4-1976

Evaluations of Former Kalamazoo Learning Village Participants

Salvatore S. Cullari
Western Michigan University

EVALUATIONS OF FORMER KALAMAZOO LEARNING VILLAGE PARTICIPANTS

by

Salvatore S. Cullari

A Thesis
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfillment
of the
Degree of Master of Arts

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
April 1976

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank all those who participated in the preparation of this study. Special thanks are due to Dr. Roger Ulrich, who served as my major Thesis Advisor; Drs. Galen Alessi and Brad Huitema, who served on the Thesis Committee; Dr. C. Townsend, of the Kalamazoo Public School System, and all the principals, teachers, parents and children who participated.

Salvatore S. Cullari

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

During the past decade, preschool compensatory education has received unprecedented attention from the public, social scientists, and elected officials. As in the past, recent support for preschool education is partially a result of social unrest, in an attempt to rectify the inequality that exists in our nation.

In the summer of 1965, supporters of compensatory education established Project Head Start, which began as part of President Johnson's War on Poverty program. The purpose of Project Head Start as stated by the Office of Economic Opportunity is as follows:

> "To improve the health and physical ability of poor children, to develop their self-confidence and ability to relate to others, to increase their verbal and conceptual skills, to involve parents in activities with their children, and to provide appropriate social services for the family in order that the child of poverty may begin his school career on more equal terms with his more fortunate classmates." (Office of Economic Opportunity, 1967)

Though Project Head Start has been plagued with many problems, it has generated much research in the field of compensatory education, and many preschool programs have been established throughout the United States.

Smith and Bissell (1970) report several factors which have influenced the development of compensatory preschool programs. Studies have shown that minority group children

(Afro-Americans, Mexican-Americans and American Indians) tend to be educationally handicapped upon entering public school. As a result of this deficiency, many of these children fall several years behind in school achievement, and often drop out of school. This and other factors greatly reduces their chances of obtaining jobs that would help them escape the poverty that is related to many of the problems. Thus the cycle repeats itself over and over again.

The idea behind compensatory education is to give these children skills and experiences similar to those of middle-class children, so that they can begin school on a more equal basis. Hopefully, more of these children would finish school and find better jobs, so that the poverty cycle could be broken.

Studies contrary to the notion of fixed intelligence add more support to compensatory preschool programs. Scott (1962) reports that intelligence is in a state of maximum plasticity in early childhood, and that it is the best time for children to learn. Bloom (1964) also reports that intelligence doesn't stabilize until age twelve, but that most of the variance in the development of intelligence occurs before age six. He indicates that environmental factors have their greatest effect during this time. Deutsch (1963) found that children from

depressed areas have less visual and auditory stimuli in their environment than middle-class children. He also found that poor children in general have no expectation of reward for academic performance, and that their environment usually does not stimulate cognitive growth.

In the early 1960's, many carefully designed experimental preschool programs were reporting very optimistic results. A preschool program by Deutsch in New York City reported that children in the program were increasing their I.Q. level, while similar children in a control group remained the same (Deutsch, 1963). Grey and Klaus (1965) using a ten week summer program, and weekly home meetings the rest of the year, reported significant I.Q. gains for the experimental group, as measured by the Binet and Peabody I.Q. tests. Weikart (1967) reported that children enrolled in the Ypsilanti Perry Preschool Project were scoring significantly higher on achievement tests in elementary school than their control group. The highly structured preschool program of Bereiter-Engelmann was evaluated in many studies and was reported to produce gains in the experimental groups which were maintained during the first few years of elementary school (Bereiter-Engelmann, 1966; Bissell, 1970; DiLorenzo, et al, 1969).

These early studies helped promote the great

increase of compensatory programs throughout the nation. In 1965, over one half million children were enrolled in Head Start programs alone, and this number more than tripled in the next few years.

During the past decade, there has been a national debate over the question of whether compensatory education produces gains that endure after the children leave the program. Although hundreds of articles have been written in this area, no totally conclusive evidence has as yet been offered by either side. A brief review of recent studies concerning compensatory education follows.

One of the first reports about a Head Start program was done by Robinson (1965) about the program in Mississippi. This study is typical of the highly optimistic attitudes concerning the early Head Start programs. The author reports that the goal of that program was to attack poverty, raise education levels and to "narrow the chasm that separate whites and blacks."[1] Though official assessments of the program were not yet available, the author reported the goals were being met.

An assessment of the six week summer Head Start program in Kalamazoo (Hamilton, 1966) reported I.Q. gains for children in the program as measured by the Peabody

---

[1]Robinson, D., "Head Start in Mississippi", Phi Delta Kappan, 1965, 47, 91.

Intelligence test. The author recommended that the program be continued on a year round basis.

A survey by the Educational Testing Service (1967) found that children in a summer preschool program gained an average of four and one half points on the Stanford-Binet Intelligence test, when tested at the end of the program.

