacy in most studies, children who were in school gained more in a year than children the same age who were not in school.¹⁴⁻²⁰ The evidence also suggests that age, at least in the ranges studied, was not a factor in how much children benefited from a year of schooling.^{18,19}

The studies comparing age and school effects suggest that educational intervention found in schools contributes more to children's cognitive competencies overall than does maturation, and that relatively young children benefit from school as much as relatively older children. The school effect is strong in an absolute as well as a relative sense. In the Crone and Whitehurst study,²⁰ for example, a year in school explained 62% of the literacy skill improvements at the kindergarten level, and 81% in second grade. Cahan and Cohen¹⁴ report that the effect of a year in school was twice the effect of a year of age.

Conclusion

The evidence suggests that within the five- to six-year-old range in which most children begin school in the U.S. (where most of the studies cited were conducted), age is not a significant predictor of ultimate academic success. Extant research does not support recent trends in the U.S. to raise the age at which children are eligible to begin school (e.g. from turning five by December of the year a child enters kindergarten to turning five in September or earlier). To the contrary, time in school appears to contribute more to young children's academic skills than time engaged in other activities outside of school. Research on day care and early childhood education also suggests advantages of centre care for children in the preschool years.²¹ It is, therefore, clear that

children benefit from some form of educational program at a very early age.

Many early childhood experts have called into question the very notion of "school readiness." Clearly, all children at all ages are "ready to learn." The meaningful question is not whether a child is ready to learn, but rather what a child is ready to learn. Even "reading readiness" – a concept with a long history in early childhood development – has little meaning in the context of current conceptualizations of emerging literacy, which includes general knowledge, language and vocabulary skills, and even early scribbling. Literacy, according to current experts, begins to develop long before children enter school.^{21,22} Current conceptions of mathematics also embrace the notion of gradual development that begins early in life. Recent work on the development of mathematical understanding shows that an understanding of basic number concepts is seen and can be promoted in toddlers.²³ The important policy issues are how to give all young children access to educational programs, and how to make sure that school programs are appropriate for the particular social and academic skills of the children in them.

References

1. Stipek D. At what age should children enter kindergarten? A question for policy makers and parents. *SRCD Social Policy Report* 2002;16(2):3-16.
2. Cameron MB, Wilson BJ. The effects of chronological age, gender, and delay of entry on academic achievement and retention: Implications for academic redshirting. *Psychology in the Schools* 1990;27(3):260-263.
3. Crosser SL. Summer birth date children: Kindergarten entrance age and academic achievement. *Journal of Educational Research* 1991;84(3):140-146.
4. Breznitz Z, Teltsch T. The effect of school entrance age on academic achievement and social-emotional adjustment of children: Follow-up study of fourth graders. *Psychology in the Schools* 1989;26(1):62-68.
5. Dietz C, Wilson BJ. Beginning school age and achievement. *Psychology in the Schools* 1985;22(1):93-94.
6. Kinard EM, Reinhertz H. Birthdate effects on school performance and adjustment: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Educational Research* 1986;79(6):366-372.
7. Langer P, Kalk JM, Searls DT. Age of admission and trends in achievement: A comparison of Blacks and Caucasians. *American Educational Research Journal* 1984;21(1):61-78.
8. Sweetland JD, De Simone PA. Age of entry, sex, and academic achievement in elementary school children. *Psychology in the Schools* 1987;24(4):406-412.
9. Jones MM, Mandeville GK. The effect of age at school entry on reading achievement scores among South Carolina students. *Remedial and Special Education* 1990;11(2):56-62.
10. May DC, Welch E. Screening for school readiness: The influence of birthday and sex. *Psychology in the Schools* 1986;23(1):100-105.
11. Bickel DD, Zigmond N, Strayhorn J. Chronological age at entrance to first grade: Effects on elementary school success. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* 1991;6(2):105-117.

12. McClelland MM, Morrison FJ, Holmes DL. Children at risk for early academic problems: The role of learning-related social skills. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* 2000;15(3):307-329.
13. Stipek D, Byler P. Academic achievement and social behaviors associated with age of entry into kindergarten. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology* 2001;22(2):175-189.
14. Cahan S, Cohen N. Age versus schooling effects on intelligence development. *Child Development* 1989;60(5):1239-1249.
15. Ferreira F, Morrison FJ. Children's metalinguistic knowledge of syntactic constituents: Effects of age and schooling. *Developmental Psychology* 1994;30(5):663-678.
16. Varnhagen CK, Morrison FJ, Everall R. Age and schooling effects in story recall and story production. *Developmental Psychology* 1994;30(6):969-979.
17. Bisanz J, Morrison FJ, Dunn M. Effects of age and schooling on the acquisition of elementary quantitative skills. *Developmental Psychology* 1995;31(2):221-236.
18. Morrison FJ, Smith L, Dow-Ehrensberger M. Education and cognitive development: A natural experiment. *Developmental Psychology* 1995;31(5):789-799.
19. Morrison FJ, Alberts DM, Griffith EM. Nature-nurture in the classroom: Entrance age, school readiness, and learning in children. *Developmental Psychology* 1997;33(2):254-262.
20. Crone DA, Whitehurst GJ. Age and schooling effects on emergent literacy and early reading skills. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 1999;91(4):604-614.
21. Bowman BT, Donovan MS, Burns MS, eds. *Eager to learn: Educating our preschoolers*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press; 2001.
22. Snow CE, Burns SM, Griffin P, eds. *Preventing reading difficulties in young children*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press. National Research Council. Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education; 1998.
23. Griffin S, Case, R. Re-thinking the primary school math curriculum: An approach based on cognitive science. *Issues in Education* 1997;3:1-65.

School Transitions/School Readiness: An Outcome of Early Childhood Development ~ Perspective: Children’s Social and Scholastic Development — Findings from the Pathways Project

Gary W. Ladd, PhD

Arizona State University, USA

June 2009, 2e éd.

Introduction

The Pathways Project is an ongoing longitudinal study funded by the National Institutes of Health that was designed to expand our understanding of child, family, school and peer factors that influence children’s progress and adjustment as they begin kindergarten at age five. Also of interest is the potential effect that early-established trajectories (i.e. “pathways”) have on children’s psychological, social and scholastic adjustment as they progress through the elementary, junior high and high school years. The Project began in 1992 and, to date, we have followed the same children and families for over 10 years. We gather data on children’s adjustment and progress every school year, and follow them (and their families) wherever they may move. Currently, the families and children who are participating in this project reside in 27 states within the USA.

Subject

Although the Pathways Project has many goals, one important objective (see others below) is to better understand how child, family, peer and school characteristics affect the attitudes children develop toward school and the level of participation children pursue in the classroom (e.g. engagement in academic and social tasks in the classroom; initiative toward schoolwork). The aims of this project are consistent with nationally recognized initiatives in the areas of school readiness, preventive education and the assessment of children’s educational progress. Early findings from the Pathways Project have been reported in scientific journals and the national and international news media.

Problems

We began by studying the earliest level of formal schooling to understand how children cope with the transition to kindergarten, and to identify factors that may place children on “pathways” toward successful or unsuccessful social, psychological and school

adjustment. We are also interested in understanding how early developments in children’s school careers shape their progress and success in later grades. Most recently, we have begun to investigate aspects of the child, family, peer and school contexts that may aid children during the transition to junior high and high school. Throughout the project, our work has been guided by key questions, such as “Can we understand what enables children to adapt to new challenges and succeed in school? What factors promote or interfere with children’s success in school?” It is our goal to address these questions with findings that benefit parents, teachers and school administrators.

Research Context

Our primary research contexts are the school, the family and children’s peer groups. We are exploring a number of factors that may affect children’s success in school and life, including attributes of the child, family, peer group, classroom and school. Our view is that each child has many attributes that they “bring” to school including gender, age, aptitude, language and prior experiences, all of which may affect the way they approach their classmates, teachers and the school environment. Included among these are specific child dispositions and social skills that are often manifest as attributes such as independence or autonomy, curiosity, aggressiveness, kindness and other forms of prosocial behaviour. We also consider that each of the child’s responses to school is affected by the type of support they receive from family, peers, teachers and others. And we recognize that children have varying instructional needs, and their ability to profit from school depends on the types of instructional settings they encounter as they move from home to school and from grade to grade. In the Pathways Project, we are interested in all of these factors and contexts, and are investigating them during each year of the study.

Key Research Questions

Although we are investigating many areas of children’s development, one of our guiding premises is that school adjustment depends on more than just the “obvious” or “known” predictors, such as children’s intellectual aptitude, language skills, family backgrounds and so on. These factors are important, but especially among younger children, we think that they do not tell the whole story

about what leads children toward healthy social, psychological and scholastic adjustment in the school context. For example, our view is that there are complex chains or sequences of factors that affect how children achieve in school. First, how children act toward their classmates, and how children are treated by their classmates, may have an important bearing on the relationships they develop in the classroom. Behaviours such as whether children work or play among classmates in a manner that is active or passive, cooperative or argumentative, helpful or demanding, may have important consequences for children's relationships with peers and teachers. Second, once relationships with teachers and classmates have formed, the quality of these relationships may affect how much children engage and participate in the school environment. Finally, we think that classroom participation and positive school attitudes are important early predictors of achievement - children who like school and participate more actively in classroom activities show much higher gains in achievement than do children who dislike school and evidence low levels of participation. Our definition of success in school is very straightforward, and encompasses several aspects of children's school adjustment. A child can be seen as successful in school when she or he: (a) develops positive attitudes and feelings about school and learning, (b) establishes supportive social ties with teachers and classmates, (c) feels comfortable and relatively happy in the classroom rather than anxious, lonely or upset, (d) is interested and motivated to learn and take part in classroom activities (participation, engagement), and (e) achieves and progresses academically each school year.

Recent Research Results

The following is a summary of five guiding premises and associated project discoveries:

Premise 1. The early behavioural dispositions that children manifest in school antecede their psychological and school adjustment in this setting.

Although aggression and anxious-withdrawal are "known" risk factors for dysfunction,^{1,2} they have not been investigated prospectively in school contexts from early childhood through adolescence, or differentiated as antecedents of children's psychological and school adjustment. Thus, a continuing aim has been to examine the presence, co-occurrence and stability of these dispositions, and the links between these propensities and children's adjustment.

Exemplary discoveries

Our findings show that aggressive dispositions were moderately stable from kindergarten to grade 6 (e.g., .56), whereas anxious- withdrawn behaviour was not stable until grades 2 (.36) and 3 (.51).^{3,4} The percentages of children in a community sample ($n = 2775$) that could be classified into

distinct risk groups were: 15% aggressive; 12% anxious-withdrawn, and 8.5% aggressive-withdrawn (comorbid).⁵ Predictive analyses showed that aggressive children who exceeded a risk criterion in kindergarten exhibited increases in psychological and school maladjustment two years later.⁶ Anxious-withdrawn dispositions predicted early and later increases in internalizing problems.⁵ Overall, the findings corroborate the premise that aggression and anxious-withdrawal are risks for later maladjustment.

Premise 2. The nature of the relationships that children form with classroom peers antecedes their psychological/ school adjustment.

Few have examined the adaptive significance of the multiple forms of relationship children participate in simultaneously in classrooms. This premise was examined by investigating the stability of children's classroom relationships, as well as concurrent and longitudinal links with psychological and school adjustment, and the extent to which different relationships were distinctly versus contingently predictive of specific forms of adjustment. Except for victimization, the types of relationships children formed in kindergarten were moderately stable to grade 6 (e.g. peer acceptance, .47; peer rejection, .37; mutual friendships, .30).^{4,6-8} From K to grade 1, peer rejection predicted lower psychological and school adjustment, whereas peer acceptance and friendship predicted better adjustment in both domains.⁵ The premise that relationships differentially contribute to adjustment was examined by investigating links between participation in different types of peer relationships and changes in children's adjustment.⁹ Victimization, for example, more than other relationships, forecasted decrements in emotional adjustment that were not predictable from other forms of relationships. Peer acceptance was uniquely linked with gains in children's class participation and achievement. Overall, results corroborated the inference that adjustment is affected by the diverse experiences children encounter in different peer relationships, and that certain relationships have greater adaptive significance depending on the type of adjustment examined.

Premise 3. There are predictable links between early behavioural dispositions and the types of relationships children form in classrooms.

To investigate this premise, we observed children's behaviour as they began school with unfamiliar peers, and assessed their emergent peer relationships over a two- to five-year period. It was hypothesized that aggressive dispositions would lead to the formation of adverse relationships, anxious-withdrawn dispositions to isolation, and prosocial dispositions to positive relationships. Results from kindergarten to grade 2 and grade 5^{6,7,10} have shown that, compared to normative matched controls, children with aggressive dispositions were more likely to develop

early-emerging and sustained peer rejection, whereas those with anxious-withdrawn dispositions tended to remain friendless. Growth curve analyses over grades K-4 showed that anxious-withdrawn children became increasingly excluded from peer activities over time.⁵ These findings corroborated the premise that aggressive and withdrawn dispositions antecede the onset and duration of children’s relationship difficulties. Prosocial dispositions, as expected, anteceded positive relationship trajectories.

Premise 4. The contributions of children’s classroom relationships to psychological and school adjustment are not entirely redundant (e.g. “markers”) with those attributable to their behavioural dispositions.

Two rather separate literatures have grown up around premises 1 and 2 (i.e. later dysfunction is attributable either to “risky” behavioural dispositions or to participation in “risky” relationships). For decades, many investigators have regarded the explanatory power of one of these two “main effects” perspectives as dominant over the other.¹¹ An aim for this project is to move beyond “main effects” perspectives by utilizing a child by environment model in which risk/protective factors are seen as originating within the child and the relational environment.

In two prospective longitudinal studies³ with kindergarten samples, we found that children whose interactions were more prosocial during the first 10 weeks of kindergarten tended to develop mutual friends and higher levels of peer acceptance by week 14. In contrast, children whose interactions were characterized by aggressive behaviour became more disliked by classmates and had fewer friends. Direct paths were found between children’s classroom relationships and participation, the strongest of which emanated from negative relationship features (i.e. peer rejection), lending support to the hypothesis that such features impede subsequent adaptive participation and achievement. It would appear that young children’s use of force or coercive tactics is likely to subvert others’ aims and interests, causing peers to develop adversarial reactions (e.g. rejection). Once formed, relationship adversity appears to impede children’s classroom participation and achievement.

Additional investigations were conducted to explicate the possible functions of classroom peer relationships for aggressive children. Principal aims were to determine whether aggressive children’s participation in different types of classroom relationships might increase (e.g. exacerbate) or decrease (i.e. compensate for) their probability of developing psychological and school dysfunction. One example of this line of work is a prospective longitudinal study in which we assessed not only children’s aggressive dispositions but also relationship risks (i.e. classroom peer rejection, victimization) and protective features (i.e. classroom peer acceptance, mutual

friendships) over a two-year period.⁶ Children who manifested higher levels of aggression as they began kindergarten evidenced significant increases in maladjustment in later grades on nearly all of the investigated indices of psychological and school functioning. Further, corroboration was found for the premise that positive relationships buffer children from psychological and school maladjustment. After accounting for children's initial aggressive risk status, early peer acceptance predicted relative declines in attention problems and misconduct, and relative gains in cooperative participation and school liking. This evidence suggests that acceptance by classmates provides children with a sense of belongingness and inclusion in peer activities that decreases the likelihood that they will engage in resistive behaviour patterns, form negative school attitudes and disengage from school tasks.

Premise 5. In addition to behavioural risks, chronic rather than transient exposure to relational adversity (e.g. peer rejection, victimization), deprivation (e.g. friendlessness) or advantage (e.g. peer group acceptance) has greater consequences for children's psychological and school adjustment.

Few have investigated whether children's future adjustment varies as a function of sustained versus transient participation in peer relationships, and no one has investigated whether a history of peer relationship difficulties shapes adjustment beyond the more immediate strains of contemporary peer relationships. To address these limitations, we investigated how enduring relational adversity (e.g. chronic rejection, victimization) and/or advantage (e.g. stable peer acceptance, friendships) interfaced with children's aggressive dispositions to influence their adjustment.⁶ Variable-oriented analyses yielded findings consistent with an additive child by environment model: with few exceptions, participation in peer relationships predicted adjustment beyond children's aggressive risk status. Some evidence supported a moderated child by environment model in that relational adversity or advantage appeared to exacerbate or compensate for dysfunctions linked with aggressive dispositions. Moreover, compared to early onset, the chronicity of children's aggressive risk status and history of exposure to relational stressors/supports bore a stronger association to changes in maladjustment. Person-oriented analyses comparing children who were aggressive but had different relational risk/support histories (ARR group: higher ratio of relational stressors to supports; ARS group: higher ratio of supports to stressors) and children who were not at risk (RF group: risk free) revealed that only the ARR group showed significant increases in psychological and school maladjustment trajectories across the early grades. Even more intriguing was the finding that children in the ARS group evidenced significant decrements in maladjustment over the same period. These findings corroborated the inference that a powerful behavioural risk (aggressiveness) can be exacerbated by chronic relational risks but buffered by stable relational supports, illustrating the importance of

research on children’s relationship histories.

Finally, Ladd and Troop¹⁰ examined the contributions of aggressive and anxious behavioural dispositions and histories of peer relationship adversity and deprivation from early (K) to middle-childhood (grade 4). Estimation via SEM of hypothesized and alternative models showed that chronic friendlessness, rejection and victimization were positively and directly linked with later forms of maladjustment. Because these paths were adjusted for children’s behavioural dispositions and concurrent peer relationships, the results constitute a more stringent test of chronic relationship adversity models.^{12,13}

Conclusions

Our findings corroborate multiple theoretical positions. First, the direct link between children’s early behavioural dispositions and later maladjustment is consistent with “child effects” models, in which it is argued that early-emerging dispositions directly contribute to later maladjustment. Second, a tenet of environmental perspectives is substantiated by evidence indicating that children’s chronic peer relationship experiences, not just their dispositional characteristics, are directly linked with later maladjustment. However, in contrast to these “main effects” perspectives, it can be argued that our findings fit best within a child by environment model. Differences in children’s peer relationships and particularly their histories of relationship adversity, deprivation or advantage—elements of their rearing environments—were found to: (a) contribute additively to the prediction of maladjustment, beyond that forecasted by behavioural dispositions, and (b) in several cases, mediate the link between early dispositions and later maladjustment.

Novel Inferences Corroborated by Project Findings

- Early behavioural dispositions antecede children’s adjustment. These same behavioural dispositions are precursors of the relational ecology (i.e. form/nature of relationships) that children develop in school.
- Although children’s dispositions and peer relationships are significant antecedents of future adjustment, the predictive power of either factor alone is less than their additive or contingent contributions.
- Enduring relationship adversity (e.g. peer rejection), deprivation (e.g. friendlessness), or advantage (e.g. peer acceptance) are more closely associated with children’s adjustment trajectories than are more transient or proximal experiences within these same relationship

domains.

- Risky behavioural dispositions may be exacerbated by enduring relationship adversity (e.g. chronic victimization), and buffered by stable relationship advantage (e.g. stable peer group acceptance).