A study by Reiber and Womack (1968) was done on a population of 568 children who came from families with the lowest income in the community. Post tests on the Peabody Intelligence test showed significant gains after a five week preschool program.

As children in early preschool programs began entering elementary school, studies began to show that much of the gain made while in a preschool program was lost after a short time. Ozer and Milgram (1967) found no differences between children who were enrolled in a preschool, and similar children without a preschool experience, when tested at the end of first grade. Hyman and Kliman (1967) reported that gains made by children in a summer preschool program were lost soon after entering first grade. Wolff and Stein (1967) found that children in a preschool scored higher in school readiness tests than children in a control group, but that these gains were lost after a short time in first grade.

In an effort to evaluate the Head Start program and to determine "to what degree has it had psychological and intellectual impact on children that has persisted into primary grades",[1] the Office of Economic Opportunity contracted with the Westinghouse Learning Corporation and Ohio University to evaluate the program. The study, now known as the Westinghouse Report, published its results in the summer of 1969. The major findings of the report are as follows:

1. Summer Head Start programs do not produce any cognitive or affective gains that are maintained in the early elementary grades.

2. Full year programs are marginally effective in producing cognitive gains that can be measured in the early elementary years, but do not influence affective development.

3. The most effective Head Start programs are those in the Southeast, and those in Negro centers.

4. Head Start children from either summer or full time programs are below national norms for tests of language development and scholastic achievement, but approach national norms for school readiness tests.

5. Most parents of Head Start students liked the program, and many participated in it.

The authors recommended that summer programs be converted into full year programs, and that efforts be

---

[1]Westinghouse Learning Corp. and Ohio University, The Impact of Head Start: An Evaluation of the Effect of Head Start on Children's Cognitive and Affective Development. Office of Economic Opportunity, Springfield, Va.: U.S. Government Clearinghouse, 1969, p. 1.

taken to make full year programs more effective.

Several limitations of this study were mentioned by the authors. One was that the study did not take into account the differences among the various Head Start centers, and treated the data as though only one center existed. Another was the use of the ex post facto experimental design, which can result in various control problems.

The Westinghouse Report was interpreted by most of the public as an indication that the Head Start program was a failure, and that compensatory education does not result in any lasting benefits for children in these programs. Many thought the findings of the study were not valid. In articles appearing in the New York Times, Robert Finch (Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare at that time) wrote that the study "contained insufficient facts",[1] and Dr. William Madow, the statistical consultant of the study, publicly removed his name from the report.

Smith and Bissell (1970) criticized the sampling methods, and statistical manipulations of the data in the Westinghouse Report. They stated that the control group used in the study was inappropriate, but nevertheless performed a re-analysis of the data and concluded that the experimental group scored significantly higher than the

---

[1]New York Times, "Date Line, Washington, D.C.". April 24, 1969.

control group on some cognitive tests.

Coupled with the Westinghouse Report, opponents of compensatory education were given added support when Jensen (1969) published the controversial report, "How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement?". The main points of the report are as follows:

1. Genetic factors are more important than environmental factors in determining I.Q. levels.

2. The pre-natal stage has the greatest amount of environmental influence on I.Q. levels.

3. Changes in I.Q. levels produced by pre-school programs are generally small, but may bring children to their genetic potential.

4. Differences in intelligence between races and social classes are attributed to genetic differences.

5. "The failure of recent compensatory education efforts to produce lasting effects on children's I.Q. and achievement suggests that the premises on which these efforts have been based should be re-examined."[1]

This report by Jensen did not resolve the debate over compensatory education, but it did cause a great deal of controversy which led to further research. In the same year as the Jensen study, the Educational Testing Service began what will be the most extensive compensatory education study to date. It will involve a longitudinal study

---

[1]Jensen, A., "How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement?", Harvard Educational Review, 1969, 39, 1.

of two thousand disadvantaged children between the ages of four and eight. This study will attempt to:

1. Determine various characteristics of disadvantaged children prior to entering preschool, and determine how these characteristics relate to home and community variables.
2. Identify the characteristics of preschool and primary grade programs.
3. Determine the characteristics of families that do and do not send their children to preschool.
4. Determine the various effects of preschool programs and the permanence of these effects.

The final results of this study are not yet available. An interim report was issued in August, 1973. Though no conclusions were made, data that had been collected seemed to suggest that environmental factors such as living conditions, socio-economic status, and others that are present prior to preschool play a significant role in predetermining what effects a preschool program will have on the children in the program.

It is obvious that all preschool programs do not produce the same results. Weikart (1972) maintains that carefully planned preschool programs can produce benefits. "Pre-school experience <u>can</u> make a difference for disadvantaged children. Unfortunately, I am speaking only of special situations."[1] The type of situations Weikart is speaking of are when highly trained individuals have direct control of the curriculum used, and the operation of the

preschool program.