Implications for Policy and Service

Applications: Implications of Pathways Project Findings for Educators and Schools

We hope that findings from the Pathways Project will allow families and schools to anticipate children's needs as they enter school and progress through the elementary and middle-school years. If so, we will be in a better position to provide children with a good start toward a quality education, and enable larger numbers of children to receive the greatest benefits from their school experiences.

The implications considered here are based on findings for the period of kindergarten and the early grade school years. Additional results that apply to later grade levels and longer periods of schooling will be available in the near future.

How can we place children on trajectories that lead to successful (as opposed to unsuccessful) trajectories toward social, psychological and scholastic competence? Our findings suggest that there may be a number of ways that parents, teachers and school administrators can help children find successful pathways to health and well-being during the school years. The following service and policy recommendations are consistent with evidence obtained from the Pathways Project:

- Increase the probability that children will form *positive feelings/attitudes toward school* as they enter kindergarten. In our samples, 25 to 35% of children had mixed or negative attitudes toward school by the second month of kindergarten. Also, once children formed a negative impression of school, their attitudes often became substantially more negative as they progressed from grade to grade. Thus, before children enter school, a key objective is to establish a line of communication with families and preschool/childcare teachers that enables children to develop realistic expectations about: (a) the purpose of school, and (b) what they will be asked to do in kindergarten/grade 1, including social as well as scholastic tasks (e.g. make friends, form a relationship with the teacher, participate actively in

classroom learning activities).

- As children enter kindergarten, family members and school personnel should pay attention to (and try to improve, if necessary) children’s feelings toward school, and the *quality of the relationships they form with classmates and teachers*. Our work suggests that, among young children, much of the “glue” that helps children identify with or become “attached” to the school environment is social rather than scholastic in nature. With respect to this, there is a pivotal “cycle” or chain of events that emerges from our findings: (1) As children enter kindergarten, those who act cooperatively toward others and refrain from aggressive/antisocial acts develop more supportive classroom social relationships with peers and teachers. (2) Those children who do develop secure and supportive ties become more interested and involved in learning activities, and are better able to cope with challenges in the classroom. (3) The engagement that seems to grow out of children’s supportive peer and teacher relationships promotes higher levels of learning and translates into greater gains in achievement over the school year. To help children profit from this cycle, it would be beneficial to institute relationship-formation activities early in the school year that would be designed to: (a) help children learn prosocial skills and refrain from aggressive/antisocial behaviours; (b) encourage every child to make at least one friend in their classroom, and (c) establish supportive interactions with their classroom teacher.
- Enroll children in early childhood programs that help them develop social and relationship before they enter grade school. Children who already possess friendship-making skills and cooperative behaviours have an increased chance of forging supportive relationships at school that may help them succeed in kindergarten and the primary grades.
- Soon after children enter kindergarten, they should be encouraged to take an active and cooperative role in classroom activities. Our work suggests that young children must behaviourally engage the learning environment to profit from it. Children who avoid (“move away”) or resist (“move against”) the social or academic challenges of early schooling appear to be at high risk for school disengagement and underachievement. Both *active participation in classroom activities* (e.g. getting involved, showing initiative), and *cooperation/compliance with the culture of the classroom* (i.e. adhering to the social rules and role expectations of the classroom) are strong predictors of early achievement.
- Establish programs or activities that *prevent* children’s exposure to major stressors, such as “bully-free” classrooms and group activities in which peers are not permitted to harass or

reject others. Programs of this nature are strongly recommended because these experiences appear to have long-lasting negative social and psychological effects on children, and often alienate them from schooling (e.g. lead to negative school attitudes, increase school avoidance and absences, limit gains in achievement). In recent years, a number of programs have been designed to address these problems in schools (e.g. S.A.F.E. program; “Don’t suffer in silence,” establishing “bully-free” schools, coaching methods for helping children develop social skills, cooperative group activities for promoting tolerance and peer acceptance, and practices such as “You can’t say you can’t play.”)

References

1. Cairns RB, Cairns BD. *Lifelines and risks: Pathways of youth in our time*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press; 1994.
2. Harrist AW, Zaia AF, Bates JE, Dodge KA, Pettit GS. Subtypes of social withdrawal in early childhood: Sociometric status and social-cognitive differences across four years. *Child Development* 1997;68(2):278-294.
3. Ladd GW, Birch SH, Buhs E. Children’s social and scholastic lives in kindergarten: Related spheres of influence? *Child Development* 1999;70(6):1373-1400.
4. Ladd GW. Probing the adaptive significance of children’s behavior and relationships in the school context: A child by environment perspective. *Advances in Child Development and Behavior*. In press.
5. Gazelle H, Ladd GW. Anxious solitude and peer exclusion: A diathesis-stress model of internalizing trajectories in childhood. *Child Development* 2003;74(1):257-278.
6. Ladd GW, Burgess KB. Do relational risks and protective factors moderate the linkages between childhood aggression and early psychological and school adjustment? *Child Development* 2001;72(5):1579-1601.
7. Ladd GW, Burgess KB. Charting the relationship trajectories of aggressive, withdrawn, and aggressive/withdrawn children during early grade school. *Child Development* 1999;70(4):910-929.
8. Ladd GW, Profilet SM. The Child Behavior Scale: A teacher-report measure of young children's aggressive, withdrawn, and prosocial behaviors. *Developmental Psychology* 1996;32(6):1008-1024.
9. Ladd GW, Kochenderfer BJ, Coleman CC. Classroom peer acceptance, friendship, and victimization: Distinct relational systems that contribute uniquely to children’s school adjustment? *Child Development* 1997;68(6):1181-1197.
10. Ladd GW, Troop WP. The role of chronic peer difficulties in the development of children's psychological adjustment problems. *Child Development*. In press.
11. Parker JG, Rubin KH, Price JM, DeRosier M. Peer relationships, child development, and adjustment: A developmental psychopathology perspective. In: Cicchetti D, Cohen D, eds. *Developmental psychopathology: Vol. 2. Risk, disorder and adaptation*. New York: John Wiley & Sons; 1995:96-161.
12. Dohrenwend BP, Dohrenwend BS. Socioenvironmental factors, stress, and psychopathology. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 1981;9(2):128-164.
13. Johnson JH. *Life events as stressors in childhood and adolescence*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage; 1988.

School Transition and School Readiness: An Outcome of Early Childhood Development

Sara Rimm-Kaufman, PhD & Lia Sandilos, PhD

University of Virginia, USA

July 2017, Éd. rév.

Introduction

Children’s transition to kindergarten and their skills at school entry forecast long-term school success.^{1,2} In the United States, the primary objective of Goals 2000 set by the National Education Goals Panel was “to ensure that all children enter school ready to learn”.³ Nearly two decades later, the U.S. early childhood education system has undergone substantial growth in investment, enrollment, and workforce development^{4,5} in an effort to foster readiness. Most recently, the 2015 Every Student Succeeds Act reemphasized the importance of readiness by requiring states to document ways in which pre-kindergarten programs cultivate early skills. Countries around the globe are investing to improve and expand early childhood education, as evidenced by the 16% increase in world-wide pre-kindergarten enrollment between 1990 and 2014.⁶

Subject

There is no single indicator of kindergarten readiness.^{7,8} Readiness involves a range of skills and developmental domains. Presently, the U.S. Department of Education defines the “essential domains for readiness” as language and literacy development, cognition and general knowledge (e.g., early mathematics, early science), approaches to learning, physical well-being and motor development, and social-emotional development.⁹

Research suggests that children’s school outcomes, especially achievement, remain remarkably stable after the first years of school.^{10,11} Further, there is evidence that interventions are more likely to be successful in the early school years.¹² As a result, researchers, policy-makers, educators and parents grapple with what it means for children to be “ready” for school.

This brief report summarizes evidence on school transition and readiness with the goal of describing stakeholders’ definitions of readiness, characteristics of child readiness, and readiness as an outcome of early childhood experiences.

Practical Context

Children and their families experience discontinuity as they make the transition into kindergarten. This shift is notable despite the fact that nearly 80% of American children receive care on a regular basis from a non-parental caregiver prior to this transition.¹³ Within the U.S., the shift toward academic priorities and the heightened rigor present challenges to children as they begin kindergarten. Emphasis on accountability has forced a “push down curriculum” in which children are expected to perform at higher academic levels at earlier ages. Many kindergarten classrooms now have increased teacher-directed math and literacy instruction, and less time engaging in free play or center-based activities.¹⁴

The transition to kindergarten has become an increasingly visible issue as federal and state governments consider the merits of federally-funded preschool programs. A national survey of kindergarten teachers examined teachers’ judgments about school transition and found that almost half of children entering school experienced some difficulty with the transition to kindergarten. Kindergarten teachers cited trouble following directions as the most prevalent problem.¹⁵ Efforts to improve kindergarten transition need to leverage home, school, neighborhood and community resources to prepare children for school.¹⁶ Some promising efforts include expanding access to high quality preschool programming,¹⁷ increasing preschool-to-kindergarten transition activities,¹⁸ and establishing stronger connections between home and school environments.¹⁹

Further, children entering kindergarten differ from those of a generation ago; they are increasingly diverse with regard to racial, ethnic, economic and language backgrounds.²⁰ For example, in U.S. Head Start preschools, 29% of children and families are African American, 38% identify as Latino, and 29% speak a language other than English at home.²¹ Promising approaches to support transition to kindergarten need to identify and leverage the full variation of family strengths.

Research Context

Three main bodies of literature inform discussions about school readiness. The first body is based on large-scale surveys that examine the views of stakeholders (e.g., kindergarten teachers, parents) on their perception of school readiness. The second body of research examines definitions of school readiness by considering the relative importance of cognitive, social, and self-

regulatory skills, as well as chronological age. The third body of work examines school readiness and child outcomes in the early years of school as a function of classroom and family experiences.

Key Research Questions

Key research questions include: How do teachers and parents define readiness? What are the cognitive, social, self-regulatory and chronological markers of school readiness? What are the child-care and home contexts associated with school readiness?

Research Results

What is Readiness: Teachers' and Parents' Definitions

Studies have examined the definition of readiness among different stakeholders in the kindergarten transition process. A national survey of kindergarten teachers showed that teachers identified “ready” children as those who are physically healthy, well-rested and well-fed; able to communicate needs, wants and thoughts verbally; and curious and enthusiastic in approaching new activities. Surprisingly, teachers did not attach particular importance to specific numeracy and literacy skills.²² Another study found that teachers place greater emphasis on self-regulatory and interpersonal skills rather than academic competence.²³ Parents, in contrast, typically define readiness in terms of academic abilities, such as the ability to count, name objects, or identify letters.²⁴

Readiness as Defined by Cognition, Self-regulation, Social Competence, and Chronological Age

Early signs of cognitive ability and maturity link to children’s performance in school. For this reason, this approach to assessing readiness has been used as an indication that a child is prepared for the school environment.²⁵ Meta-analytic work shows that preschool and kindergarten cognitive assessments predict, on average, 25% of variance in early elementary school cognitive assessments.²⁶ Thus, these cognitive indicators are important but other factors account for the majority of variation in early school outcomes.

Accumulated evidence points to the significant role of self-regulation and executive functioning.^{27,28} These features have a neurobiological basis and provide the foundation for many of the behaviours and abilities required in kindergarten.²⁹⁻³¹ Ability to attend selectively, show appropriate social responses, and stay engaged in academic tasks are all implicated as factors that contribute

to and define school readiness. Relatedly, children’s “approaches to learning”, which include emotion-regulation, attention, persistence, and attitude, support their ability to take advantage of learning opportunities in the classroom and predict achievement in later elementary grades.^{32,33}

Other research links children’s social competence to academic performance. For example, children’s early social-emotional skills and social adjustment (e.g., relationships with peers, positive emotions, and prosocial behaviours) are associated with academic outcomes and classroom engagement in kindergarten.³⁴⁻³⁶ Conversely, problem behaviours, such as aggression or withdrawal, interfere with classroom learning.³⁷

Children’s age is also a marker of school readiness insofar as it indicates maturity in the cognitive, social and self-regulatory domains. Research on the effect of age is mixed. Some studies suggest that while there is some advantage to being slightly older upon the transition to kindergarten, these effects disappear by third grade.^{38,39} Other work finds that an earlier state-wide entry cutoff for kindergarten (resulting in older kindergartners, on average) linked to higher state test scores in 4th and 8th grade.⁴⁰

What are the antecedents of “readiness”?

Attributes of children’s child-care environment contribute to their transition and adjustment to school. Stimulating and supportive teacher-child interactions in early childhood classrooms can enhance students’ social-emotional and academic competence.⁴¹⁻⁴⁴ Quality preschool or child-care also predicts ease of kindergarten adjustment,⁴⁵ strengthens social and self-regulatory skills⁴⁶ and reduces the likelihood of some negative outcomes, such as grade retention.⁴⁷ Higher caregiver training and lower child-staff ratio are associated with cognitive competence prior to school entry.⁴⁸ Further, research shows that children who face early adversity, such as growing up in low income or impoverished homes, may have the most to gain from high quality early classroom experiences.^{49,50}

Family processes also influence children’s competencies as they enter school. Quality of parent-child relationships, specifically parental sensitivity and stimulation, contribute to early school success.⁵¹⁻⁵⁵ Parents’ behaviours toward their children and the stimulating materials and consistent routines they provide in the home environment are associated with children’s adjustment to the first months and years of school.^{56,57} Moreover, parents’ involvement in school, such as participating in school activities and attending teacher conferences, forecast early gains in

achievement.⁵⁸

Conclusion

The evidence suggests that school readiness is an important factor for predicting children’s school success and that the characterizations of school readiness are multi-dimensional. Teachers and parents have different definitions of school readiness – teachers emphasize readiness in the social and self-regulatory domains, whereas parents emphasize basic academic skills. Research shows that cognitive skills, social competence, and self-regulatory abilities provide a foundation for academic success and that chronological age, alone, is not an effective indicator of school readiness. Early predictors of school success point to the contribution of sensitive and stimulating family processes, and high quality child-care environments.

Implications

Programs designed to prepare children for kindergarten should strive to boost students’ self-regulatory, social, and cognitive skills.⁵⁹ Parents and early childhood teachers are key contributors to children’s readiness.

Awareness of the multi-dimensionality of readiness and the importance of early teacher-child relationships is essential for practitioners. Transition practices are needed to help families and schools develop congruent expectations for the kindergarten year. Given the increased diversity in U.S. schools and the heightened academic rigor of the early years of school, extra resources allocated toward such transition practices may benefit children, especially those at risk for early school problems.

References

1. Magnuson KA, Ruhm C, Waldfogel J. Does prekindergarten improve school preparation and performance? *Economics of Education Review* 2007;26(1):33-51.
2. Sabol TJ, Pianta RC. Patterns of school readiness forecast achievement and socioemotional development at the end of elementary school. *Child Development* 2012;83(1):282-99.
3. National Education Goals Panel. *National education goals report executive summary: Improving education through family-school-community partnerships*. Washington, DC: National Education Goals Panel; 1995.
4. Barnett WS, Friedman-Krauss A, Gomez R, Horowitz M, Weisenfeld GG, Brown KC, Squires, JH. *The state of preschool 2015: State Preschool Yearbook*. New Brunswick, NJ: National Institute for Early Education Research; 2016.
5. U.S. Census Bureau. Table A-1. School enrollment of the population 3 years old and over, by level and control of school, race, and Hispanic origin: October 1955 to 2015. <https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/school-enrollment/cps-historical-time-series.html>. Accessed July 18, 2017.

6. UNESCO Institute for Statistics. Gross enrollment ratio, pre-primary, both sexes. <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SE.PRE.ENRR>. Accessed July 18, 2017.
7. Kagan SL, Moore E, Bredekamp S. *Reconsidering children's early development and learning toward common views and vocabulary: National Education Goals Panel*. Darby, PA: Diane Publishing; 1998.
8. Office of Head Start, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The Head Start child development and early learning framework: Promoting positive outcomes in early childhood programs serving children 3-5 years old. 2011. Contract no. HHSP233201000415G.
9. U.S. Department of Education. Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) Program - Definitions: Essential domains of readiness. <https://www.ed.gov/early-learning/elc-draft-summary/definitions>. Accessed July 18, 2017.
10. Alexander KL, Entwisle DR. Achievement in the first 2 years of school: Patterns and processes. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development* 1988;53(2):1-157.
11. Entwisle DR, Alexander KL. Early schooling and social stratification. In: Pianta RC, Cox MJ, eds. *The Transition to Kindergarten*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brooks Publishing; 1998:13-38.
12. Ramey CT, Ramey SL. Intensive educational intervention for children of poverty. *Intelligence* 1990;14(1):1-9.
13. Redford J, Desrochers D, Hoyer KM. The years before school: Children's non-parental care arrangements from 2001 to 2012. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics; 2017. NCES 2017-096.
14. Bassok D, Latham S, Rorem A. Is kindergarten the new first grade? *AERA Open* 2016;2(1):1-31.
15. Rimm-Kaufman SE, Pianta RC, Cox MJ. Teachers' judgments of problems in the transition to kindergarten. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* 2000;15(2):147-166.
16. Rimm-Kaufman SE, Pianta RC. An ecological perspective on the transition to kindergarten: A theoretical framework to guide empirical research. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology* 2000;21(5):491-511.
17. Watson S. *The right policy at the right time: The Pew pre-kindergarten campaign*. Washington, DC: Pew Center on the States; 2010.
18. LoCasale-Crouch J, Mashburn AJ, Downer JT, Pianta RC. Pre-kindergarten teachers' use of transition practices and children's adjustment to kindergarten. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* 2008;23(1):124-139.
19. Dearing E, Kreider H, Simpkins S, Weiss HB. Family involvement in school and low-income children's literacy: Longitudinal associations between and within families. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 2006;98(4):653-664.
20. Zill N, Collins M, West J, Germino-Hausken E. *Approaching Kindergarten: A Look at Preschoolers in the United States*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics; 1995. NCES 95-280.
21. Head Start Early Learning and Knowledge Center. Head Start program facts: Fiscal year 2015. 2015; Available at: <https://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/data-ongoing-monitoring/article/head-start-fact-sheets>
22. United States Department of Education. Readiness for kindergarten: Parent and teacher beliefs. Statistics in brief. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, Office of Educational Research and Improvement; 1993. NCES 93-257. <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs93/web/93257.asp>. Accessed July 18, 2017.
23. Abry T, Latham S, Bassok D, LoCasale-Crouch J. Preschool and kindergarten teachers' beliefs about early school competencies: Misalignment matters for kindergarten adjustment. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* 2015;31:78-88.
24. Barbarin OA, Early D, Clifford R, Bryant D, Frome P, Burchinal M, Howes C, Pianta R. Parental conceptions of school readiness: Relation to ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and children's skills. *Early Education and Development* 2008;19(5):671-701.
25. Meisels SJ. Assessing readiness. In: Pianta RC, Cox M, eds. *The transition to kindergarten: Research, policy, training, and practice*. Baltimore, MD: Paul Brooks Publishers; 1999:39-66.