Well planned preschool programs which report successful completion of their objectives do exist. Among the most successful are those using behavioral techniques (Haring, Hayden, and Nolen, 1969; Hart and Risley, 1968; Brigham and Sherman, 1968).

One preschool program which uses behavioral techniques is the Kalamazoo Learning Village. This program was designed to meet several objectives. One of these is to act as a primary prevention program for various behavioral problems. By teaching skills that are necessary for living in our society, social ills such as crime, unemployment, drug abuse, and others hopefully can be prevented.

Another objective of the Learning Village is to make all children in the program excellant students. Since the program includes children from deprived environments, successful completion of this objective will demonstrate that well designed preschool programs can make good students out of children that typically fail in school. "The program of the Learning Village is designed to insure the development of children who read well, who think well, who

---

[1]Weikart, D., "Relationship of Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning in Preschool Education", in Stanley, J. (ed.) Preschool Programs for the Disadvantaged. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972, p. 28.

can make the most of their environment, and who love themselves and their fellow man."[1]

The children in the Learning Village range in age from several months to about age six. The Learning Village is a full time program which is in operation five days a week, all year round. It is subdivided into infant, toddler, nursery, and pre-elementary sections. The majority of the children are black, and many come from families which are on public assistance.

Programed instructional material, such as Distar (Engelmann and Bruner, 1969) and Science Research Associates Reading Laboratories (Parker, Covell, LaForge, Paternoster, Quinn, and Fisher, 1959) are used in the program. Library books and educational games and toys are also available.

A gymnasium and playground are used for physical development, and the children are taken on field trips every week. Breakfast, lunch, and two snacks are served to each child every day.

A low child-teacher ratio, which averages about one teacher to every four children, allows personal interactions to develop between children and teachers. The

---

[1]Ulrich, R.E., Alessi, G.J., and Wolfe, M., "The Learning Village: An Alternate Approach to Traditional Education." In Packham, D., Cleary, A., and Mayes, T. (eds.) Aspects of Educational Technology, Volume 5. London: Pitman Publishing Co., 1971, p. 15.

staff of the Learning Village is made up of graduate students, volunteers from the community, parents of children in the program, and regular paid staff. In general, the program is set up so that each child can experience success.

Many evaluations were made of children in the Learning Village program using such tests as the Wide Range Achievement Test (Jastak, Bijou, and Jastak, 1965), Bayley Scales of Infant Development (Bayley, 1969), Boehm Test of Basic Concepts (Psychological Corporation, 1970), and the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (1965).

In general, the results of these evaluations showed that almost all children in the program scored much higher than the average of the standardized group. Seventeen of the eighteen Learning Village kindergarten children scored above the 90th percentile on the reading section of the Wide Range Achievement Test, while ten scored above the 90th percentile on the mathematics section (Ulrich, Louisell, and Wolfe, 1971). Test scores for the Boehm Test of Basic Concepts showed that eleven of fourteen children scored above the 90th percentile, and the lowest score was at the 60th percentile. Results of the Bayley Scales of Infant Development were equally impressive. Scores ranged from the 85th to 99th percentile (Ulrich, Alessi, and Wolfe, 1971). It was also reported that in general, the scores for the reading sections of the above

tests were higher than the scores for the mathematics sections, and the reason for this is that at the time of the evaluations, the reading program of the Learning Village was much more advanced than the mathematics program.

Recently, Camacho (1975) did a follow up study of some of the former Learning Village children. These children, who are now in public school (grades one through six), were compared to a control group of similar children. The two groups were matched according to sex, age, race, and school districts. Scores on the Metropolitan Achievement and Readiness Tests (Durost, 1960) failed to show significant differences between the groups. Control problems (which are similar to ones encountered in the present study) were cited. This study seems to indicate an erosion of gains made while in the Learning Village program, as indicated in the evaluations reported above. Since many of the former Learning Village children could not be located, no conclusions could be drawn from the findings of Camacho.

In looking at preschool evaluations presented in this and other studies, a pattern seems to emerge. Children in preschool programs seem to make gains while they are in the programs, but often lose these gains soon after leaving them. Many critics use this as their main argument against compensatory preschool programs, but the controversy really centers on economics. While some benefits

can be obtained from most preschool programs, few studies report any detrimental effects of such programs. The main subject of controversy is whether the money used to run these programs can produce greater benefits if used in other ways (for example, other social services when these children are older).

The lack of consistency in evaluations of preschool programs is another reason why the issue of compensatory education has not been resolved. This is due to many factors other than the programs themselves. One is the difficulty of finding adequate instruments and procedures for evaluations. Standardized tests present problems of finding tests that are suitable for the population found in compensatory programs. These tests often result in inaccurate predictions of future achievement.

The type of program or school which follows preschool is another problem. Supporters of compensatory programs feel that the low quality education of public school is the reason why preschool gains are lost so quickly. "...sending a child to Head Start and then putting him into a public school is like preparing a soldier for combat by sending him on vacation to the French Riviera."[1] In the past several years other programs such as "Follow

---

[1]Mendelsohn, R., "Is Head Start a Success or Failure?" In Hellmuth, J. (ed.) Disadvantaged Child, Volume 3. N.Y.: Brunner-Mazel, Inc., 1970, p. 447.

Through" have been established in order to reduce this problem, but essentially the same problem may exist when the children leave these programs.

A study by Lessler and Fox (1969) mentions that preschool programs often change very quickly because of a lack of funds, teacher turnovers, etc. This may result in evaluating a program that is different than the one that existed when the study was initiated. Thus any predictions about the children in the program will be difficult to interpret.

Similar problems occur when preschool evaluations are made without specifying the objectives of the program, or without describing the procedures used. Thus, even if a program is reported to be successful, the procedures used to make it successful are not known. Taking the example of the Head Start program again, many evaluations were made using I.Q. gains as a criterion. Yet, raising the I.Q. level of children in the programs is not one of the objectives of Project Head Start. One of the objectives is to increase the achievement level of these children in school, but the two are not the same (Caldwell, 1974). An increase in I.Q. level does not always lead to a corresponding increase in school achievement, and increases in school achievement can occur without changes in I.Q. levels. Therefore, preschool evaluations based solely on I.Q. changes may not be valid.

Taking into consideration some of the problems mentioned above, it is not difficult to see why consistent or conclusive data concerning preschool programs has as yet been lacking. Along with this, many non-academic benefits of preschool programs, such as increased social adjustment, improved diet, medical care, and others, are difficult to measure and thus, often are not included in preschool evaluations. Therefore, complete evaluations are almost never done.

Another problem is that preschools will not have the same effects on all children in the program. Studies have shown that procedures used will have varying effects depending on the type of children enrolled (Specher and Bartel, 1968; Karnes, Hodgins, and Teska, 1968). Weikart (1967) studied three types of compensatory preschool programs: (a) traditional, (b) structured, and (c) task-oriented. The study concluded that disadvantaged children benefit more from structured programs than others. However, other studies have shown that middle and upper class children benefit more from programs that are less structured. Therefore, at times the procedures used in preschool programs may not be suitable for all children.

Other factors also influence the effectiveness of compensatory preschool programs. Zigler and Butterfield (1968) report that motivational deficits may be as important as intellectual deficits as a cause of failure

in school. The authors suggest that this may be one of the reasons preschool programs have not been more successful with disadvantaged children.

In general, many variables influence the effectiveness of preschool programs, and this is why they are so difficult to evaluate.

In view of the different variables involved in evaluating a program, some researchers have recommended setting up specific procedures to be used in all preschool evaluations. For example, Becker (1974) has recommended the following to be included in preschool evaluations:

1. Description of instructional program (written goals, objectives, tests, daily lessons, etc.).
2. Clock hours of instruction completed by each child.
3. Specific teaching behaviors used in the program (specified in advance and frequently measured by teacher).
4. Number of lesson plans completed by each child.
5. Effects of program (unit, standardized, and follow up tests for each child).

Though there is no doubt that following such procedures will improve the quality of preschool evaluations, there is some doubt as to whether such procedures can be used in all preschool programs. Problems such as staff turnovers, unstable budgets, frequently changing programs, and having staffs large enough to take such data can prevent their use. In looking at preschool evaluations

that appear in this and other studies, very few were found that used procedures similar to those recommended by Becker. The ETS study uses similar procedures, but that study will take over seven years to complete, and will require a great deal of funds. The great majority of preschool programs are not capable of producing such evaluations.

This leads to the question of whether preschool evaluations are necessary, and if so, what type should be done. Since a great deal of time and money are needed to run preschools, it would seem appropriate for some type of evaluation to be done in order to justify the cost of the program to the public, and to make sure it is of some benefit to the children. What type of evaluation should be done depends on how the evaluation will be used. Many evaluations are done in order to meet degree requirements, to produce articles suitable for publication, or similar reasons. In such situations, it does not seem justifiable to make changes in the preschool program so that certain experimental requirements can be met for the evaluation. On the other hand, it may be that the recent decline in funds for preschool programs is partly due to the inconclusiveness of most evaluations. If this is the case, then perhaps more effort should be put into designing programs that can be evaluated properly.

PURPOSE

Evaluations of children in the Learning Village, which were reported in the last section, indicated that almost all children in the program scored well above national norms in reading, math, and other areas. A recent study by Camacho, however, reports that no significant differences were found between former Learning Village children, and a control group of similar children.