26. La Paro K, Pianta RC. Predicting children's competence in the early school years: A meta-analytic review. *Review of Educational Research* 2000;70(4):443-484.
27. Rimm-Kaufman SE, Curby TW, Grimm KJ, Nathanson L, Brock LL. The contribution of children's self-regulation and classroom quality to children's adaptive behaviors in the kindergarten classroom. *Developmental Psychology* 2009;45(4):958-972.
28. Schmitt SA, McClelland MM, Tominey SL, Acock AC. Strengthening school readiness for Head Start children: Evaluation of a self-regulation intervention. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* 2015;30(A):20-31.
29. Blair C, Diamond A. Biological processes in prevention and intervention: The promotion of self-regulation as a means of preventing school failure. *Development and Psychopathology* 2008;20(3):899-911.
30. Clark CA, Pritchard VE, Woodward LJ. Preschool executive functioning abilities predict early mathematics achievement. *Developmental Psychology* 2010;46(5):1176-1191.
31. Ponitz CC, McClelland MM, Matthews JS, Morrison FJ. A structured observation of behavioral self-regulation and its contribution to kindergarten outcomes. *Developmental Psychology* 2009;45(3):605-619.
32. Vitiello VE, Greenfield DB, Munis P, George JL. Cognitive flexibility, approaches to learning, and academic school readiness in Head Start preschool children. *Early Education & Development* 2011;22(3):388-410.
33. Li-Grining CP, Votruba-Drzal E, Maldonado-Carreño C, Haas K. Children's early approaches to learning and academic trajectories through fifth grade. *Developmental Psychology* 2010;46(5):1062-1077.
34. Nix RL, Bierman KL, Domitrovich CE, Gill S. Promoting children's social-emotional skills in preschool can enhance academic and behavioral functioning in kindergarten: Findings from Head Start REDI. *Early Education & Development* 2013;24(7):1000-1019.
35. Ladd GW, Price JM. Predicting children's social and school adjustment following the transition from preschool to kindergarten. *Child Development* 1987;58(5):1168-1189.
36. Ladd GW. Having friends, keeping friends, making friends, and being liked by peers in the classroom: Predictors of children's early school adjustment? *Child Development* 1990;61(4):1081-1100.
37. Bulotsky-Shearer RJ, Bell ER, Domínguez X. Latent profiles of problem behavior within learning, peer, and teacher contexts: Identifying subgroups of children at academic risk across the preschool year. *Journal of School Psychology* 2012;50(6):775-98.
38. Kinard E, Reinhertz H. Birthdate effects on school performance and adjustment: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Educational Research* 1986;79(6):366-372.
39. Stipek D, Byler P. Academic achievement and social behaviors associated with age of entry into kindergarten. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology* 2001;22(2):175-189.
40. Fletcher J, Kim T. The effects of changes in kindergarten entry age policies on educational achievement. *Economics of Education Review* 2016;50:45-62.
41. Burchinal M, Zaslow M, & Tarullo L. Quality thresholds, features, and dosage in early care and education: Secondary data analyses of child outcomes. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development* 2016;81:1-120.
42. Curby TW, Rimm-Kaufman SE, Ponitz CC. Teacher-child interactions and children's achievement trajectories across kindergarten and first grade. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 2009;101(4):912-925.
43. Hamre BK, Pianta RC. Early teacher-child relationships and the trajectory of children's school outcomes through eighth grade. *Child Development* 2001;72(2):625-638.
44. Williford AP, LoCasale-Crouch J, Whittaker JV, DeCoster J, Hartz KA, Carter LM, Wolcott CS, Hatfield BE. Changing teacher-child dyadic interactions to improve preschool children's externalizing behaviors. *Child Development* 2016;[Epub ahead of print]. doi:10.1111/cdev.12703

45. Howes, C. Can the age of entry into child care and the quality of child care predict adjustment in kindergarten? *Developmental Psychology* 990;26(2):292-303.
46. Cost, Quality, and Child Outcomes Study Team. *Cost, quality and child outcomes in child care centers, Technical report*. Denver, Colo: University of Colorado at Denver, Department of Economics, Center for Research in Economic and Social Policy; 1995.
47. Zill N, Collins M. Approaching kindergarten: A look at preschoolers in the United States. Washington, DC: US Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement; 1995. NCES No. 95-280. <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs95/95280.pdf>. Accessed July 18, 2017.
48. NICHD Early Child Care Research Network. Child-care structure, process and outcome: Direct and indirect effects of child-care quality on young children's development. *Psychological Science* 2002;13(3):199-206.
49. Loeb S, Fuller B, Kagan SL, Carrol B. Child care in poor communities: Early learning effects of type, quality, and stability. *Child Development* 2004;75(1):47-65.
50. Yoshikawa H, Weiland C, Brooks-Gunn J, Burchinal MR, Espinosa LM, Gormley WT, Ludwig J, Magnuson K, Phillips D, Zaslow M. Investing in our future: The evidence base on preschool education. Washington, DC: Society for Research in Child Development; 2013; <https://www.fcd-us.org/the-evidence-base-on-preschool/>. Accessed July 18, 2017.
51. Estrada P, Arsenio WF, Hess RD, Holloway SD. Affective quality of the mother-child relationship: Longitudinal consequences for children's school-relevant cognitive functioning. *Developmental Psychology* 1987;23(2):210-215.
52. Comer JP, Haynes NM. Parent involvement in schools: An ecological approach. *The Elementary School Journal* 1991;91(3):271-277.
53. Ramey CT, Campbell FA. Poverty, early childhood education, and academic competence: The Abecedarian experiment. In: Huston AC, ed. *Children in poverty: Child development and public policy*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press; 1991:190-221.
54. Pianta RC, Harbers K. Observing mother and child behavior in a problem solving situation at school entry: Relations with academic achievement. *Journal of School Psychology* 1996;34(3):307-322.
55. Connell CM, Prinz RJ. The impact of childcare and parent-child interactions on school readiness and social skills development for low-income African American children. *Journal of School Psychology* 2002;40(2):177-193.
56. Bradley RH, Caldwell BM, Rock SL. Home environment and school performance: A ten year follow up and examination of three models of environmental action. *Child Development* 1988;59(4):852-867.
57. Belsky J, MacKinnon C. Transition to School: Developmental Trajectories and School Experiences. *Early Education and Development* 1994;5(2):106-119.
58. Galindo C, Sheldon SB. School and home connections and children's kindergarten achievement gains: The mediating role of family involvement. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* 2012;27(1):90-103.
59. Raver CC. Emotions Matter: Making the case for the role of young children's emotional development for early school readiness. *SRCD Social Policy Report* 2002;16(3):3-18.

School Transition. Commentary on Ladd and Stipek

Clancy Blair, PhD

Pennsylvania State University, USA

June 2009, 2e éd.

School Transitions/School Readiness: An Outcome of Early Childhood Development. Commentary on Ladd

Introduction

The theoretical and empirical work of the *Pathways Project*, as outlined by Gary Ladd, has many strengths. The longitudinal design and careful attention to the measurement of multiple influences on child functioning within the context of the school environment create a strong methodological foundation for the Project's findings, enhancing confidence that these findings provide valid and useful information on school transition. Overall, the strength of the *Pathways Project* lies perhaps in its explicit focus on relationships and the holistic perspective on school success and child functioning within school that this focus entails. The Project clearly indicates that one or two indicators of adjustment alone cannot tell the whole story of a child's success or difficulty in school transition. This is a crucial point. By situating children within their contexts, the Project eschews *main effects* conclusions in favour of meaningful, theoretically driven examinations of child characteristics within classrooms and classroom effects on children in the presence of distinct child characteristics.

Research and Conclusions

The longitudinal perspective of the Project allows for examinations of antecedent-consequence linkages between the early aspects of adjustment and later success or difficulty in school. These linkages are vitally important when making inferences about particular child characteristics or configurations of characteristics. The longitudinal perspective also allows for some estimation regarding the stability of particular individual characteristics associated with risk for subsequent adjustment problems. For example, higher levels of internalizing or externalizing behaviours may predispose an individual to risk, but how stable are these behaviours over time? What characteristics in children, homes, classrooms, and schools are associated with stability or change? These are but a few of the important questions that have been or will be addressed by

Ladd and his colleagues in their research. Most impressive in this research is the presence of both variable-oriented and person-oriented approaches in illustrating conclusions. In a variable-oriented approach, support for an additive child by environment model was found. That is, aggressive tendencies among children increased the risk for poor school adjustment in the presence of chronic peer rejection and adversity. In the presence of persistently supportive peer relations, however, the risk for poor school adjustment associated with aggressive tendencies among children was reduced. This finding was born out by a person-oriented analysis in which a number of variables characterizing relationship histories were used to categorize aggressive children as having persistently supportive or adversarial peer relations. Children with a net balance of variables in favour of support were found to more successfully adjust to school.

Although Ladd's research is generally very strong, the theoretical basis for his focus on relationships and on social behaviour as important components of school adjustment remains limited. Moreover, while his approach to child functioning is valid and useful, it lacks a clear theoretical and empirical statement as to how relationships and social development are related to academic achievement within school. It is almost as if, in a reaction to more traditional cognitive approaches to school adjustment, aspects of attention, memory, and cognitive self-regulation have been left out of the picture. But surely the focus on relationships should encompass these cognitive skills, since school adjustment must be mediated to some extent through them.

In sum, Ladd's foundational research provides a focus that is conducive to advancing a variety of questions about the interface between cognition and emotion in children's transition to school. Ladd's research remains firmly grounded at the psychological level of explanation while encouraging us to examine neurological and molecular analyses. It also embraces school and community influences as the social foundations of school adjustment intersect the cognitive aspects of engagement and achievement.¹ Indeed, the influence of early experience on subsequent school adjustment is likely to be critical. But the approach proposed by Ladd and his colleagues pays too little attention to the first 4-5 years of a child's life preceding school transition. Certainly, no one program of research can do it all. Ladd's work is no exception and remains to be informed by literature on early childhood experience and the wide variation in social and cognitive functioning that children bring to school.

School Entry Age. Commentary on Stipek

Introduction

In counterpoint to Ladd's explication of the Pathways Project, Stipek's review situates the discussion of school transition within a key question around which multiple issues may be addressed. At what age are children ready to enter school?

Research and Conclusions

In reviewing the relevant literature, Stipek makes clear that the current cross-sectional approaches to the relation between age at entry on one hand and school outcome on the other have been very limited in scope and have yielded little of substantive interest to inform our understanding of children's success or difficulty in the transition to school. If anything, the literature on age at entry has produced the very intriguing finding that school drives cognitive growth in particular areas. This result has considerable implications for understanding cognitive development and the relation of schooling to intelligence. However, a major limitation of the review (and perhaps of age at entry literature in general) is the absence of data regarding the effect that age at entry may have on children's social development. Given Ladd's clear demonstration of the relation between social processes and school transition, the effect that early entry into school may have on school transition through social developmental processes would seem to be very meaningful. Nevertheless, as is more likely the case (and as Stipek makes clear), age at entry is really a poor marker for variables relevant to the transition to school. As noted by Stipek in her conclusion, the relevant questions about school transition concern the antecedents and determinants of skills and abilities that will foster the early adjustment process. The age at entry findings really have little to say about this important aspect of school transition.

Stipek's brief review of the age at entry literature makes the very useful point that we must look at the development of foundational thinking skills prior to school entry. However, the review limits its focus to the cognitive implications of the age at entry question. Certainly, being the youngest or oldest in an entering kindergarten class has implications for peer relations and for teacher expectations. Although these areas may not have been previously addressed in the age at entry literature, there are substantial bodies of literature on each that are relevant to the age at entry question and pertinent to the examination of the effect of age of entry on school achievement and adjustment.²

Future research should include a longitudinal perspective on the question along with further consideration of age at entry literature that takes into account the methodological strengths and weaknesses of individual studies. Such research would provide the basis for greater accuracy in

assessing the limited utility of age at entry findings when formulating policy regarding children's adjustment to school.

Implications for Development and Policy Perspectives

The authors' discussions regarding the policy implications of the empirical work they have reviewed are very much to the point. Stipek is correct in her assessment that age at entry is simply not useful for formulating policy regarding school transition. However, whereas age at entry is not a useful measure, early introduction to "school" (ie, early educational daycare) is a clearly important predictor of subsequent school adjustment among children at risk for school failure. This point constitutes a primary policy implication that both Stipek and Ladd allude to in their articles.

Research on school transition and adjustment is increasingly clear regarding which aspects of child functioning are relevant to successful transitions. Social skills and relationships, along with key cognitive skills and abilities in early literacy, numeracy, and metacognitive ability, are the childhood characteristics upon which successful transitions are built. Policy should therefore be directed at enhancing preschool and early school experiences that build upon these empirically validated aspects of functioning. Issues must be addressed regarding teacher training, service delivery for needy families and children in disadvantaged circumstances, and the establishment of consistent care environments that provide children with the social and cognitive stepping stones to enhance school transition. In addition, a system for ensuring the quality and utility of these services is needed.

Those interested in developing and evaluating the efficacy and effectiveness of programs that promote successful school transitions will be faced with the sizeable dilemma of implementation. In discussing the policy implications of his review, Ladd focuses on programs to be implemented during the early school transition years. He makes a number of excellent suggestions regarding ways in which environments to promote successful transitions might be structured. However, implicit in Ladd's proposals is the knowledge that services delivered only in preschool or only during the early school grades are likely not, in themselves, sufficient to enhance transitions for children at risk for school failure. Therefore, integrated preschool- and school-age services, enacted by agencies and service systems in many communities that may have limited interaction, are needed. Thus, perhaps the most pressing policy need and implication in the review is the need to coordinate pre- and post-preschool services to maximize success among children as they enter

school.

References

1. Blair C. School readiness: Integrating cognition and emotion in a neurobiological conceptualization of children's functioning at school entry. *American Psychologist* 2002;57(2):111-127.
2. Hamre BK, Pianta RC. Early teacher-child relationships and the trajectory of children's school outcomes through eighth grade. *Child Development* 2001;72(2): 625-638.

School Transitions/School Readiness: An Outcome of Early Childhood Development. Commentary on Ladd and Stipek

Martha J. Cox, PhD

Center for Developmental Science & University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, USA

June 2009, 2e éd.

Introduction

In current western culture, the five-to-seven age group is a culturally mandated point at which children make the transition from spending time exclusively in the family and perhaps in an intimate daycare setting to spending significant time in the larger, less intimate context of the public school.¹ This transition provides a challenge to the child and the family, in that new behaviours and skills are usually required in this new setting. Some children are able to make this transition well, behaving skilfully with peers, interacting well with teachers in these new social settings and appearing generally well adjusted, all of which predict success during the elementary school years.² Other children do not make the transition as easily. Ladd and Stipek discuss research findings relevant to understanding this transition. Ladd details research that he and his colleagues have conducted pertinent to understanding the processes that influence children's adjustment as they begin kindergarten at age five. Stipek summarizes research on the age of school entry as a practice that supports or hinders adjustment for children in the transition to kindergarten.

School Transitions/School Readiness: An Outcome of Early Childhood Development. Commentary on Ladd

Research and Conclusions

In considering the conclusions that Ladd and Stipek reach, it is important to consider first the quality of the work. Conclusions reached from poorly conducted research necessarily should have less impact on practice and policy than conclusions reached from excellent research.

Ladd's work represents conceptual as well as methodological excellence. On the conceptual level, the consideration of multiple levels of factors that may "transact" in forming different pathways of

school progress for different children moves our knowledge beyond the “main effect” models of development that conceptualize each influence as making an independent contribution. A limited main effect model characterizes much of the research on early school adjustment. The broader model that Ladd uses incorporates the holistic, contextual, ecological and transactional views of leading developmentalists such as Magnusson, Bronfenbrenner and Sameroff. It provides information about the processes and the interaction between factors that lead to children having school difficulties versus making a smooth adjustment to school.

Methodologically, Ladd’s work also breaks new ground. The definition of success in school goes beyond the child’s score on tests that measure academic progress and includes a broader conceptualization of the child’s adjustment. Thus, a child is seen as successful in school when a positive attitude about school and learning is developed, supportive social ties with teachers and classmates are formed, comfortable and positive emotions are experienced by the child rather than anxiety or loneliness, the child participates and is positively engaged in the classroom, and the child achieves and progresses academically. This broader view of success in school recognizes the whole child and the importance of these relationship, emotional and cognitive attitudinal factors in addition to the child’s academic progress.

I agree with the conclusions Ladd reaches, but find it useful to discuss them in light of the concept of maintenance of behaviour or risk. In understanding the pathways through which children have difficulty in school, it appears that early aggressive or anxious-withdrawn behavioural dispositions make it more likely that children will have difficulty in forming positive peer relationships in school. Greater understanding of difficulties in school adjustment is achieved by considering these factors together, in that it is when more difficult behavioural dispositions lead to chronic difficulties with peers that children show significant increases in psychological and school maladjustment across the early school grades. When the school environment does not maintain the early risk (the child forms positive peer relationships despite the early aggressive or anxious-withdrawn behavioural dispositions), children do not show long-term adjustment difficulties. This notion of maintenance of problems by the school context may be useful as schools tend to see the child and the family as responsible for the child’s behaviour and success, but do not consider how the school context may serve to either maintain or fail to maintain early risk.

Implications

This leads directly to the implications for policy and service. Ladd’s work has important implications for the creation of school contexts that either maintain or fail to maintain early problematic behavioural dispositions and behaviour patterns in children. Ladd’s recommendations addressing these problems are sensible, but focus only on improving dyadic relationships between children. It is very likely that the overall context and atmosphere of the classroom sets the tone for the kind of interactions that occur between children. Classrooms that focus on mutual respect and support may be likely to create the kinds of contexts where victimization and rejection of individual children is less likely. The quality of whole classroom settings should be considered in addition to efforts to improve the relationships between pairs of children.

School Entry Age. Commentary on Stipek

Research and Conclusions

Turning to Stipek’s review, findings from a number of carefully executed studies regarding age of child on entry into school are considered. The review suggests that age of entry into school as a single variable does not explain much about differences in children’s achievement in school. Stipek suggests that research regarding age of entry does not favour either earlier or later school entry as policy. This is another demonstration of the weakness of single-cause explanations for school adjustment. It seems apparent from this research that young children benefit from the school context and make academic gains despite their age of entry. Stipek contends that the emphasis should be placed instead on constructing classroom contexts that maximally support the development of both academic and social skills in children with an understanding that children of all ages are “ready to learn.” This recommendation is consistent with Ladd’s work suggesting that children’s progress in both social and academic realms is important for their adjustment to school, and thus schools must consider the appropriateness of their classrooms for children’s social and academic progress. These two are intimately tied in development, as demonstrated by Ladd’s work.