The data obtained by Camacho seem to indicate that gains made by children in the Learning Village program are lost after a short time in public school. However, since only one type of comparison was used in that study, the purpose of the present study is to re-evaluate former Learning Village children using the following:

1. The most recent Metropolitan Achievement Test scores.
2. A teacher rating form that compares these children to others in the class.
3. Previous teacher evaluations of the children.

In addition, former Learning Village children and their parents were asked to complete a questionnaire, which focused on their reactions to the program.

This study is an attempt to determine if any lasting benefits were derived from the Learning Village program, and if so, in what areas did the children benefit the

most. Looking at the problems of doing preschool evaluations, an attempt was made to obtain data from various sources, and to reduce some control problems found in other studies. In this way, it could best be determined whether the goals of the Learning Village program are being met.

METHOD

Subjects

A list of ninety-eight former Learning Village children was made from information gathered from the Learning Village files. Forty-seven children were found to be currently enrolled in Kalamazoo Public Schools. A randomly selected control group of similar children was matched with this group using the following variables: school district, classroom and teacher, race, age, and sex. Each child was matched by variable in the order just given. The control group was chosen from children in the same class as the former Learning Village children.

One black child in the experimental group was given a white control, two experimental children were one year younger than their controls, and four were of the opposite sex. In each of these cases, control children that matched all five variables were not available.

The experimental group was made up of thirty males and seventeen females. Thirty-three of these children were black, and fourteen were white. The control group included twenty-nine males, and eighteen females. Thirty-two of these children were black, and fifteen were white.

All children were in grades one through six, and ranged in age from six to fifteen years. Former Learning

Village children were in the program for a mean of one year and seven months. This ranged from a minimum of one month to a maximum of forty-seven months. These children had been out of the program for an average of four years and two months, with a range of two to six years.

No data concerning I.Q. levels or socio-economic backgrounds were available.

Procedure I

After the control group was selected, standard scores obtained on the math and reading sections of the Metropolitan Achievement Test were recorded for each child. These tests had been given in the Kalamazoo Public Schools in the beginning of the 1975-76 school year. All data were obtained and recorded at the Administration Building of the Kalamazoo Public Schools.

Procedure II

After the MAT scores were recorded for both groups, a list was made of all children, their teachers, principals, and school buildings. They were found to be in forty-one classrooms of sixteen buildings. At this time, an administrator of the Kalamazoo Public Schools sent each principal an introductory letter, stating that the author had permission to carry out this study. A brief

description of the study, and background information about the author was also included. Each principal had the final decision of allowing or not allowing data to be collected at their school. At this time, the author contacted each of the principals. Two initially refused to participate in the study. After meeting individually with each of the sixteen principals, only one refused to participate.

The meetings with the principals centered on the purpose of the study, types of data to be collected, and instructions of how the forms were to be completed. Ten of the thirty-seven teachers involved in the study also requested to meet with the author, at which time the data forms, and instructions for completing them were given. In all other instances, forms and instructions were given by the principals.

After meeting with the principals, it was decided that all parents of children included in the study should be contacted and given an explanation of the purpose of the study, and told what information was to be collected. Five of the principals also requested that written permission be obtained from all parents.

Every parent was contacted and informed of the study. Permission slips (Appendix C) were distributed, and all parents agreed to allow data concerning their children to be collected.

The Teacher Rating Scale (Appendix B) is modeled after the Pupil Development Survey, used in a study by Ross (1972). Written instructions were given with each form. Each teacher was requested to complete one form for every former Learning Village child and their control. No information was given indicating which children had gone to the Learning Village. Most teachers completed two of these forms, and each was reported to have taken about five minutes to complete.

Teachers were also asked to complete forms indicating past evaluations in the areas of reading and math, and to indicate the present reading level of each child in both groups. This reading level is based on the Houghton-Mifflin reading series, which is used in all of the schools. The reading levels range from one to twelve, depending on the abilities of the children.

The past evaluations in the areas of reading and math are based on written evaluations given by the teachers during the current school year. Since the schools use written evaluations in place of letter grades, the teachers were asked to convert these into numbers, using a scale of one to nine, with the higher numbers indicating a greater level of achievement.

Procedure III

An attempt was made to contact all former Learning

Village children and their parents in order to have them complete a questionnaire (Appendices E and F). From a list of ninety-eight former students, thirty-five parents were contacted (many parents could not be contacted for a variety of reasons, see discussion). A telephone interview was held with each of these parents. The questions were read (one at a time), and the response given after each question was recorded. After the parents completed their questionnaires, the same procedures were used for the former Learning Village children. Thirty children completed the questionnaire. In the case where more than one child in a family had been in the program, only one of the children was interviewed.

RESULTS

Table 1 shows the standard scores obtained on the reading section of the Metropolitan Achievement Test by children in the experimental and control groups. Significant differences ($p=.021$) were found between the two groups.[1] The experimental group had a mean score of 58.1, while the control group's mean score was 53.3. Significant differences in reading were also found between the white children in the experimental group, who had a mean score of 65.0, and white children in the control group, with a mean score of 53.4. Other significant differences were not found on the reading section of the MAT, but all experimental groups had higher mean scores than the control groups.

Scores obtained on the mathematics section of the MAT also appear in Table 1. Significant differences were not found. The mean scores obtained on the mathematics section were similar for all experimental and control groups. The white experimental group had the highest mean score (65.6), and the female control group (58.0) had the lowest mean score on the mathematics section.

---

[1]All computations were done on the PDP-10 computer system. Correlated *t*-tests were used for all comparisons. The probability associated with the *t*-tests assume a two-tail test.

Table 1

Comparison of Scores Obtained on the Reading and Mathematics Sections of the Metropolitan Achievement Test (Standard Scores)

Exper.	N	Mean	S.D.	Range	t-value	Prob.	Control	Mean	S.D.	Range
Reading										
Total	46	58.1	20.0	96	2.443	.021*	Total	53.3	14.1	54
Males	27	57.4	19.7	84	1.539	.146	Males	53.7	14.0	51
Females	16	58.6	20.9	88	1.844	.086	Females	51.9	14.3	50
Black	31	55.0	17.8	70	1.182	.239	Black	52.6	13.8	51
White	13	65.0	24.3	76	2.827	.016*	White	53.4	15.6	54
Mathematics										
Total	47	64.1	20.3	88	.3464	.728	Total	63.4	17.7	74
Males	28	64.7	18.8	81	.0136	.882	Males	64.8	15.4	61
Females	15	62.2	22.8	82	1.144	.270	Females	58.0	21.1	67
Black	33	63.5	19.7	82	.0467	.620	Black	63.4	17.4	73
White	13	65.6	23.4	78	1.077	.292	White	62.3	19.5	74

*Significant at .05 level

As Table 1 shows, the black children of the experimental group had lower mean scores than the white children on both the reading and mathematics sections of the MAT.

Correlations between scores obtained on the reading and mathematics sections of the MAT by the former Learning Village children and length of attendance in the program, age upon entering, and length of time the children have been out of the program appear in Table 2. Significant positive correlations (.308 and .302) were found between scores obtained on the reading and mathematics sections of the MAT and length of attendance in the Learning Village program. Significant positive correlations were also found between these scores and the age of the child upon entering the program (.546 and .657). Table 2 also shows that slight negative correlations were found between MAT scores and the length of time the children have been out of the program, but these were not found to be significant.

Responses made on the Teacher Rating Scale are shown on Table 3. Teachers rated former Learning Village children higher than the control children on all areas of the Language Arts section. Significant differences between groups were found on the areas of general intelligence ($p=.0128$), general reading ability ($p=.0010$), comprehension ($p=.0034$), vocabulary ($p=.0201$), and the ability to express thoughts clearly ($p=.0115$). Other

Table 2

Correlations of MAT Standard Scores Obtained by the experimental Group

Variable 1	Variable 2	Corr. Coef. (r)
Reading Scores	Length of Attendance in L.V. Program	.308*
Reading Scores	Age of S at Entry of L.V. Program	.546**
Reading Scores	Length of Time Since Termination Date	-.089
Reading Scores (Exper. Group)	Mathematics Scores (Exper. Group)	.881**
Reading Scores (Control Group)	Mathematics Scores (Control Group)	.842**
Mathematics Scores	Length of Attendance in L.V. Program	.302*
Mathematics Scores	Age of S at Entry of L.V. Program	.657**
Mathematics Scores	Length of Time Since Termination Date	-.041

*Significant at .05 level
**Significant at .01 level
L.V. = Learning Village

Table 3

Comparison of Responses Recorded on the Teacher Rating Scale (N=37)

Area	Exper. (mean)	Control (mean)	t-value	Prob.
General Intelligence	6.35	5.54	2.619	.0128*
Social Maturity	5.67	5.81	.4388	.6634
Acceptance by Peers	6.27	6.35	.2460	.8071
Self-Confidence	5.97	5.51	1.050	.3007
Initiative	5.05	5.40	1.067	.2931
Persistence	5.21	5.35	.3757	.7093
Attention Span	5.16	5.54	1.022	.3136
Gross Motor Coordination	6.83	7.16	1.099	.2791
Fine Motor Coordination	6.05	6.29	.6296	.5329
Reading Ability	5.94	4.51	3.565	.0010**
Comprehension	5.97	4.81	3.135	.0034**
Vocabulary	5.78	4.91	2.433	.0201*
Expression of Thoughts	5.78	4.78	2.662	.0115*
Group Discussion	6.05	5.13	1.947	.0594
Ability to Listen	5.35	5.08	.6458	.5225
Ideas in Writing	5.16	4.59	1.318	.1958
Spelling	5.51	4.83	1.591	.1204
General Ability in Math	6.56	6.05	1.362	.1817
Concepts in Mathematics	5.70	5.78	.2120	.8333
Computation	5.97	6.00	.0667	.9472
Problem Solving	5.48	5.59	.2639	.7934

*Significant at .05 level
**Significant at .01 level

significant differences were not found. As Table 3 shows, in almost all areas besides the Language Arts section, teachers rated children in the experimental and control groups about the same.