Implications

Two key implications arise from this work. First, we must more broadly construe the “success” of children in the classroom. Because aspects of development are intimately bound together in the “whole child,” understanding aspects of the child’s social, emotional, attitudinal and academic adjustment is critical. Ladd’s work demonstrates the power of social relationships in thrusting

children with early difficulties on different paths, paths associated with children becoming involved and attached to the school environment versus paths that maintain behavioural difficulties and alienation from the school enterprise. The narrow focus on children's academic skills misses the important progress children must make in adjusting to the classroom. Second, the classroom context is important in either maintaining early risk or thwarting it. Little attention is paid to the quality of classroom environments. Teachers are left to construct their environment as they see fit. Classroom environments must be constructed to meet the needs of the children in the classroom.

References

1. Barth JM, Parke RD. Parent-child relationship influences on children's transition to school. *Merril-Palmer Quarterly* 1993;39(2):173-195.
2. Pianta RC, Rimm-Kaufman SE, Cox MJ. An ecological approach to kindergarten transition. In: Pianta RC, Cox MJ, eds. *The Transition to Kindergarten*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing; 1999:3-12.

Services and Programs that Influence Young Children’s School Transitions

Diane Early, PhD

FPG Child Development Institute, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, USA

June 2009, 2e éd.

Introduction and Subject

Legislators, policy-makers and educators are increasingly focused on school readiness as a key to improving school outcomes for all children. School readiness includes both children’s academic and social skills as they enter school and “ready schools,” meaning the school’s preparedness to serve all children. This emphasis on ready schools naturally focuses attention on the services and programs implemented by schools or teachers that influence young children’s school transitions. Love, Logue, Trudeau and Thayer¹ argue that key ingredients to a successful transition are “activities and events (over and above the preschool and school programs) that are designed to overcome the discontinuities that may disrupt children’s learning and development” (p. 9). Although high-quality experiences prior to the beginning of school and a high-quality elementary education program are critical to child success, some attention must also be given to the discontinuities between settings.

Research Context

Ready schools, according to Pianta, Cox, Taylor and Early², have three characteristics: 1) they reach out, linking families, preschool settings and communities with schools; 2) they reach backward in time, making connections before the first day of school; and 3) they reach with appropriate intensity. Based on this theoretical approach, a rapport should be established among the child, the kindergarten teacher, the pre-kindergarten teacher, peers and the parent *before* the child enters kindergarten. Establishing this positive system of relationships among these social contexts is critical for successful transitions.^{3,4} Relationships serve as resources for children as they enter school by allowing for clear communication, providing a sense of familiarity during the transition and facilitating social competencies.

Problems and Key Research Questions

The key research questions in the area of school transitions fall into three main categories: 1) what types of services and programs are most effective for aiding children as they make this transition? 2) what types of services and programs are currently in use? and 3) how can more effective services and programs become the norm? We have strong theoretical information guiding beliefs about effective transition practices, but little data linking specific practices to child outcomes. There is a stronger research base from which to address the second and third key research issues.

Recent Research Results

Recent research has provided information about what practices teachers are currently using to improve school transitions, obstacles teachers face in implementing more effective practices and possible points of intervention for increasing the use of more effective practices. Pianta et al., using a comprehensive survey representative of U.S. kindergarten teachers, found that whereas almost all teachers reported some practices aimed at facilitating children's transitions into kindergarten, practices that would be most effective, according to the theoretical base – those that reach out, backward in time and with appropriate intensity – are relatively rare. Group-oriented practices occurring after the beginning of the school year (e.g. open houses) were the most common, while practices that involve one-to-one contact with children and families and those occurring prior to the first day of school were rare. Additionally, Pianta et al. found that in urban schools and in areas with more poverty and/or a higher concentration of minority students, individualized practices prior to the beginning of the school year were even less prevalent.

Several obstacles to the use of more effective transition practices have been reported. The most common barriers cited by teachers to implementing additional transition practices were the strain of large class sizes, class lists that are generated too late, practices involving summer work that is not supported by salary, and lack of a transition plan in the district.⁵ When teachers are faced with these obstacles, Early et al. found that optimal transition practices, particularly those that occur before school begins, are challenging to implement. Transition activities before the beginning of the school year require more preparation on the part of the teacher and school (e.g. class lists must be generated, children's and families' phone numbers/addresses must be known) and require either additional funds for teacher pay or unpaid time donated by teachers. Similarly, practices involving individualized interaction with a child or family require more time and planning than practices involving the entire class simultaneously. This is congruent with the finding that teachers with large class sizes were less likely to use transition practices before school began,

probably because of the burden associated with large class sizes. Lastly, communication and coordination with preschool settings (a practice that would sustain on-going relationships and lessen discontinuities) are challenging because they require knowledge of the incoming class and their preschool settings, time and willingness on the part of the preschool programs, and coordination with many different programs.

Strikingly, Early and colleagues found the largest between-group differences in use of transition practices were between teachers who had and had not received training in transitions. Teachers with such training were more likely to use all types of transition practices, apparently seeing some value in approaching transitions from a variety of angles. They started before the beginning of the school year, creating a longer transition period. They made efforts to use individualized practices, as well as group-oriented events. They involved the child's preschool setting – using the information provided by that setting and coordinating curricula and goals with that setting. Few teachers have such training, but these data indicate that it may be valuable in encouraging more comprehensive transition practices.

Conclusions

How children adapt to their earliest school experiences has long-term implications for cognitive and social development and for dropping out of high school.^{6,7,8} With this in mind, attention is appropriately focused on optimizing children's transitions to school.

Optimal transitions to school are best supported by practices that are individualized and engage the child, family and preschool setting prior to the first day of school. Practices that establish and foster relationships among important individuals in the child's life are likely to reap the most benefit for the child. Unfortunately, current research on the status of school transition practices shows that these optimal transition strategies are not widely practiced. High-intensity practices are the most time-consuming and least likely to be used by early elementary teachers.

Administrative and structural barriers, such as low teacher pay, large class sizes and poor district coordination, suggest that schools may not be "ready" for kindergarteners. Encouragingly, teachers who have training in transitions are more likely to use all types of transition.

Data are lacking that link specific transition practices to children's outcomes, but the strong theoretical base in this area allows for useful recommendations to teachers and schools as they work to improve transitions for all children.

Implications

Current research points to several avenues for improving transitions for young children. First, schools need to focus on systematic transition planning for children. Plans need to be coordinated, flexible, individualized and pay particular attention to helping children and families form relationships with schools and peers.

Second, schools and communities need to focus on issues of timing to ensure that the transition process begins well before the first day of school. This ensures that there is sufficient time for key relationships to form and that there is continuity between the home or preschool environments and the school. System-level changes, such as paying for teachers to work during the summer, generating class lists early, smaller class sizes and holding events at school prior to the first day of class, can help to create a transition process rather than a transition event.

Last, there is evidence that teacher training in transition practices leads to increased use of transition practices of all types. Thus, providing pre-service and in-service training in this area may help teachers create plans for children and families that aid in helping children succeed during this transition.

References

1. Love JM, Logue ME, Trudeau JV, Thayer K. *Transitions to Kindergarten in American schools*. Portsmouth, NH: U.S. Department of Education; 1992. Contract No. LC 88089001.
2. Pianta RC, Cox MJ, Taylor L, Early D. Kindergarten teachers' practices related to transition into schools: Results of a national survey. *Elementary School Journal* 1999;100(1):71-86.
3. Kraft-Sayre ME, Pianta RC. *Enhancing the transition to kindergarten, Linking children, families and school*. Charlottesville, Va.: University of Virginia, National Center for Early Development and Learning; 2000.
4. Rimm-Kaufman SE, Pianta RC. An ecological perspective on the transition to kindergarten: A theoretical framework to guide empirical research. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology* 2000;21(5):491-511.
5. Early DM, Pianta RC, Taylor LC, Cox MJ. Transition practices: Findings from a national survey of kindergarten teachers. *Early Childhood Education Journal* 2001;28(3):199-206.
6. Alexander KL, Entwisle DR. Achievement in the first 2 years of school: Patterns and processes. *Monographs of the Society for Child Development* 1988;53(2).
7. Alexander KL, Entwisle DR, Horsey, C.S. From first grade forward: Early foundations of high school dropout. *Sociology of Education* 1997;70(2):87-107.
8. Ensminger ME, Slusarcick AL. Paths to high school graduation or dropout: A longitudinal study of a first-grade cohort. *Sociology of Education* 1992;65(2):95-113.

Transitions Begin Early

John M. Love, PhD, Helen H. Raikes, PhD

Mathematica Policy Research, USA, The Gallup Organization/University of Nebraska-Lincoln, USA^a
June 2009, 2e éd.

Introduction

It is common for policy-makers to think of preschool-to-school transitions as the experiences children have between the end of their preschool or pre-kindergarten year and entrance into kindergarten. However, evidence is accumulating that interventions earlier in life (in the first three years) contribute to enhanced development in ways that are consistent with improving children's chances for a successful transition. In addition to the specific *services* supporting continuity that Early,¹ Pianta et al.,² and others³ have described, children need the benefits of quality early childhood *programs*.

Subject

In this paper, we first describe the developmental qualities that are important for a successful transition to school, and then show how quality infant-toddler programs contribute to those features of children's early development and learning.

Research Context

What is important for successful preschool-to-school transitions?

When the National Education Goals Panel defined the first education goal in the United States, the Goal One Technical Planning Group broke new ground by defining not only what the important dimensions of "readiness" are, but also what conditions are critical for supporting those dimensions.⁴ The five dimensions of early development and learning (physical and motor development, social and emotional development, approaches toward learning, language, and cognition and general knowledge) have become widely accepted, in one form or another. The three supporting conditions identified include having access to quality preschool programs, parents as children's first teachers, and appropriate nutrition and health care. Good-quality infant-toddler programs have been shown to be effective in changing the environments babies

experience in the early years in ways consistent with these supporting conditions, enhancing children's development.

Recent Research Results

What do effective infant-toddler programs contribute?

Between 1972 and 1977, the Carolina Abecedarian Project enrolled 120 “high-risk” African-American families in four cohorts. From these, 111 children were randomly assigned to the program, which included full-time child care beginning in the first three months of life, or to a control group. Families and children continued receiving services until the children reached the age of five. The program, which also provided social supports for families, was highly successful in improving children’s cognitive development relative to the control group, with significant differences at 18, 24 and 36 months of age.^{5,6} Follow-up studies showed that program effects persisted at every assessment point through 16 to 20 years of age.

The Infant Health and Development Program (IHDP) combined home visiting, centre-based education and family services to low-birthweight premature infants and their families during the first three years of life. At age three, the program group scored significantly higher on the Stanford Binet test of intelligence and lower in behaviour problems. The heavier low-birthweight infants benefited more at ages two and three than did the very low-birthweight children.⁷ Effects were sustained through age eight for the heavier low-birthweight children.⁸

The Comprehensive Child Development Program (CCDP) was implemented as a demonstration program in 24 highly diverse sites in 1989 and 1990. Programs featured intensive social services and parent education, although direct child development services and program-sponsored child care were far less intensive than in the IHDP and Abecedarian programs. When children were two years old, the national evaluation found that CCDPs significantly improved (1) mothers’ parenting skills and attitudes; (2) parents’ economic self-sufficiency; and (3) children’s cognitive development. However, these effects largely disappeared by age three and were absent at age five.⁹

The national evaluation of the federal Early Head Start program¹⁰ found that this two-generation intervention benefited two- and three-year-old children (when contrasted with their randomly assigned control group) along a number of important dimensions: cognitive development,

vocabulary and social behaviour (reduced aggressive behaviour problems, increased engagement of parents and higher sustained attention with objects in a play situation). The program also made important changes in the children's environments or the conditions supporting development. These included changing parenting practices so that Early Head Start parents provided more supports for learning and literacy in their home environments and were more likely to read to their children every day.

The Early Head Start intervention also improved children's environments by increasing access to good-quality child care.¹¹ By ages 14 and 24 months, for example, Early Head Start children were almost three times as likely to be in *good-quality* centre child care as their control-group counterparts. Program children were also 50% more likely to be in good-quality centre settings at 36 months.

Conclusions

Do children from good infant-toddler programs have a head start?

Unfortunately, there is not a great deal of evidence that these positive effects from infant-toddler programs will translate into greater success when the children reach school age. The Abecedarian and IHDP results suggest this outcome, but were implemented only within two special populations (African-American children and low-birthweight babies, respectively). However, the Early Head Start evaluation demonstrated significant impacts across the full range of developmental domains thought to be important for success in school according to the National Education Goals Panel.⁴ If children's experiences upon leaving Early Head Start, between ages three and five, maintain Early Head Start's benefits, these children will indeed be shown to have an early "head start" toward a successful transition to school.

Implications

Parents, teachers, program managers and policy-makers need to think about the transition process beginning in the first years of life in order to build the foundations for future success in school. Further research is needed to understand this process in more detail.

References

1. Early D. Services and programs that influence young children's school transitions. In: Tremblay RE, Barr RG, Peters RDeV, eds. *Encyclopedia on Early Childhood Development* [online]. Montreal, Quebec: Centre of Excellence for Early Childhood Development; 2004:1-5. Available at: <http://www.child-encyclopedia.com/documents/EarlyANGxp.pdf>. Accessed November

8, 2004.

2. Pianta RC, Cox MJ, Taylor L, Early D. Kindergarten teachers' practices related to the transition to school: Results of a national survey. *Elementary School Journal* 1999;100(1):71-86.
3. Love JM, Logue ME, Trudeau J, Thayer K. *Transitions to kindergarten in American schools: Final report of the National Transition Study : Report submitted to U.S. Department of Education* . Portsmouth, NH: RMC Research Corporation; 1992.
4. Kagan SL, Moore E, Bredekamp S, eds. *Reconsidering children's early development and learning: toward common views and vocabulary* . Washington, DC: National Education Goals Panel; 1995.
5. Campbell FA, Ramey CT. Effects of early intervention on intellectual and academic achievement: A follow-up study of children from low-income families. *Child Development* 1994;65(2):684-698.
6. Ramey CT, Campbell FA. Poverty, early childhood education, and academic competence: The Abecedarian experiment. In: Huston AC, ed. *Children in poverty: Child development and public policy* . New York, NY: Cambridge University Press; 1994:190-221.
7. Brooks-Gunn J, Klebanov PK, Liaw F, Spiker D. Enhancing the development of low-birthweight, premature infants: Changes in cognition and behavior over the first three years. *Child Development* 1993;64(3):736-753.
8. McCarton CM, Brooks-Gunn J, Wallace IF, Bauer CR, Bennet FC, Bernbaum JC, Broyles RS, Casey PH, McCormick MC, Scott DT, Tyson J, Tonascia J, Meinert CL. Results at age 8 years of early intervention for low-birth-weight premature infants: The Infant Health and Development Program. *JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association* 1997;277(2):126-132.
9. St. Pierre RG, Layzer JI, Goodson BD, Bernstein LS. *National impact evaluation of the Comprehensive Child Development Program: Final report* . Cambridge, Mass: Abt Associates Inc; 1997. Available at: <http://www.abtassociates.com/reports/D19970050.pdf>. Accessed November 8, 2004.
10. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. *Making a difference in the lives of infants and toddlers and their families: The impacts of Early Head Start* . Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; 2002. Available at: <http://www.mathematica-mpr.com/earlycare/ehstoc.asp>. Accessed November 8, 2004.
11. Love JM, Constantine J, Paulsell D, Boller K, Ross C, Raikes H, Brady-Smith C, Brooks-Gunn J. *The role of Early Head Start Programs in addressing the child care needs of low-income families with infants and toddlers: Influences on child care use and quality* . Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; 2004. Available at: <http://www.headstartinfo.org/pdf/ChildCare.pdf>. Accessed November 8, 2004.

Note:

^a Raikes was Society for Research in Child Development Fellow, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, during the Early Head Start Research and Evaluation Project.

Role of Early Childhood Education Intervention Programs in Assisting Children With Successful Transitions to School

Nicholas Zill, PhD, Gary Resnick, PhD

Child and Family Studies, Westat, USA

June 2009, 2e éd.

Introduction

The transition between early childhood and elementary school is widely considered a crucial period in children's development.¹ Early childhood education programs are valuable interventions to assist children in developing appropriate school-readiness skills to facilitate the transition to formal schooling. Some of these programs are targeted at disadvantaged children while others are provided for all children. There are important questions concerning the benefits of early childhood education programs for assisting children's transition to formal schooling and the level of quality required to produce these benefits.

Subject

Many reading specialists believe that early skills in reading and writing are essential precursors to later success at learning to read, and becoming a fluent reader is central to academic achievement in elementary school and beyond. Prior to kindergarten, the majority of kindergartners today have had at least one experience in out-of-home group care environments, which vary from centre-based classroom settings, operating either full-time or part-time, to private family daycare homes.^{2,3} Some programs are universally provided in states or provinces while others are targeted at needy children and their families. Variations in children's emergent literacy skills when they enter kindergarten may be related to the types of programs they experienced prior to entry. Centre-based early childhood learning environments may be beneficial for the development of all children, but especially for those from higher-risk family environments.⁴

Problems

School readiness is a multi-faceted phenomenon comprising development in the physical/health, social and emotional domains, as well as language acquisition, literacy and cognition.⁵ New

perspectives on school readiness recognize that schools also need to be ready to meet the varied needs of children and their families.⁶ Several demographic trends within the past decade may account for the proliferation of early childhood education programs, particularly those targeted at low-income families. More families are now living at or below the poverty line, come from minority groups and are less likely to be two-parent households. There is substantial evidence that low-income families provide less intellectual stimulation to their young children compared with higher-income families.^{6,7}

Research Context

Most studies employ longitudinal designs, in which samples of children are followed from early childhood through first or second grade. To help separate the effects of early education programs from the normal increase in skills that comes with children's maturation, some studies randomly assign children to participate in a preschool program and assign other children to a control group that does not receive the program in question. This procedure compensates for possible biases that may be introduced when program participation is left wholly up to parents or program administrators. Families that choose to have their children take part in one kind of early education program usually differ in important ways from families that select other kinds of programs or no program at all. Factors related to parents' selection of an early childhood education program may well influence children's outcomes. Along with the lack of adequate controls for selection factors, many studies do not include a representative sample of parents, thereby reducing the generalizability of the results. Finally, studies have primarily looked at the role of centre-based early childhood education programs, but have not adequately included other forms of non-parental care, such as family child care.

Child outcomes for most studies are based on direct assessment of the children before program entry and then at either program exit or at regular time intervals using age cohorts of children. Follow-up involves testing the same children either at kindergarten entry or in the spring of their kindergarten year. Most child assessments consist of a variety of tests of verbal, quantitative or psychomotor skills that can be compared to scores from a larger population of children or based on criteria for what children should know at different ages. It is desirable for tests to have sound measurement properties, be easily administered and scored, and have been used in previous large-scale studies.