The mean ratings for each of the six categories of the Teacher Rating Scale are given on Table 4. This again shows significant differences for the categories of General Intelligence ($p=.0128$), and Language Arts ($p=.0180$). As shown in Appendix B, the Language Arts section covers areas relating to speech and reading. The mean score of the experimental group for the Teacher Rating Scale as a whole is 121.9, and for the control group the mean score is 114.2. This difference was not found to be significant.

Table 5 shows the mean scores in the Language Arts, and General Ability in Mathematics sections obtained by each sex and race. Significant differences were found between white experimental and control children on both the Language Arts and General Ability in Mathematics sections. Other significant differences were not found, but all experimental groups had higher mean ratings than the control groups in the Language Arts section.

The total mean scores in all categories of the Teacher Rating Scale obtained by each sex and race are shown in Table 6. Significant differences were found

Table 4

Mean Scores on the Teacher Rating Scale
for Each Category (N=37)

	Category	Exper. (mean)	S.D.	Control (mean)	S.D.	*t*-value	Prob.
I.	General Intelligence	6.35	1.96	5.54	1.69	2.619	.0128*
II.	Social Development	11.94	3.62	12.16	3.70	.3831	.7039
III.	Emotional Development	21.40	6.55	21.70	8.09	.2175	.8290
IV.	Physical and Motor Development	13.13	3.35	12.97	3.70	.2665	.7914
V.	Language Arts	45.59	15.0	38.64	16.3	2.479	.0180*
VI.	General Ability in Mathematics	23.72	8.60	23.08	8.07	.4206	.6765
TOTAL (Six Categories)		121.9	34.4	114.2	36.5	1.281	.2084

*Significant at .05 level

Table 5

Mean Language Arts and General Ability in Mathematics Section Scores Obtained by Each Sex and Race

Experimental	N	Mean	S.D.	Control	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Prob.
Language Arts								
Males	25	43.3	14.1	Males	37.0	15.8	2.020	.0547
Females	12	50.0	16.6	Females	42.1	17.6	1.392	.1914
Black	27	41.8	13.7	Black	37.0	16.5	1.411	.1701
White	10	55.9	14.0	White	43.0	15.9	2.705	.0242*
General Ability in Mathematics								
Males	25	22.6	8.0	Males	22.8	8.6	.1830	.8563
Females	12	26.2	9.6	Females	23.6	7.1	.7205	.4862
Black	27	22.0	8.2	Black	23.1	8.2	.6539	.5189
White	10	28.5	8.1	White	22.9	8.2	2.316	.0458*

*Significant at .05 level

between the white children in the experimental group, and the white children in the control group. The white former Learning Village children had a mean score of 140.9, and the white children in the control group had a mean score of 117.7. All experimental groups were again rated higher than the control groups.

Correlations between the Teacher Rating Scale and Metropolitan Achievement Test scores are shown on Table 7. A significant positive correlation was found between scores obtained on the reading section of the MAT and scores obtained on the Language Arts section of the Teacher Rating Scale by children in the experimental group. Correlations between scores obtained by the experimental group were greater than those of the control group. The correlations on the reading and mathematics areas were .463 and .290 for the experimental group, and .006 and -.052 for the control group.

Table 8 shows the correlations between scores obtained by former Learning Village children on the Teacher Rating Scale and length of time spent in the program, age at entry, and length of time the children have been out of the program. Significant correlations were not found. The correlation between scores on the Language Arts section, and the General Ability in Mathematics section, however, was found to be significant at the .01 level (.8367).

Table 6

Mean Total Scores on the Teacher Rating Scale Obtained by Each Sex and Race

Exper.	N	Mean	S.D.	Control	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Prob.
Males	25	116.0	32.4	Males	109.0	36.1	1.023	.3165
Females	12	134.2	36.5	Females	125.2	36.2	.7420	.4736
Black	27	114.9	31.6	Black	112.9	35.3	.2685	.7904
White	10	140.9	36.0	White	117.7	41.4	2.562	.0306*
TOTAL	37	121.9	34.4	Total	114.2	36.5	1.281	.2084