An important distinction in comparing research studies is whether the programs under investigation are expensive, small, targeted research and demonstration efforts, or whether the evaluations involve large-scale, government-funded, community-based programs. Many of the known effects of early childhood education programs may be attributed to the intensity and control available in model programs. In the few long-term studies that compared model programs with large-scale public programs, model programs were found to be more effective.⁸

Key Research Questions

The most important research question is whether early childhood education programs are effective at preparing children for entry into formal schooling. Related but still critical questions include whether the quality of the preschool program contributes to children’s school readiness, the factors that make a difference in producing a higher-quality program, and the key quality ingredients, such as curricula. Some curricula focus more on instructional activities, such as teaching children letters and numbers, while others encourage more play-oriented and discovery-learning activities and still others focus on whole-language and language-rich environments. Finally, the underlying mechanisms in which children’s program participation is linked to improved outcomes are not fully known, although direct instruction, socialization experiences and increased involvement of parents in their child’s education have been strongly implicated.

The benefits of early childhood education programs for disadvantaged children have been reported in studies of the United States’ Head Start program, which is designed to bring these children closer to their middle-class peers upon entry to formal schooling. While studies found that Head Start produced immediate, meaningful gains in cognitive development, social behaviour, achievement motivation and health status, some gains appeared to fade over time. However, the validity of the “fade out” effect has been challenged for weaknesses in research methods, such as selective loss of test scores for children in the comparison group who have been retained in grade.⁸

Recent Research Results

In general, high-quality more intensive centre-based programs have shown the strongest and most consistent effects.^{8,9} Randomized, controlled trials of high-quality programs have yielded significant benefits for children, often extending through adolescence and into young adulthood.^{10,11} There is a strong body of research pointing to the importance of early, intensive language and literacy instruction in a language-rich environment that spans developmental domains and that

focuses on both expressive and receptive vocabulary, literacy and numeracy.¹² Early childhood education programs that also provide family support services appear to improve both child and family outcomes.^{13,14} However, it would appear that no single curriculum model or philosophy stands out as the most successful prototype of early childhood interventions.¹⁵

Some studies that have included measures of children's social development reported that children in high-quality preschool settings showed higher levels of peer engagement, positive relationships with teachers, more frequent pretend play and secure attachment.¹⁶ Other research has shown that Head Start produced immediate positive gains in social behaviour and achievement motivation^{17,18} as well as growth in social skills and reductions in hyperactive behaviour.²⁶

The contribution of quality in early childhood education classrooms to raising children's school readiness is significant but relatively modest.¹⁹ High quality in community child-care settings has been related to better child outcomes in the short term, after controlling for child and family background factors.^{2,20,21,22} There have also been some notable exceptions in which quality was not related to children's developmental outcomes,²³ but this finding could be due to small samples of classrooms, a relatively restricted range of quality across centres in the study, or both.²⁴ Recently, there has been promising evidence that, despite some modest immediate effects for quality, there are long-term effects that extend into the second grade, and that these effects are strongest for children living in the most at-risk family backgrounds.²⁴

Results from the Head Start Family and Child Experiences Survey (FACES) show that children from disadvantaged families do make gains in Head Start, and that the quality of the Head Start programs in general is higher than other centre-based preschool programs.^{25,26} Although Head Start children make gains, particularly in vocabulary and early writing skills, they still trail their peers nationally when they leave the program. Higher teacher salaries, use of an integrated, developmentally appropriate curriculum such as High/Scope, higher teacher educational qualifications and full-day programming were factors linked to these gains.²⁶

In general, the majority of studies that have looked at age of entry (three vs. four years of age) and duration (one vs. two years of the program) find that starting an intervention program earlier is better for children, and that children with longer exposure also do better.²⁷ Although one recent study reported no effects from two years compared to one year of the intervention on reading and mathematics achievement in grades one to three,²⁸ recent results from a national probability sample of Head Start children revealed that children who spent two years in the program showed

stronger gains and higher scores at graduation, compared with those who spent one year.²⁹

Conclusions

In general, there is sufficient evidence from both model demonstration programs and large-scale studies to suggest that early childhood education can assist children to enter school ready to learn. While studies of model programs show greater effects than do those of publicly-funded, large-scale programs, there is still evidence that these latter programs are beneficial, particularly for children from disadvantaged families. However, early childhood programs also boost the achievement of children from more advantaged families. The evidence also supports the importance of quality in early childhood education programs, the use of better-qualified teachers, and full-day programs where children enroll at younger ages and stay in the program longer. Finally, the methodological strengths and weaknesses of studies in research design, sampling and measurement are often related to the strength of the reported findings.

Implications

With the increased participation of all families in early childhood education programs, rivalling the move of families a decade ago towards greater use of kindergarten, it appears that “all boats are lifted,” that is, children from both advantaged and disadvantaged families benefit. Despite greatly expanded investment in preschool programs, the achievement gap between advantaged and disadvantaged children remains. Although the benefits of early childhood education programs may last beyond initial entry into formal schooling, to obtain similar results, programs must be of high quality and focused on didactic learning activities, such as teaching children letters and numbers, while encouraging play-oriented and discovery-learning activities in a language-rich and emotionally-supportive environment. Efforts to improve early childhood education programs should encourage the use of an integrated curriculum, bolstering program quality through adding resources to lower-quality programs and upgrading teacher training and qualifications.

References

1. Pianta RC, Rimm-Kauffman SE, Cox MJ. Introduction: An ecological approach to kindergarten transition. In: Pianta RC, Cox MJ, eds. *The transition to kindergarten*. Baltimore, Md: Paul H. Brookes Publishing; 1999:3-12.
2. Zill N, Collins M, West J, Hausken EG. *Approaching kindergarten: A look at preschoolers in the United States*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Center for Education Statistics, National Household Education Survey; 1995. NCES 95-280. Available at: <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs95/95280.pdf>. Accessed November 30, 2004.

3. Hofferth SL, Shauman KA, Henke RR, West J. *Characteristics of children's early care and education programs: Data from the 1995 National Household Education Survey*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Center for Education Statistics; 1998. NCES 98-128. Available at: <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs98/98128.pdf>. Accessed November 30, 2004.
4. NICHD Early Child Care Research Network (ECCRN). The relation of child care to cognitive and language development. *Child Development* 2000;71(4):960-980.
5. Goal One Technical Planning Group. The Goal One Technical Planning Subgroup report on school readiness. In: National Education Goals Panel, ed. *Potential strategies for long-term indicator development: Reports of the technical planning subgroups*. Washington, DC: National Education Goals Panel; 1991:1-18. Report no. 91-0.
6. Zill N, Moore KA, Smith EW, Stief T, Coiro MJ. The life circumstances and development of children in welfare families: A profile based on national survey data. In: Chase-Lansdale PL, Brooks-Gunn J, eds. *Escape from poverty: What makes a difference for poor children?* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press; 1995:38-59.
7. Dickinson DK, Tabors PO, eds. *Beginning literacy with language: Young children learning at home and school*. Baltimore, Md: Paul H. Brookes Publishing; 2001.
8. Barnett WS. Long-term effects on cognitive development and school success. In: Barnett WS, Boocock SS, eds. *Early Care and Education for Children in Poverty: Promises, programs, and long-term results*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press; 1998:11-44.
9. Burchinal MR, Roberts JE, Nabors LA, Bryant DM. Quality of center child care and infant cognitive and language development. *Child Development* 1996;67(2):606-620.
10. Campbell FA, Ramey CT. Effects of early intervention on intellectual and academic achievement: A follow-up study of children from low-income families. *Child Development* 1994;65(2):684-698.
11. Schweinhart LJ, Barnes HV, Weikart DP. *Significant benefits: The High/Scope Perry Preschool Study through age 27*. Ypsilanti, Mich: High/Scope Press; 1993.
12. Whitehurst GJ, Lonigan CJ. Child development and emergent literacy. *Child Development* 1998;69(3):848-872.
13. Seitz, V. Intervention programs for impoverished children: A comparison of educational and family support models. In: Vasta R, ed. *Annals of Child Development: A research annual*. Vol. 7. Philadelphia, Pa: Jessica Kingsley Publishers; 1990:73-103.
14. Halpern R. Community-based early intervention. In: Meisels SJ, Shonkoff JP, eds. *Handbook of early childhood intervention*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press; 1990:469-498.
15. Reynolds AJ, Mann E, Meidel W, Smokowski P. The state of early child intervention: Effectiveness, myths and realities, new directions. *Focus* 1997;19(1):5-11.
16. Howes C, Phillips DA, Whitebook M. Thresholds of quality: Implications for the social development of children in center-based care. *Child Development* 1992;63(2):449-460.
17. Love J, Ryer P, Faddis B. *Caring environments: Program quality in California's publicly funded child development programs*. Portsmouth, NH: RMC Research Corporation; 1992.
18. McKey RH, Condelli L, Ganson H, Barrett BJ, McConkey C, Plantz MC. *The impact of Head Start on children, families and communities. Final report of the Head Start evaluation, synthesis and utilization project*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; 1985. (Contract No. 105-81-C-026).
19. Peisner-Feinberg ES, Burchinal MR. Relations between preschool children's child-care experiences and concurrent development: The Cost, Quality, and Outcomes Study. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly* 1997;43(3):451-477.
20. Bryant DM, Burchinal M, Lau LB, Sparling JJ. Family and classroom correlates of Head Start children's developmental outcomes. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* 1994;9(3-4):289-304.

21. Phillips D, McCartney K, Scarr S. Child care quality and children's social development. *Developmental Psychology* 1987;23(4):537-543.
22. Whitebook M, Howes C, Phillips D. *Who Cares? Child care teachers and the quality of care in America: Final report of the National Child Care Staffing Study*. Berkeley, Calif: Child Care Employee Project; 1989. Available at: <http://www.ccw.org/pubs/whocares.pdf>. Accessed November 30, 2004.
23. Kontos S, Fiene R. Child care quality: Compliance with regulations and children's development: The Pennsylvania Study. In: Phillips DA, ed. *Quality in child care: What does research tell us?* Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children; 1987:57-59.
24. Peisner-Feinberg ES, Burchinal MR, Clifford RM, Culkin ML, Howes C, Kagan SL, Yazejian N. The relation of preschool child-care quality to children's cognitive and social developmental trajectories through second grade. *Child Development* 2001;72(5):1534-1553.
25. Zill N, Resnick G, Kim K, McKey RH, Clark C, Pai-Samant S, Connell D, Vaden-Kiernan M, O'Brien R, D'Elio MA. *Head Start FACES: Longitudinal findings on program performance. Third progress report*. Washington, DC: Administration on Children, Youth and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; 2001. Available at: http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/hs/faces/reports/perform_3rd_rpt/perform_3rd_rpt.pdf. Accessed February 1, 2005.
26. Zill N, Resnick G, Kim K, O'Donnell K, Sorongon A, McKey RH, Pai-Samant S, Clark C, O'Brien R, D'Elio MA. *Head Start FACES 2000: A whole child perspective on program performance*. Washington, DC: Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; 2003. Available at: http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/hs/faces/reports/faces00_4thprogress/faces00_4thprogress.pdf. Accessed February 1, 2005.
27. White KR. Efficacy of early intervention. *Journal of Special Education* 1985-1986;19(4):401-416.
28. Reynolds AJ. One year of preschool intervention or two: Does it matter? *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* 1995;10(1):1-31.
29. Zill N, Resnick G. Emergent literacy of low-income children in Head Start: Relationships with child and family characteristics, program factors and classroom quality. In: Dickinson D, Neuman SB., eds. *Handbook of Early Literacy Research*. Vol. II; 2005. Guilford Press. In Press.

School Readiness: Preparing Children for the Transition from Preschool to Grade School. Comments on Love and Raikes, Zill and Resnick, and Early

Gary W. Ladd, PhD

Arizona State University, USA

June 2009, 2e éd.

Introduction

How can we help infants, toddlers and preschoolers get ready for the challenges of grade school and make satisfactory progress during the early years of formal schooling? Although interest in this question dates back more than 30 years to the inception of compensatory early childhood programs (e.g. Head Start), its importance has grown in recent years as accumulating evidence has revealed that children's performance during the primary school years (Kindergarten through Grade 3) has an important bearing on their later success in school and in life.¹ Consequently, understanding how young children are best prepared to enter and succeed in grade school has become a priority among parents, educators, legislators and researchers.

To a large extent, contemporary efforts to address this agenda have been guided by the concept of "school readiness." As many researchers, practitioners, and policy-makers have defined it, school readiness implies that by the time children enter grade school (Kindergarten), they have achieved a level of development that makes it likely that they will successfully adapt to the challenges of formal schooling. Whether intended or not, this concept implies that an important objective for the early childhood years is to ensure that young children achieve a state of "readiness" before they enter grade school. In practice, however, this objective has proven difficult to achieve. Every year, large numbers of children have difficulty adapting to grade school, and these data make it clear that there is considerable variation in the extent to which young children are prepared for formal schooling. Most often, deviations from this implied norm are attributed to differences in children's rearing conditions (e.g. poverty, violence in the community or home, inadequate or dysfunctional socialization), health (developmental delays, disabilities, injuries, chronic illness), inherited characteristics (e.g. ability, temperament, personality), and

various combinations of these factors.

Each of the articles that accompany this commentary represents an attempt to identify, from extant lines of investigation, certain aspects of young children's development and socialization that may be crucial to the promotion of school readiness (e.g. social, language, literacy development) and some of the processes that appear to promote specific forms of preparedness (e.g. infant and toddler programs, early childhood curricula, parenting practices, etc.). Because these investigators work from different theoretical perspectives and focus on different child attributes and socialization experiences, the evidence they review is diverse and speaks to a number of factors that may affect children's success in grade school.

Research and Conclusions

Love and Raikes describe qualities of young children's development that, according to the National Education Goals Panel, constitute "readiness" dimensions. They also review evidence that reflects on the effectiveness of early interventions (infant and toddler programs) as a strategy for promoting school readiness. Five dimensions were cited as important facets of readiness: children's physical and motor development, social and emotional development, learning, language, and cognitive development. In addition to these dimensions, three supporting conditions were recognized: children's participation in high quality preschool programs, socialization by parents (as first teachers), and receipt of adequate nutrition and health care. These goals were accompanied by an analysis of the role that *early* intervention and demonstration programs, primarily those developed and tested with infants and toddlers, play in promoting the focal readiness dimensions. Findings were reviewed for four exemplary interventions: the Carolina Abecedarian Project (CAP), the Infant Health and Development Program (IHDP), the Comprehensive Child Development Program (CCDP), and the national evaluation of Early Head Start (EHS). Results from the CAP were used to illustrate the effectiveness of early program participation on children's cognitive development. Children assigned to this program, unlike controls, participated from the first months of life until age five, and manifested significant gains in cognitive development, starting as early as the toddler and preschool years. Similarly, results from the IHDP were presented as evidence of the effects of early intervention on children's intelligence. Data gathered on the CCDP were used to show that a comprehensive family service program could generate gains of a temporary nature on more than one criterion. This program yielded initial improvements in children's cognitive development as well as in certain supporting conditions, such as mother's child-rearing skills and parents'

economic status. Unfortunately, these improvements had disappeared by the time children entered grade school. Of all the program effects that were reviewed, those from the EHS evaluation were among the most impressive because they implied that the intervention not only contributed to several aspects of young children's (two- and three-year olds) readiness, but also increased the quality of the conditions that support growth in readiness. Gains were found in children's cognitive, language and social development, as well as in parent-mediated literacy development and children's participation in high-quality child-care programs.

Zill and Resnick address a similar question: whether early educational experiences promote school readiness. However, in contrast to Love and Raikes, this article focuses on the potential benefits that older preschool children may derive from participation in early childhood education programs. Much of the evidence that is reviewed comes from experimental studies in which the objective was to follow children who attended different types of preschool programs (or who served as controls or comparison groups) over a period of years and compare their development on school-readiness criteria. Based on the available data, the authors suggest that preschoolers accrue the most favourable developmental consequences when they participate in high-quality intensive centre-based programs, and that theoretically-guided "model" programs tend to show stronger effects than do large-scale publicly-funded programs, especially for disadvantaged children. Although the construct of program quality is not well defined, it is implicated as a modest contributor to several aspects of early development that may affect children's school readiness, including language and literacy proficiency, play skills, capacity to engage in positive peer- and teacher-child interactions, and achievement motivation.

In the final article of this series, Early encourages us to look beyond the infant, toddler and middle preschool years to consider readiness-related developments that occur in closer proximity to school entrance. Here, the focus is on the period of time during which children make the transition from preschool to grade school, and it is argued that numerous factors that operate during this interval (i.e. before, during and after the transition) may promote or impede children's school readiness. Among the findings considered are those obtained from surveys of transition-enhancing services and programs – practices based in schools or performed by teachers and parents that are intended to facilitate children's transition into grade school. Regrettably, what this review makes clear is that most children receive little in the way of formal assistance before they enter school, and that many of the services that are provided are perfunctory in nature and tend to be implemented belatedly, just before children enter kindergarten (e.g. inviting parents and children

to pre-registration meeting, open houses, etc.). Services that are designed to prepare children for successful school transitions, especially those implemented well before children enter grade school, are rare and are seldom based on sound developmental principles or practices. Although evidence gathered from survey studies implies that many pragmatic hindrances prevent the implementation of such practices, many of these obstacles do not appear to be insurmountable. As Early notes, it is particularly important to devise pre-transition practices that encourage children to form and maintain relationships with persons who are in a position to foster readiness and provide support before, during and after the transition to school (e.g. teachers, friends, future classmates).

Implications for Development and Policy

Much of the information presented in these reviews is consistent with the premise that early educational experiences further children's development in directions that prepare them for the challenges of formal schooling. Extant data imply that full-time child care, especially when it is supplemented with social supports for children and parents, can be beneficial for very young children (infants and toddlers). Similarly, there is evidence to suggest that preschoolers who attend early childhood education programs are better prepared for school, especially if they have been participants in high-quality programs. Although not yet empirically tested, conceptual advances support the expectation that transition-enhancing practices and programs that are implemented during the interval between preschool and kindergarten will enhance children's school readiness.

At the same time, however, the writers of these reviews acknowledge that extant theory and evidence is not sufficient to affirm the premise that early educational programs and practices promote children's development in ways that affect their school readiness. It remains unclear, for example, which types of early educational experience are more effective for promoting school readiness, and what aspects of school readiness these programs affect. Based on Love and Raikes' analysis of early intervention programs, it would appear that there is stronger empirical substantiation for some areas of growth in child development than others. Whereas gains in cognitive development are reported in more than one investigation, growths in other readiness-related attributes (e.g. language and social development) are not as well documented. Moreover, much remains to be learned about the longitudinal links between children's participation in early educational programs and their readiness for school. It is tempting to conclude that very early gains in cognitive development translate into scholastic readiness several years later as children

enter school but, as Love and Raikes note, empirical corroboration of this linkage remains rare.

Moreover, if such linkages exist, then a crucial next step will be to probe the mechanisms or processes that might explain how early educational or child-care programs affect later readiness (e.g. what features of early educational or child-care programs foster child development in specific readiness domains?). Zill and Resnick see this investigative challenge as a pivotal objective for researchers who wish to understand how early childhood education programs help preschool children prepare for school. They suggest that investigators examine more closely the effects of specific program features on differing dimensions of children's school readiness and, toward this end, they articulate an investigative agenda in which variations in curricula (e.g. promotion of pre-academic skills vs. language enrichment and emergent literacy vs. social-emotional development, etc.) and instructional methods (e.g. didactic, play-oriented, discovery-learning activities, etc.) are systematically varied and documented. Implied within this objective is the need to understand which dimensions of school readiness can be altered by programmatic variations, and this goal intersects with recent efforts to define "domains of preparedness" or specify the types of characteristics, skills and abilities that children should possess before they enter grade school.³ Clearly, these are important goals for further investigation, and findings from such studies will likely expand existing knowledge substantially.

From a policy perspective, it is clear that consensus about what constitutes school readiness in young children is lacking. This absence of construct specificity is exemplified by the plethora of definitions that appear in the articles that accompany this commentary, and by the fact that the meaning of this concept remains a matter of scientific and public debate. It has been shown, for example, that teachers, principals and others who are in a position to formulate and implement educational practice and policy (e.g. legislators) do not always agree on what exactly constitutes readiness for formal schooling. For example, results from one investigation² showed that, whereas teachers and principals considered children's ability to engage in meaningful interactions an important indicator of school readiness, legislators placed greater emphasis on children's preparedness to perform specific pre-academic tasks (e.g. knowing the alphabet, paying attention, writing with pencils). As has been argued elsewhere,³ further attempts to conceptualize the construct of school readiness should also be informed by an empirical analysis of the predictors of early school performance, that is, by research on child and school attributes that are closely linked with indicators of early school competence or success.

The default definition for school readiness seems to derive from the assumption that *children* should be prepared or made ready to adapt to the demands of formal schooling. A common construal of this premise is that, because school readiness resides in the child, preschool educators and parents must inculcate certain forms of “preparedness” in children (e.g. academic, social, and emotional competencies) before they enter Kindergarten. In contrast, school readiness is rarely defined in a way that implies that *schools* must be “ready” for children or prepared to adapt the demands of classrooms and schools to differences in five-year-olds’ preparedness, developmental levels or individual needs. As Early points out, “School readiness includes both children’s academic and social skills as they enter school and ‘ready schools,’ meaning the school’s preparedness to serve all children.” Because few of the characteristics of “ready schools” have been empirically investigated, little is known about how school-sponsored transition or outreach practices affect children’s school readiness and subsequent educational progress. Not only do the ideas stemming from this concept represent important policy considerations, but they also provide a promising conceptual foundation for future research.

Finally, as Early notes, children’s relationships may play an important role during the transition to formal schooling. In general, policy-makers have not given this facet of child development as much consideration as other potential predictors of school readiness (e.g. cognitive development, language development, emergent literacy, etc.). In recent years, however, accruing evidence has begun to corroborate the proposition that this and other aspects of children’s social development are precursors of the interpersonal and psychological conditions (e.g. curiosity, interest, attention, motivation, support and security) that empower children to succeed in grade school. For example, findings from a number of studies suggest that young children’s success at social school-entry tasks (e.g. making friends, becoming accepted by classmates, forming a close rather than conflict-ridden relationship with the teacher) has an important bearing on how much they value or “bond” with school, adopt the student role, initiate and constructively participate in classroom activities, and profit scholastically from their classroom experiences.^{4,5,6,7,8,9} Moreover, it has also been shown that young children’s social relationships and competence during the preschool years are significant predictors of their interpersonal adjustment after they enter school.¹⁰ Because of this, the social and emotional context of early schooling and its relation to children’s scholastic attainment have become a more prominent consideration in recent reviews of educational research.^{1,6,8,9} Likewise, the social precursors of school readiness have begun to receive more attention in contemporary social policy statements. In one such report, Raver¹¹ argued that children’s social and emotional development are important aspects of their readiness for school

and their future learning and achievement. In particular, she recommended that elementary school curricula be expanded to include tasks that foster children’s behavioural and emotional adjustment, and that school personnel regularly assess these aspects of children’s development throughout the early grade-school years.

References

1. Ladd GW. Probing the adaptive significance of children’s behavior and relationships in the school context: A child by environment perspective. *Advances in Child Behavior and Development* 2003;31:43-104.
2. Wesley PW, Buysse V. Making meaning of school readiness in schools and communities. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* 2003;18(3):351-375.
3. Ladd GW, Herald SL, Puccia K. School readiness: Are there social prerequisites? *Early Education and Development*. In press.
4. Birch SH, Ladd GW. Interpersonal relationships in the school environment and children’s early school adjustment: The role of teachers and peers. In: Wentzel KR, Juvonen J, eds. *Social motivation: Understanding children’s school adjustment*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press; 1996:199-225.
5. Connell JP, Wellborn JG. Competence, autonomy, and relatedness: A motivational analysis of self-system processes. In: Gunnar MR, Sroufe LA, eds. *Self processes and development*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 1991:43-77. *The Minnesota symposia on child psychology*; vol 23.
6. Ladd GW. Shifting ecologies during the 5 to 7 year period: Predicting children’s adjustment during the transition to grade school. In: Sameroff AJ, Haith MM, eds. *The five to seven year shift: The age of reason and responsibility*. Chicago, Ill: University of Chicago Press; 1996:363-386.
7. Ladd GW, Birch SH, Buhs ES. Children’s social and scholastic lives in kindergarten: Related spheres of influence? *Child Development* 1999;70(6):1373-1400.
8. Perry KE, Weinstein RS. The social context of early schooling and children’s school adjustment. *Educational Psychologist* 1998;33(4):177-194.
9. Wentzel KR. Social competence at school: Relation between social responsibility and academic achievement. *Review of Educational Research* 1991;61(1):1-24.
10. Ladd GW, Price JM. Predicting children’s social and school adjustment following the transition from preschool to kindergarten. *Child Development* 1987;58(5):1168-1189.
11. Raver CC. Emotions matter: Making the case for the role of young children’s emotional development for early school readiness. *Social Policy Report* 2002;16(3):3-18. Available at: <http://www.srcd.org/Documents/Publications/SPR/spr16-3.pdf>. Accessed April 26, 2005.

The Role of Schools and Communities in Children's School Transition

Sue Dockett, PhD, Bob Perry, PhD

Murray School of Education, Charles Sturt University, Australia

March 2017, Éd. rév.

Introduction

The transition to school is recognized as a focal point of children's future school engagement and educational outcomes.^{1,2} Children who have positive start to school are well positioned to build a sense of belonging that promotes engagement in the educational environment.³

In many discussions of starting school, the terms 'transition' and 'readiness' are used interchangeably. While some discussions of readiness incorporate child, family, school, and community elements,⁴ often the major focus is the readiness of individual children or, sometimes, groups of children.^{5,6} In contrast, a focus on transition directs our attention to the processes of continuity and change that characterize children's school start. While a great deal of the research focus on educational transitions is directed towards children's changing role, identity and status,⁷ studies of transition also incorporate focus on what happens within children's social and cultural contexts – notably the family,⁸ school, and community.⁹⁻¹¹

Subject

Starting school is a key transition point for individuals.¹² The first day of school is often marked by special events and rites that hold both individual and social significance. For example, in some German states, school starters are presented with a Schultüte – a cone filled with sweets and school supplies – before engaging in celebrations with families. In Australia, children don their school uniform and multiple photographs are taken. These events mark both the importance of starting school for the individual, and provide social and cultural recognition that starting school is an important life event.

However, the first day of school is neither the beginning nor the end of the transition process, and it is not only the individual that contributes to the effectiveness of transition experiences. Transition occurs over an extended time frame, incorporating a range of experiences involving the

child, family, community and educational settings.¹³

Research indicates the importance of school factors. Indeed, it has been noted that “almost any child is at risk of making a poor or less successful transition if their individual characteristics are incompatible with features of the environment they encounter,”¹⁴ and that “‘lack of readiness’ is not a problem of children being insufficiently skilled to learn at school, but instead it is where there is a mismatch between the attributes of individual children and families, and the ability and resources of the school and/or system to engage and respond appropriately”.¹⁵

In addition to school factors, the importance of the community in supporting learning and promoting children’s preparedness for school has been established.^{16,17} This paper emphasizes the importance of school and community contexts, as well as their impact on the transition to school.

Problems

There are many ways to conceptualize the transition to school. For example, transition can be described as the movement of individual children from prior-to-school or home to school settings; as a rite of passage marked by specific events; and as a range of processes.¹⁸

Recently, an international group of scholars defined transition to school as a time of “individual and social change, influenced by communities and contexts and, within these, the relationships, identities, agency and power of all involved”.¹⁹ To reframe discussions about starting school towards a focus on transition, the group developed the Transition to School: Position Statement,²⁰ which characterizes transitions as times of opportunities, expectations, aspirations and entitlements. One of the key features of the Position Statement is that it recognizes the many participants in transition and urges consideration of the four constructs not only for the children starting school, but also for the families, communities, schools and school systems that contribute to transition experiences.

The move to reframe starting school as a time of transition recognizes several research problems:

1. Who is involved in the transition to school?
2. What strengths do they bring to transition processes?
3. How do stakeholders define effective transitions?
4. What strategies facilitate effective transitions?

5. What are the roles of schools and communities in promoting positive transitions?

Research Context

Recent worldwide attention has been directed to the importance of the early years.²¹ The attention to early childhood education has extended to the early years of school and to the nature of the transition between early childhood and school education. The development of new curricula for early childhood education and school education in many countries has contributed to the focus on transition to school.

There is increasing pressure to recognize the global implications of education and to establish educational programs that guarantee the development of a highly trained workforce.²² Early childhood education faces this same pressure, often in the guise of academic curriculum that is “pushed down” from primary schools, and in increasing pressure from schools and school systems to ensure that children entering school are prepared, particularly for the academic demands of school.²³

Consequences of this context include:

1. pressure for prior-to-school services to implement a stronger academic curriculum and become more “school-like”;
2. pressure for families to prepare their children for school with specific experiences; and
3. deficit views of communities, families and children who do not provide or engage in these experiences.

Key Research Questions

- What are the roles of schools and communities in facilitating transition?
- How can transition experiences promote opportunities, expectations, aspirations and entitlements for all involved?
- What is the potential to support continuity of learning across prior-to-school, home and school environments?

Recent Research Results

Recent research, policy and program initiatives in Australia and elsewhere have sought to address these issues. In this discussion we draw on a recent research report undertaken in Australia during 2013-2014.³

What are the roles of schools and communities in facilitating transition?

The essence of effective transition practices is commitment to building secure, respectful and reciprocal relationships among those involved. It is from these relationships – between and among children, families, communities, educators and educational settings – that continuity between home, prior-to-school and school is built.

Strong relationships support effective transitions. When strong relationships exist between schools, prior-to-school settings and communities, each context is regarded as a valuable resource. Relationships are key mediators of children’s competencies.²⁴ Relationships provide resources for children and families as they enter new and different contexts and confront different expectations and experiences.

It is not only children’s relationships that are central to effective transitions. Relationships between schools and prior-to-school settings, among service-providers within communities, between families and schools and among families themselves all play an important role in constructing a context based on collaboration. It is this sense of collaboration, of working together, that is the key for facilitating effective transitions.³

Schools have a key role in establishing and maintaining these relationships. What happens at school largely determines children’s success, both during the transition and in later school outcomes and far outweighs factors such as the age at which children start school and their assessed readiness.²⁵

Schools that make efforts to reach out to families and communities and build connections across services and agencies are rewarded with higher levels of engagement and family connection with school.²⁶⁻²⁸ This is particularly so when school and prior-to-school services collaborate and where relationships that are established before children start school continue into the new school environment.²⁹

Schools exist within communities. The relationships between schools and communities influence children’s transition to school and their ongoing connection with school.³ Communities with high

levels of social capital,³⁰ provide both structural and social support for families and children at times of transition. These can include services such as out-of-school-hours care, and social networks that provide information about school and educational expectations. Social capital is generated by the web of connections and interconnections present within communities and the trust and shared values that underpin these.

Bioecological theory³¹ emphasizes the importance of inter-related contexts in supporting children's development and learning. Communities differ in many ways, including the availability and accessibility of resources and the opportunities afforded for interactions that affirm community values, aspirations and expectations. There is a well-established link between the local community context and children's development and learning,³²⁻³⁴ largely linked to the availability of opportunities to engage in a range of experiences.¹⁶

When positive relationships are built between families, schools, prior-to-school settings and other community groups, there is the potential for collaboration and, through this, information sharing, the establishment of networks, and growing awareness of different contexts and resources.³⁵ These, in turn, can lead to everyone working towards common goals.

How can transition experiences promote opportunities, expectations, aspirations and entitlements?

Utilizing the Position Statement, educators are encouraged to reflect on transition practices from a range of perspectives. For example:

How do transition strategies and experiences provide opportunities for:

- Children to continue shaping their identities and to extend their existing knowledge, skills and understandings through interactions with adults, peers and family?
- Educators to share their own expertise, while recognizing the expertise of others, as they communicate and make connections with children, other educators, families and communities?
- Families to strengthen and support each child's learning and development?
- Communities to recognize starting school as a significant life event in the lives of children and their families?

In what ways do transition approaches recognize:

- Children’s aspirations for friendships and a sense of belonging at school?
- Family hopes for positive educational outcomes for their children?
- Educators’ aspirations for professional partnerships and support to create strong learning environments for all children?
- The aspirational importance of education within communities?

How do transition approaches respect the expectations of:

- Children to learn, face challenges and have access to support?
- Families to have their knowledge recognized and valued?
- Educators to access appropriate support and professional recognition?
- Communities to attend to the wellbeing of all children and the promotion of active citizenship?

How do transition approaches reflect entitlements of:

- All children to access high quality educational environments?
- Equity and excellence in all interactions with children, families, educators and communities?
- Professional recognition for educators – across prior-to-school and school sectors?
- Communities to be engaged as contributors to educational environments?

What is the potential to support continuity of learning across prior-to-school, home and school environments?

Transition is a time of both continuity and change. A great deal of focus is directed towards the changes – or discontinuities – encountered during the transition; changes such as the environment (physical and educational), pedagogy and curriculum, expectations, rules and routines.^{36,37}

However, it is also important to note that not everything changes at times of transition – elements of continuity remain. For example, family contexts continue to support children, many relationships are retained, community resources or supports may continue to be accessed, and children’s learning journeys continue.

Pedagogical approaches in schools and prior-to-school settings can promote, or inhibit, continuity of learning for children.³⁷ Continuity of learning, pedagogy and curriculum is facilitated by positive relationships and interactions. An integral part of this is cross-sectoral communication, where educators in early childhood and school settings communicate regularly to support the sharing of information.^{38,39} While there may be many challenges to such communication – including a lack of awareness of the role of educators in ‘other’ settings,³⁷ and different expectations about transition experiences,⁴⁰ – where such communication exists it provides a powerful basis for continuity.³

Research Gaps

Much of the evidence invoked in discussions of school and community roles in supporting the transition to school remains anecdotal or derived from small-scale, locally relevant research. It is important that this research base not be dismissed, as many of the decisions and influences relevant to successful transitions are drawn from individual beliefs, experiences and expectations, as well as locally relevant and constructed understanding of school and who succeeds in school.⁴¹ However, it is also important that such studies are complemented by larger-scale, longer-term, generalizable studies.

Many studies of the influence of school and communities on the transition to school have been undertaken in urban areas, and have focused on children’s primary or secondary school experiences. Fewer studies have explored more diverse contexts – such as schools and communities in rural, regional or remote areas, or involving younger children and their transitions experiences.

Research gaps are also noted in the factors identified and studied in relation to school and community influences on transition to school. While many studies identify risk factors, vulnerabilities, or the impact of disadvantage on children and their transitions to school, fewer explore the strengths inherent among families, schools and communities. Assumptions about disadvantage and deficit can color the issues explored.

Conclusions

Starting school successfully is a social and communal endeavour. Schools and communities make significant contributions to children’s connections with school, both in the transition process and in later school engagement. Where children and their families feel connected to schools, valued, respected and supported in schools and communities, they are likely to engage positively with

school, with the result that not only children and families but also schools and communities benefit. When the reverse occurs, with children and families feeling alienated from school and unsupported in the community, communities and those within them suffer.

Implications

In order to meet increasing pressures for greater accountability of academic outcomes, it can be tempting to focus on increasing the readiness requirements of individual children as they start school. This approach overlooks the significant influence of schools and communities on children's engagement with school.

Policy perspectives that support the roles of schools and communities in transition are based on:

1. collaborating with multiple stakeholders across a range of contexts;
2. acknowledging transition as a joint responsibility, rather than something "owned" by a particular group;
3. recognizing the importance of relationships and providing time and resources to support relationship-building; and
4. identifying the existing strengths, rather than deficits, of families and communities and developing strategies to build upon and extend these strengths.

References

1. Peters S. *Literature review: Transition from early childhood education to school*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education; 2010.
2. Rosier K, McDonald M. *Promoting positive education and care transitions for children*. Communities and Families Clearinghouse Resource Sheet; 2011. <https://aifs.gov.au/cfca/publications/promoting-positive-education-and-care-transitions-children>. Accessed February 17, 2017.
3. Dockett S, Perry B. *Continuity of learning: A resource to support effective transition to school and school age care*. Canberra: Australian Government; 2014. http://www.csu.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0015/1101093/continuity.pdf. Accessed February 17, 2017.
4. Britto P, Limlingan M. *School readiness and transitions*. UNICEF; 2012. https://www.unicef.org/publications/files/CFS_School_Readiness_E_web.pdf. Accessed February 17, 2017.
5. Dockett S, Perry B, Kearney E. *School readiness: What does it mean for Indigenous children, families, schools and communities?* Canberra: Australian Institute of Health and Welfare; 2010. <http://www.aihw.gov.au/uploadedFiles/ClosingTheGap/Content/Publications/2010/ctg-ip02.pdf>. Accessed February 17, 2017.
6. Dockett S, Perry B. Trends and tensions: Australian and international research about starting school. *International Journal of Early Years Education* 2013;21(2-3):163-177. doi:10.1080/09669760.2013.832943.

7. Ecclestone K, Biesta G, Hughes M. (2010). Transitions in the lifecourse. In: Ecclestone K, Biesta G., Hughes M eds. *Transitions and learning through the lifecourse*. London: Routledge; 2010:1-15.
8. Griebel W, Niesel R. A developmental psychology perspective in Germany: Co-construction of transitions between family and education system by the child, parents and pedagogues. *Early Years* 2009;29(1):59-68.
9. Biddulph F, Biddulph J, Biddulph C. The complexity of community and family influences on children's achievement in New Zealand: Best evidence synthesis. New Zealand Ministry of Education; 2003.
<https://www.educationcounts.gov.nz/publications/series/2515/5947>. Accessed February 17, 2017.
10. Bowes J, Harrison L, Sweller N, Taylor A, Neilsen-Hewett C. From child care to school: Influences on children's adjustment and achievement in the year before school and the first year of school. Research report to the NSW Department of Community Services; 2009.
http://www.community.nsw.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0008/321596/research_childcare_school.pdf. Accessed February 17, 2017.
11. Bronfenbrenner U, Morris P. The bioecological model of human development. In: Damon W, Lerner RM, eds. *Handbook of child psychology, Vol.1: Theoretical models of human development*, 6th ed. New York: Wiley; 2006:993-1023.
12. Elder GH, jr. The life course as developmental theory. *Child Development* 1998;69:1-12.
13. Graue ME. The answer is readiness- now what is the question? *Early Education and Development* 2006;17(1):43-56.
http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1207/s15566935eed1701_3. Accessed February 17, 2017.
14. Peters S. *Literature review: Transition from early childhood education to school*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education; 2010.
15. Dockett S, Perry B, Kearney E. School readiness: What does it mean for Indigenous children, families, schools and communities? 2010. <http://www.aihw.gov.au/uploadedFiles/ClosingTheGap/Content/Publications/2010/ctg-ip02.pdf>. Accessed February 17, 2017.
16. Hanson MJ, Miller AD, Diamond K, Odom S, Lieber J, Butera G, Horn E, Palmer S, & Fleming, K. Neighbourhood community risk influences on preschool children's development and school readiness. *Infants & Young Children* 2011;24(1):87-100.
17. Rogoff B. *The Cultural Nature of Human Development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2003.
18. Dockett S, Griebel W, Perry B. Transition to school: A family affair. In: Dockett S, Griebel W, Perry B, eds. *Families and the transition to school*. Dordrecht: Springer. In press.
19. Dockett S, Perry B. Transition to school: Times of opportunity, expectation, aspiration and entitlement. In: Parnell W, O'rio J, eds. *Rethinking readiness in early childhood education: Implications for policy and practice*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan; 2015:123-140.
20. Educational Transitions and Change (ETC) Research Group. *Transition to school: Position statement*. Albury-Wodonga: Research Institute for Professional Practice, Learning and Education, Charles Sturt University; 2011.
21. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Policy lever 1: Setting out quality goals and regulations. Starting strong III: A quality toolbox for early childhood education and care.
<http://www.oecd.org/edu/school/startingstrongiii-aqualitytoolboxforearlychildhoodeducationandcare.htm>. Published October 1, 2012. Accessed February 17, 2017.
22. The World Bank. Early Childhood Development. <http://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/earlychildhooddevelopment/overview>. Updated December 22, 2015. Accessed February 17, 2017.
23. Moss P. The relationship between early childhood and compulsory education: A proper political question. In: Moss P, ed. *Early childhood and compulsory education: Reconceptualising the relationship*. London: Routledge; 2013:2-49.
24. Mashburn AJ, Pianta RC. Social relationships and school readiness. *Early Education and Development*. 2006;17(1):151-176.

25. La Paro K, Pianta RC. Predicting children's competence in the early school years: A meta-analytic review. *Review of Educational Research* 2000;70(4):443-484.
26. Bull A, Brooking K, Campbell R. Successful home-school partnerships. Education counts. Ministry of Education, New Zealand. <http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/schooling/28415/3>. Published June 2008. Accessed February 17, 2017.
27. Edwards C, Kutaka T. Diverse perspectives of parents, diverse concepts of parent involvement and participation: Contrasts between Italy and the United States. In: Sheridan S, Kim E, eds. *Foundational aspects of family-school partnership research*. New York: Springer; 2015:35-53.
28. Rosenberg H, Lopez M, Westmoreland H. Family engagement: A shared responsibility. Harvard Family Research Project. FINE Newsletter, November 2009. <http://www.hfrp.org/family-involvement/publications-resources/family-engagement-a-shared-responsibility>. Accessed February 17, 2017.
29. Rimm-Kaufman S, Pianta RC (2000). An ecological perspective on the transition to kindergarten: A theoretical framework to guide empirical research. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 2000; 21(5):491-511.
30. Coleman JS. Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology* 1988;94:95-120.
31. Bronfenbrenner U, Morris P. The bioecological model of human development. In: Damon W, Lerner RM, eds. *Handbook of child psychology, Vol.1: Theoretical models of human development, 6th ed*. New York: Wiley; 2006:993-1023
32. Leventhal T, Brooks-Gunn J. Children and youth in neighbourhood contexts. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*. 2003; 12:27-31.
33. Winkworth G, White M. Australia's children 'safe and well'? Collaborating with a purpose across Commonwealth family relationships and state child protection systems. *Australian Journal of Public Administration* 2011;70(1):1-14. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8500.2010.00706.x.
34. Sanders M. A study of the role of 'community' in comprehensive school, family, and community partnerships programs. *The Elementary School Journal*. 2001;102:19-34.
35. Clark, A. Understanding community: A review of networks, ties and contacts. ESRC National Centre for Research Methods. NCRM Working Paper Series 9/07, May 2007. http://eprints.ncrm.ac.uk/469/1/0907_understanding_community.pdf. Accessed February 17, 2017.
36. Arnold C, Bartlett K, Gowani S, Merali R. Is everybody ready? Readiness, transition and continuity: Reflections and moving forward. Working Paper 41. Bernard van Leer Foundation: The Hague, The Netherlands; 2007.
37. Dockett S, Perry B. *Transitions to school: Perceptions, expectations, experiences*. Sydney: UNSW Press; 2007.
38. Hopps K. Preschool + school + communication = What for educator relationships? *Early Years*. 2014;34(4):405-419. doi:10.1080/09575146.2014.963032.
39. Petriwskyj A, Thorpe K, Tayler C. Trends in the construction of transition to school in three western regions, 1990-2004. *International Journal of Early Years Education*. 2005;13(1):55-69.
40. Timperley H, McNaughton S, Howie L, Robinson V. Transitioning children from early childhood education to school: teacher beliefs and transition practices. *Australian Journal of Early Childhood*. 2003;28(2):32-38.
41. Graue ME. Diverse perspectives on kindergarten contexts and practices. In: Pianta RC, Cox MJ, eds. *The Transition to Kindergarten*. Baltimore, MD: Paul Brookes Publishing; 1999:109-142.

School Readiness and International Developments in Early Childhood Education and Care

Sheila B. Kamerman, DSW

Compton Foundation Centennial Professor for the Prevention of Children and Youth Problems,
School of Social Work, Columbia University, USA

August 2008

Subject

One major concern in many industrialized countries is that a large number of children enter primary school, and even kindergarten or its equivalent, with widely differing levels of preparation for formal schooling or *school readiness*.^a When school readiness is narrowly understood, the emphasis is to prepare or *ready* children so that they develop a specific set of academic skills and abilities--follow directions, demonstrate reading and reasoning skills, and carry out independent work¹--by the time they enter school. In contrast, the U.S. National Education Goals Panel^b took a broader approach, arguing that school readiness encompasses five dimensions: physical well-being and motor development, social and emotional development, language usage, cognition, and general knowledge.² It is this broader definition, which has international applicability, that frames this discussion, with special attention to academic and related skills.

Research has found that on starting kindergarten, children who participated in high quality, model preschool programs were significantly more advanced in key areas of development than those who were in parental or informal care.¹ The key areas were language, literacy and reasoning skills, and children's concepts and understanding of the world around them. Former preschool participants were more eager to learn and try new things and less likely to be retained in a grade or placed in a special education class.³ Of particular importance, these results were disproportionately achieved by disadvantaged children.^{4,5}

Problems

Because children's readiness to learn is so strongly associated with future school performance, children who enter kindergarten less ready than their peers are unlikely to ever close the achievement gap. Given this concern, there is growing interest with regard to which programs are

successful in achieving readiness goals. What does research tell us about the impact of ECEC programs on school readiness? And what are the implications for early childhood education and care (ECEC) policy and program development?

Research Context

Most of the research on school readiness has been conducted in the U.S. Most of the U.S. research on the impact of ECEC on school readiness has highlighted two small-scale, random-assignment, experimental model programs: the High/Scope Perry Preschool Program and the Carolina Abecedarian Study. These studies found that high quality early childhood education can have large and significant effects on school readiness, produce both short- and long-term cognitive and academic benefits for children from disadvantaged backgrounds, and that the positive effects are disproportionately larger for disadvantaged children.^{4,5,6,7,8} A second focus has been on Head Start, the large scale compensatory education program now serving, primarily, 3- to 4-year-olds, designed to remedy the deficiencies disadvantaged children face when they start school. Studies of this program found that participation brings short-term benefits to children's cognitive and socio-emotional development, but these positive impacts have been found to fade out by around the third grade.^{5,6,8,9} There is some debate regarding whether such fade-out is a problem of the program or is related to the poor schools attended by these children once they leave the program.

In contrast, we know much less about the effects of the typical preschool programs that most children experience in the U.S. and other English-speaking countries. Generally, these are more diverse, pro grammatically and in terms of the children served, and are of lower quality and lower cost than the model programs or Head Start. Several studies of such programs have demonstrated significant positive benefits and produced important results in terms of preparation for entry into primary school. In several cases, cognitive gains during the early childhood years were sustained through the early school years.

Recent Research Results

Magnusson, Ruhm and Waldfogel (2004)¹⁰ focus on school readiness using data from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study-Kindergarten Class of 1998-99 (ECLS-K), a large nationally representative sample of children who entered kindergarten in the fall of 1998. The overall finding is that children who attended prekindergarten programs entered primary school more ready to learn and had better math and reading performance at school entry. As well, there were more

lasting cognitive gains for disadvantaged children.

Other U.S. studies finding positive school readiness outcomes include: the Chicago Child Care study, the Cost, Quality and Child Outcomes study, the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) Study of Early Childcare, the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) study, and a study of a universal preschool program in Tulsa, Oklahoma, that concluded that regardless of race, ethnicity, and/or family income, the children who participated in the program demonstrated enhanced school readiness as compared with a similar group of children who did not participate.¹¹

Several international studies reached the same conclusions, including the Swedish longitudinal studies,^{12,13} a New Zealand longitudinal study (Competent Children's Project), and a more recent British study, the Effective Provision of Pre-School Education (EPPE) project.^c The New Zealand study found that literacy, math, and social skills were sustained even at age 20.

Implications

Six lessons from this ECEC research are clear and generalizable internationally:

First, expanding access to ECEC for 3- to 4-year-olds is a key policy for enhancing child well-being, in general, and school readiness, in particular. Research has documented that preschool education can significantly improve primary school readiness and school performance and enhance overall child development. Children who participate in preschool programs are more likely to have better language skills, better verbal skills, better arithmetic skills, and consistently higher reading achievement scores. They are more interested in school when they attend primary school: They are more motivated to learn, to attend school, and to complete assignments and are more likely to have long term academic success. The universal preschool programs in Denmark, France, Italy, and Sweden are preschool exemplars, in which almost all children of 3 to 4 years old are enrolled.

Second, there is a growing body of evidence that quality can make a difference although the debate about the definition of quality continues. Children who receive high quality ECEC (defined as high staff-to-child ratios, small groups, and qualified/trained staff) are likely to demonstrate better cognitive and language abilities while those in lower quality settings are more likely to have difficulties with language, social, and behavior skills.¹⁴ Moreover, benefits for children of well-

designed, intensive forms of ECEC (i.e., which are responsive to children’s needs and use good pedagogy) are less likely to fade out than those that are merely designed for custodial purposes.

Third, disadvantaged children benefit significantly more from a good quality preschool experience than more advantaged children. Preschool attendance can narrow the achievement gaps faced by disadvantaged children.

Fourth, there is an emerging trend toward integrating the education and care services into one system, increasingly into the educational system, a development likely to result in greater public support and higher quality programs. Sweden, New Zealand, Spain, Scotland, and the UK have already implemented this system.

Fifth, making preschool programs a full school-day program rather than a very short day, appears to lead to more positive outcomes.¹⁵ The Scandinavian programs cover the full workday and the French preschool covers a long school day with after-school programs.¹⁶

Sixth, there is a growing need to pay more attention to policies and programs for parents with children under 3 years old, in particular parental leave policies. The EU provides statutory maternity and parental leaves ranging from 6 months to 3 years and Canada provides one year.

Conclusions

Promoting school readiness has emerged as an increasingly important factor in driving ECEC policy and program initiatives, supplementing the existing influence of high labor force participation rates of women with young children, with a goal of increasing human capital. As a result, countries are increasingly expanding the supply of ECEC places, especially for 3- and 4-year-olds (there is largely universal coverage in preschool or primary school for the year preceding compulsory school entry), and beginning to pay more attention to children under 3 years old.

A new report issued by UNESCO (2006)¹⁷ reminds us that despite well-documented benefits on all aspects of child development and child well-being, ECEC remains the “forgotten link in the education chain” even for the 3- and 4-year-olds in much of the world. Especially important, about half of the world’s countries have no early childhood care and education policy for children under 3 years old.

The European Commission has taken an explicit position with regard to access. At the Barcelona summit in 2002, explicit targets were set with regard to ECEC arrangements. The commission agreed that “Member States should remove disincentives to female labor force participation and strive, taking into account the demand for childcare facilities and in line with national patterns of provision, to provide childcare by 2010 to at least 90% of children between 3 years old and the mandatory school age and at least 33% of children under 3 years of age”.¹⁸ About half of the EU-25 countries have achieved the goal for the 3-, 4-, and 5-year-olds, in particular the Scandinavian countries, Belgium, France, and Italy. The UK and Netherlands are approaching this goal. If coverage for children under 3 years old includes paid and job protected maternity and parental leaves, as well as services, this goal is close to being achieved as well.

References

1. Brown J. *The Link Between Early Learning and Care and School Readiness*. Seattle, WA: Economic Opportunity Institute; 2002.
2. Kagan SL, Moore E, Bredekamp S, eds.. *Reconsidering Children's Early Learning and Development: Toward Shared Beliefs and Vocabulary* . Washington, DC: National Education Goals Panel; 1995.
3. Barnett WS, Hustedt JT. Preschool: The most important grade. *Education Leadership* 2003;60(7):54-57.
4. Currie J. *What We Know about Early Childhood Interventions*. Chicago, IL: Joint Center for Poverty Research, University of Chicago; 2000. Policy Brief 2(10)
5. Currie J. Early childhood education programs. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 2001; 15(2):213-238.
6. Barnett WS. Long-term effects of early childhood programs on cognitive and school outcomes. *The Future of Children* 1995;5(3):25-50.
7. Brooks-Gunn J. Do you believe in magic?: What we can expect from early childhood intervention programs. *Social Policy Report* 2003;17(1):3-14. Available at: <http://www.srcd.org/Documents/Publications/SPR/spr17-1.pdf> . Accessed February 25, 2008.
8. Karoly LA, Greenwood PW, Everingham SS, Hoube J, Kilburn MR, Rydell CP, Sanders M, Chiesa J. *Investing in Our Children: What We Know and Don't Know about the Costs and Benefits of Early Childhood Interventions* . Santa Monica, CA: Rand; 1998.
9. Currie J, Thomas D. Does Head Start Make a Difference?. *American Economic Review* 1995;85(3):341-364.
10. Magnusson KA, Ruhm CJ, Waldfogel J. *Does Prekindergarten Improve School Preparation and Performance?* Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research; 2004. NBER Working Paper No. 10452.
11. Gormley WT jr., Gayer T, Phillips D, Dawson B. The effects of universal pre-K on cognitive development. *Developmental Psychology* 2004;41(6):872-884.
12. Andersson BE. Effects of day-care on cognitive and socioemotional competence of thirteen-year-old Swedish schoolchildren. *Child Development* 1992;63(1):20-36.
13. Hwang CP, Broberg AG. The historical and social context of child care in Sweden. In: Lamb ME, Sternberg KJ, Broberg, AG, Hwang CP, eds. *Child Care in Context. Cross-Cultural Perspectives*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum ; 1992: 27-54.

14. Vandell DL, Wolfe B. *Child Care Quality: Does It Matter and Does It Need to be Improved?* Madison, WI: Institute for Research on Poverty, University of Wisconsin; 2000. Special Report no. 78.
15. Herry Y, Maltais C, Thompson K. Effects of a full-day preschool program on 4-year-old children. *Early Childhood Research and Practice* 2007;9(2). Available at: <http://ecrp.uiuc.edu/v9n2/herry.html>. Accessed February 25, 2008.
16. Columbia University. Clearinghouse on International Developments in Child and Family Policies Website. Available at: <http://www.childpolicyintl.org/> . Accessed February 25, 2008.
17. UNESCO. *Strong Foundations: Early Childhood Care and Education*. Paris, France: UNESCO; 2006. EFA Global Monitoring Report 2007.
18. Plantenga J, Siegel M. European Childcare Strategies. Paper presented at: Childcare in a Changing World; October 21-23 2004; Groningen, The Netherlands. Available at: http://www.childcareinachangingworld.nl/downloads/position_paper_part1.pdf . Accessed February 26, 2008.

Notes:

^a *Kindergarten* in the U.S. is the year before compulsory school begins. It is universal, free, and voluntary and is attended by almost all 5-year-olds. It is viewed as the transitional year, before formal schooling begins.

^b U.S. bipartisan and intergovernmental body of federal and state officials created in July 1990 to assess and report state and national progress toward achieving national education goals.

^c An important, large scale, longitudinal study--Effective Provision of Pre-School Education (EPPE) Project and Effective Pre-School and Primary Education 3-11 (EPPE-3-11) is currently being carried out in the UK, funded by the UK Department of Education and Skills. The findings agree with those of the U.S. research reported here.

The Role of Parents in Children’s School Transition

Philip A. Cowan, PhD, Carolyn Pape Cowan, PhD

University of California, Berkeley, USA

March 2009

Introduction

The prevailing explanatory model of children’s successful transition from preschool to elementary school assumes that major risk and protective factors lie primarily within the child in terms of cognitive and emotional “readiness” to enter kindergarten.¹ Consistent with this assumption, most intervention efforts involve school-based attempts to improve children’s cognitive and self-regulation skills. Investigations of the social contexts and relationships that affect children’s transition to school have only begun to emerge. Surprisingly, despite the general acknowledgment that parent-child relationships constitute central contexts for children’s development,² there has been little attention to the roles parents play in children’s transition to elementary school, and almost none to planning or evaluating interventions addressed to parents of preschoolers. We attempt to address these gaps.

Subject

In most studies of children’s development, “parent” means mother, and parenting is studied in isolation from other family and social contexts in which parent-child relationships develop. We present a multidomain model of children’s development that locates mother-child and father-child relationships within a system of relationships inside and outside the family, paying special attention to the quality of the relationship *between* the parents. We then describe the results of preventive interventions based on our conceptual model in the form of a couples group led by trained mental health professionals.

Problems

Challenges for the young pre-schooler about to enter kindergarten have been well documented.^{3,4,5} What makes this an especially important developmental transition period is the consistent evidence for a “trajectory hypothesis” in both middle-class and low-income samples: how children fare academically and socially in early elementary school is a strong predictor of their academic,

social, and mental health outcomes throughout high school.^{6,7,8} These findings imply that interventions to improve the child’s relative standing at school entrance could have long-term payoff.

Research context and research gaps

Research claiming to demonstrate the importance of parent-child relationships in children’s school adaptation has a number of important gaps. We lack longitudinal studies that trace family trajectories across the school transition. Information about fathers’ potential role in their children’s transition is extremely sparse. Only a handful of studies examine other aspects of the family system context (e.g., the couple relationship) that may affect how children fare. Finally, outside of early school-based interventions that focus on children’s readiness, we have very little evidence concerning family-based interventions during the pre-school period that could help children meet the new challenges of entering school successfully.

Key research questions

What do we know from current research about parents’ role in shaping children’s transition to school? What do the findings tell us about interventions that might provide children with a “leg up” as they make the elementary school transition?

Recent research results

Concurrent correlations. It has been well-established in countless studies that parents who are warm, responsive to children’s questions and emotions, provide structure, set limits and make demands for competence (authoritative parents, in Baumrind’s terms) have children who are more likely to succeed in the early years of school and get along successfully with peers.^{9,10,11} The problem with these studies is that they do not establish antecedent-consequent connections.

Longitudinal studies. Only a few studies, including two of our own, assess families during the preschool period and again after the child has entered elementary school.^{8,12,13} The basic finding is of considerable consistency across the transition in terms of mothers’, fathers’, and children’s characteristics; both mothers’ and fathers’ authoritative parenting style during the preschool period explains significant variance in children’s academic achievement and externalizing or internalizing behaviour with peers two and three years later.

The multidomain context of parenting. Our findings support a family systems risk model¹⁴ that explains children’s cognitive, social and emotional development using information about five kinds of family risk or protective factors: (1) Each family member’s level of adaptation, self-perceptions, mental health and psychological distress; (2) The quality of both mother-child and father-child relationships; (3) The quality of the relationship between the parents, including communication styles, conflict resolution, problem-solving styles and emotion regulation; (4) Patterns of both couple and parent-child relationships transmitted across the generations; and (5) The balance between life stressors and social supports outside the immediate family. Most studies of children’s development focus on one or at most two of the five family risk and protective domains. We have shown that each domain, especially the quality of the couple relationship, contributes uniquely to predicting children’s academic and social competence, and their internalizing and externalizing problem behaviours in early elementary school.¹⁵ Consistent with prevention science, then, we have identified a set of factors that can be targeted in interventions to lower the probability that children will have difficulties, and increase the probability that they will display both intellectual and social competence in early elementary school.

Family-based parenting interventions. Over the past 35 years we have conducted two randomized clinical trials in which some couples were randomly chosen to participate in couples groups led by trained mental health professionals, while others were not. The male-female co-leaders met with the couples weekly for at least 4 months.

In the Becoming a Family Project,¹² we followed 96 couples with interviews, questionnaires and observations over a period of five years from mid-pregnancy to their first child’s completion of kindergarten. Some of the expectant couples, randomly chosen, were offered participation in a couples group that met with their co-leaders for 24 weeks over 6 months. Each group session included some open time to discuss personal events and concerns in their lives *and* a topic that addressed one of the aspects of family life in our conceptual model. We found that, while there was a decline in satisfaction as a couple in new parents without the intervention, the new parent couples who participated in an ongoing couples group maintained their level of satisfaction over the next five years until their children had finished kindergarten. Five years after the couples groups ended, the quality of both the couple- and parent-child relationships measured when the child was 3-1/2 was significantly correlated with the children’s adaptation to kindergarten (child self-reports, teacher ratings and tested achievement).

A second intervention study, the Schoolchildren and their Families Project¹⁶ followed another 100 couples from the year before their first child entered kindergarten until the children were in 11th grade. There were three randomly-assigned conditions – an opportunity to use our staff as consultants once a year (the control group), a couples group that emphasized parent-child relationships during the open-ended part of the evenings (the more traditional approach), or a couples group that focused more on the relationship between the parents during the open-ended parts. When the families were assessed during kindergarten and 1st grade, parents who had been in a group emphasizing parent-child relationships had improved in the aspects of parenting we observed in our project playroom, with no improvement in the control participants. By contrast, parents who had participated in a group in which the leaders focused more on parents' issues as a couple showed decreased conflict as a couple when we observed them, *and their parenting became more effective*.

Both intervention variations affected the children. The children of parents in the parenting-focused groups improved in positive self-image, and were less likely to show shy, withdrawn, depressed behaviour at school. Children of parents in the couple-focused groups were at an advantage in terms of higher scores on individually administered achievement tests, and lower levels of aggressive behaviour at school. The interventions continued to have a significant impact on the families over the next 10 years in terms of both self-reported and observed couple relationship quality and behaviour problems in the students. The impact of the couple-focused groups was always equal to or greater than the impact of the parenting-focused groups.¹⁷

Conclusions

In sum, we have shown through correlational studies that the quality of the parent-child and couple relationships is related to the children's early school adaptation. Through intervention studies, we see that changing the tone of couple and parent-child relationships has a long-term causal impact on children's adaptation to school.

Implications

Our emphasis on family relationships as important contexts for children's abilities to cope with the demands of elementary school admittedly poses a challenge for education policy makers and school personnel. We are suggesting reaching out to parents before children enter school and proposing that children will benefit from an enhanced relationship between their parents. It has

been our experience during years of consulting to preschool and elementary school staff that very few have training in communicating with parents, and none are trained to provide interventions that might enhance co-parenting or couple relationships.

An obvious alternative would be to hire trained family educators, social workers, nurses or clinical psychologists to do the outreach and lead groups for couples. Of course this would be costly. What is as yet unknown is the balance between benefits and costs. If the cost of dealing with behaviour problem children to the school and society is greater than the cost of these family-based interventions, perhaps it is time to consider such an approach.

References:

1. Rimm-Kaufman S., School transition and school readiness: An outcome of early childhood development. In: Tremblay RE, Barr RG, Peters RdeV, eds. *Encyclopedia on Early Childhood Development* [online]. Montreal, Quebec: Centre of Excellence for Early Childhood Development; 2004:1-7. Available at: <http://www.child-encyclopedia.com/pages/PDF/Rimm-KaufmanANGxp.pdf>. Accessed March 4, 2009.
2. Bornstein MH, ed. *Handbook of Parenting*. 2nd ed. Mahwah, N.J.: Erlbaum; 2002.
3. Pianta RC, Cox MJ, National Center for Early Development & Learning (U.S.), eds. *The transition to Kindergarten*. Baltimore, MD: P.H. Brookes Pub;1999.
4. Cowan PA, Heming G. How children and parents fare during the transition to school. In: Cowan PA, Cowan CP, Ablow JC, Johnson VK, Measelle JR, eds. *The Family Context of Parenting in Children's Adaptation to Elementary School*. Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates; 2005. Monographs in parenting series.
5. Sameroff AJ, Haith MM, eds. *The Five to Seven Year Shift: The Age of Reason and Responsibility*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press; 1996. The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation series on mental health and development.
6. Entwisle DR, Alexander KL. Facilitating the transition to first grade: The nature of transition and research on factors affecting it. *The Elementary School Journal* 1998;98(4):351-364.
7. Kellam SG, Simon MB, Ensminger ME. Antecedents in first grade of teenage drug use and psychological well-being: A ten-year community-wide prospective study. In: Ricks DF, Dohrenwend BS, eds. *Origins of psychopathology: Research and public policy*. Cambridge, NY: Cambridge University Press; 1983.
8. Cowan PA, Cowan CP, Ablow JC, Johnson VK, Measelle JR, eds. *The Family Context of Parenting in Children's Adaptation to Elementary School*. Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates; 2005. Monographs in parenting series.
9. Baumrind D. New directions in socialization research. *American Psychologist* 1980;35(7):639-652.
10. Steinberg L. We know some things: Parent-adolescent relationships in retrospect and prospect. *Journal of Research on Adolescence* 2001;11(1):1-19.
11. Parke RD, Buriel R. Socialization in the family: Ethnic and ecological perspectives. In: Damon W, ed. *Handbook of Child Psychology*. 5th ed. New York : J. Wiley; 1998: 463-552. Eisenberg N, ed. *Social, Emotional, and Personality Development*; vol 3.
12. Cowan CP, Cowan PA. *When Partners Become Parents : the Big Life Change for Couples*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 1999.
13. Barth JM, Parke RD. The impact of the family on children's early school social adjustment. In: Sameroff AJ, Haith MM, eds. *The Five to Seven Year Shift: The Age of Reason and Responsibility*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press; 1996: 329-

361 The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation series on mental health and development.

14. Cowan PA, Cowan CP. Interventions as tests of family systems theories: Marital and family relationships in children's development, and psychopathology. *Development and Psychopathology* 2002;14:731-760.
15. Cowan PA, Cowan CP. *Five-domain models: Putting it all together*. In: Cowan PA, Cowan CP, Ablow JC, Johnson VK, Measelle JR, eds. *The Family Context of Parenting in Children's Adaptation to Elementary School*. Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates; 2005. Monographs in parenting series.
16. Cowan CP, Cowan PA, Heming G. Two variations of a preventive intervention for couples: effects on parents and children during the transition to elementary school. In: Cowan PA, Cowan CP, Ablow JC, Johnson VK, Measelle JR, eds. *The Family Context of Parenting in Children's Adaptation to Elementary School*. Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates; 2005. Monographs in parenting series.
17. Cowan PA, Cowan CP. Group Interventions for parents of preschoolers: 10-year impact on family functioning and teen's adaptation. Paper presented at: SRA Biennial Meeting; March 23-26, 2006; San Francisco, California.

Commentary on Rimm-Kaufman, Cowan and Cowan, Dockett and Perry, and Kamerman

Jennifer LoCasale-Crouch, PhD, Carolyn Gosse, MeD, Robert Pianta, PhD

University of Virginia, Center for Advanced Study of Teaching and Learning, USA

June 2009

Introduction

The papers reviewed for this commentary address the issue of young children's transition to school. School transition is situated within the broader topic of *school readiness* and examined in light of the contexts that support children's academic and social development. Children's success or failure in school is influenced by how they move between the systems that impact their development. Given that children's early functioning is a consistent predictor of later social and academic outcomes, it is critical to attend to movement between these settings as they have the potential to either support or hinder development.

Research and Conclusions

According to Rimm-Kaufman,¹ early childhood experiences directly contribute to school readiness. As children transition into kindergarten, their future academic success depends on their social and academic preparedness for learning. Yet, we know, from Kammerman's² work, that children enter kindergarten with a wide variety of skills and abilities that significantly contribute to their later school success or difficulties. Given the increasing focus on formal academic skills during the kindergarten year, and the linguistic, economic and cultural diversity of students, Rimm-Kaufman¹ notes that inquiry into what factors constitute and affect school readiness is an important area of research.

Recognizing that children experience multiple systems and settings that influence their development, and thus school readiness, leads us to conclude that the interactions between these systems is an important area of focus. Current research and interest taking a developmental/ecological approach focuses on the connections made between the multiple systems children experience.³ Transition practices that enhance relational and informational linkages between systems during children's shift into kindergarten are one way to promote stability and support, which may facilitate early school adjustment.⁴ In addition to anecdotal

positive reviews from both parents and teachers,⁵ empirical evidence now exists that links the use of transition practices with children’s social, behavioural and academic adjustment to kindergarten.^{6,7}

Considering the importance of transition practices on child outcomes, the remaining papers focus on interventions within systems that influence children’s development, and how those systems support successful school transitions. For example, Cowan and Cowan⁸ focused on parents’ and families’ roles in preparing a child, both cognitively and socially, for transition into a school setting. Their work found that particular relationships within the family system impact children’s school readiness and may be amenable to intervention. The authors concluded that intervention programs focused on strengthening family systems could have positive impacts on children’s transitions to school.

Moving from family systems to larger-scale interactions, Dockett and Perry⁹ examined the social and cultural contexts of schools and communities and found that they can significantly impact children’s school readiness and their later school engagement. Kamerman’s² work highlights the role of quality preschool programs as a support for preparing children for kindergarten. Quality programs produce gains in children’s development of language, social and behavioural skills, and these gains are more pronounced for disadvantaged children.

Within the systems approach to school transition and readiness, the linkages between the settings that serve critical roles in child development need to be examined further. Areas amenable to intervention include providing structural and social supports to children and families through after-care and social networks; building relationships between and within families, schools and communities; and facilitating collaborations that help children and families navigate the transition to school. Intervention into these systems is particularly important given that transition practices appear to facilitate quicker adjustment to kindergarten, which then allows children to take better advantage of learning opportunities in the classroom.^{6,7} These associations between transition practices and children’s adjustment during kindergarten are of particular importance given that future academic and behavioural outcomes are associated with children’s early competencies.
10,11,12,13,14

Implications for Development and Policy

These articles serve as a starting point for understanding that multiple systems (family, community and school) are amenable to change that supports children’s successful transition to school. The papers reviewed here further reinforce the United States’ National Education Goal

Panel's¹⁵ emphasis on strengthening relationships between systems as key to successful school transitions. The panel identified relationships as useful tools for improving connections between home, community, pre-kindergarten and elementary school, which could result in enhanced competence for all children. Implications from the studies reviewed here, as well as others in the field, indicate potential benefits from a more formalized and systematic approach to creating and sustaining transition support plans that align spheres of influence. Children, especially those from poor families, appear to adjust better to kindergarten when exposed to well-aligned support systems. These findings are conducive to advancing a variety of questions regarding the most effective systems amenable to intervention that best support children's school readiness.

As pointed out by Rimm-Kaufman,¹ further work needs to be done on defining [school readiness](#) but, more importantly, in identifying the characteristics of the child and/or environment that contribute to [school success](#). Cowan and Cowan⁸ see increased focus on interventions that strengthen the family system, and in turn impact children's transitions to school and their future academic outcomes, as one area of attention. An additional area that is primed for research and intervention is the integration of school (Kamerman²) and community (Dockett & Perry⁹) influence in order to create cohesion between these systems. Investments in these types of transition practices that build coherence across early childhood settings through vertical and horizontal linkages^{16,17} show promise as a means of supporting children's adjustment during early schooling.

Most researchers and practitioners in the field of early childhood accept the complexity of school readiness arising from the multiple systems of influence on children's development. Few, however, are able to articulate an encompassing organizational change that will address how the spheres of influence can work together to more systematically support children's development. In a recent policy statement, Bogard and Takanishi¹⁸ reflected on the disconnected worlds of pre-kindergarten and elementary schools and proposed better alignment of learning opportunities for children ages three to eight. Many states are currently attempting to work collaboratively across regulating agencies on early learning guidelines that systematically align expectations of children's development along a continuum in a range of domains. Despite these efforts, a recent review of state-level early education standards indicates considerable variability within the early childhood field in what are considered to be the most important learning objectives during these early years.¹⁹ It is very clear that there is a real need to invest time and resources in further building cohesion between systems of influence on child development, school transitions, and school readiness. The field is ready for an integration of families, schools and communities,

through interdisciplinary work, collaboration and communication; that then embraces a coherent and comprehensive view of child development and holds the well-being of the child as a central tenant.

References

1. Rimm-Kaufman, S. School transition and school readiness: An outcome of early childhood development. In: Tremblay RE, Barr RG, Peters RDeV, eds. *Encyclopedia on Early Childhood Development* [online]. Montreal, Quebec: Centre of Excellence for Early Childhood Development; 2004:1-7. Available at: <http://www.child-encyclopedia.com/documents/Rimm-KaufmanANGxp.pdf>. Accessed April 28, 2009.
2. Kamerman SB. School readiness and international developments in early childhood education and care. In: Tremblay RE, Barr RG, Peters RDeV, Boivin M, eds. *Encyclopedia on Early Childhood Development* [online]. Montreal, Quebec: Centre of Excellence for Early Childhood Development; 2008:1-6. Available at: <http://www.child-encyclopedia.com/documents/KamermanANGxp-School.pdf>. Accessed April 28, 2009.
3. Rimm-Kaufman S, Pianta R. An ecological perspective on the transition to kindergarten: A theoretical framework to guide empirical research. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology* 2000;21(5):491-511.
4. Kagan SL, Neuman MJ. Lessons from three decades of transition research. *The Elementary School Journal* 1998;98(4):365-379.
5. Pianta R, Kraft-Sayre M. *Successful Kindergarten Transition: Your Guide to Connecting Children, Families & Schools*. Baltimore, Md.: P.H. Brookes; 2003.
6. Schulting AB, Malone PS, Dodge KA. The effect of school-based kindergarten transition policies and practices on child academic outcomes. *Developmental Psychology* 2005;41(6):860-871.
7. LoCasale-Crouch J, Mashburn A, Downer J, Pianta R. Pre-kindergarten teachers' use of transition practices and children's adjustment to kindergarten. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* 2008;23(1):124-139.
8. Cowan PA, Cowan CP. The role of parents in children's school transition. In: Tremblay RE, Barr RG, Peters RDeV, Boivin M, eds. *Encyclopedia on Early Childhood Development* [online]. Montreal, Quebec: Centre of Excellence for Early Childhood Development; 2009:1-6. Available at: <http://www.child-encyclopedia.com/documents/Cowan-CowanANGxp-School.pdf>. Accessed April 28, 2009.
9. Dockett S, Perry B. The role of school and communities in children's school transition. In: Tremblay RE, Barr RG, Peters RDeV, Boivin M, eds. *Encyclopedia on Early Childhood Development* [online]. Montreal, Quebec: Centre of Excellence for Early Childhood Development; 2007:1-8. Available at: <http://www.child-encyclopedia.com/documents/DockettPerryANGxp.pdf>. Accessed April 28, 2009.
10. Badian NA. *Early prediction of academic underachievement*. Paper presented at the Annual International Convention, The Council for Exceptional Children: April 4-9 1976; Chicago, IL.
11. Hamre BK, Pianta RC. Early teacher-child relationships and the trajectory of children's school outcomes through eighth grade. *ChildDevelopment* 2001;72(2):625-638.
12. Hoge RD, Butcher R. Analysis of teacher judgments of pupil achievement levels. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 1984;76(5):777-781.
13. Kenoyer CE. Agreement between student achievement level and teacher judgment of student need for compensatory education. *UrbanReview* 1982;14(1):3-16.
14. Quay LC, Steele DC. Predicting children's achievement from teacher judgments: An alternative to standardized testing. *EarlyEducation and Development* 1998;29(3):207-218.

15. National Education Goals Panel. *National Education Goals Report Executive Summary: Improving education through family-school-community partnerships*. Washington, DC: National Education Goals Panel; 1995.
16. Brown R, Ing M. *Exploring Sustained Improvement in Low Performing Schools*. Bekerley, CA: Policy Analysis for California Education; 2003. PACE Working Paper Series; PACE-WP-Ser-03-3.
17. Kagan SL, Neuman MJ. Lessons from three decades of transition research. *The Elementary School Journal* 1998;98(4):365-379.
18. Bogard K, Takanishi R. PK-3: An aligned and coordinated approach to education for children 3 to 8 years old. *SRCD Social Policy Report* 2005;29(3):3-23.
19. Scott-Little C, Kagan SL, Frelow V. Conceptualization of readiness and the content of early learning standards: The intersection of policy and research. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* 2006;21(2):153-173.