*Significant at .05 level

Table 7

Correlations of MAT and Teacher Rating Scale Scores

Variable 1	Variable 2	Corr. Coef. (r)
Language Arts Section Scores	MAT Reading Standard Scores	.463* (Exper. Group)
General Ability In Mathematics Scores	MAT Mathematics Standard Scores	.290 (Exper. Group)
Language Arts Section Scores	MAT Reading Standard Scores	.006 (Control Group)
General Ability In Mathematics Scores	MAT Mathematics Standard Scores	-.052 (Control Group)

*Significant at .05 level

Table 8

Correlations of Scores Obtained on the Teacher Rating Scale by Experimental Group

Variable 1	Variable 2	Corr. Coef. (r)
Total T.R.S. Scores	Length of Attendance in L.V. Program	-.2787
Total T.R.S. Scores	Age of S at Entry of L.V. Program	-.0418
Total T.R.S. Scores	Length of Time Since Termination Date	-.0233
Language Arts Section Scores	Length of Attendance in L.V. Program	-.2543
Language Arts Section Scores	Age of S at Entry of L.V. Program	-.0384
Language Arts Section Scores	Length of Time Since Termination Date	-.0933
General Ability In Mathematics	Length of Attendance in L.V. Program	-.2292
General Ability In Mathematics	Length of Time Since Termination Date	.0003
General Ability In Mathematics	Age of S at Entry of L.V. Program	-.0743
Language Arts Section Scores	General Ability In Mathematics Scores	.8367**

**Significant at .01 level
L.V. = Learning Village
T.R.S. = Teacher Rating Scale

Current reading levels for the experimental and control groups are given in Table 9. These reading levels are based on the Houghton Mifflin Reading Series and range from levels one to twelve. The mean reading level of the experimental group was 7.08, and 6.37 for the control group. This difference was not found to be significant.

Past evaluations in the areas of reading and mathematics are also shown on Table 9. Although the former Learning Village children have higher achievement levels than the control children in all areas, none of the differences were found to be significant.

The most frequent responses given on the questionnaire completed by parents of former Learning Village children appear in Table 10. Two of the thirty-five parents stated that their children had never gone to the Learning Village, although files indicated these children had been in the program for several months. Also, one parent did not want to be interviewed, so that responses were obtained from thirty-two parents. Seventy-five per cent of those interviewed were the mothers of the children. Most of the parents interviewed thought that the Learning Village greatly benefited their children. Half could not think of anything they didn't like about the program. More than half of the parents responded that the main reason for sending their child to the Learning

Table 9

Current Reading Levels and Comparison of Past Teacher Evaluations of Experimental and Control Groups (N=24)

Area	Exper. (mean)	S.D.	Control (mean)	S.D.	t-value	Prob.
Reading						
Figures Out New Words	5.33	2.2	4.66	2.2	1.138	.2668
Understands What Is Read	5.58	2.1	4.75	2.1	1.647	.1132
Finds Needed Information	5.16	2.2	4.45	2.1	1.412	.1713
Seems to Enjoy Reading	5.50	2.2	4.91	2.1	1.167	.2552
TOTAL READING	21.58	8.5	18.95	8.2	1.293	.2088
Mathematics						
Understands Number Concepts	5.50	2.0	5.41	2.0	.1759	.8619
Knows Basic Number Facts	5.75	2.2	5.37	2.2	.6765	.5055
Thinks Clearly In Problem Solving	5.12	2.3	4.70	2.1	.8797	.3881
TOTAL MATHEMATICS	16.37	6.3	15.75	6.0	.4233	.6760
TOTAL READING AND MATHEMATICS	37.54	13.5	34.70	13.4	.8792	.3884
CURRENT READING LEVEL	7.08	2.6	6.37	2.4	1.922	.0671

Table 10

Most Frequent Responses to the Parent Questionnaire

Question	Response	Freq.	Percentage of Responses
Who is being interviewed?	Mother	24	75%
	Father	7	22%
Do you feel the Learning Village has benefited your child greatly, somewhat, or very little?	Greatly	19	59%
	Somewhat	12	37%
What ways has it benefited your child the most?	Interaction with other children	11	34%
	No response, or don't know	6	19%
How did you find out about the program?	Can't remember	9	28%
	From someone at W.M.U.	7	22%
What did you like best about the program?	Teaching children at a very young age	7	19%
	Transportation of child to and from school	4	11%
What didn't you like about the program?	No response or don't know	16	48%
	Some of the student teachers from W.M.U.	4	12%

Table 10
(Continued)

What were the main reasons for having your child in the program?	Needed day care for the child	17	45%
	Thought the program would benefit the child	8	21%
What changes should have been made in the program?	No response or don't know	20	62%
	Have more certified teachers	3	9%
Did you ever work for the Learning Village?	No	26	81%
	Yes, as a teacher	5	16%
Do you feel the L.V. program has made your child a better student academically?	Yes	15	47%
	No	6	19%
Have you, or would you like to have other children in the L.V. program?	Yes	15	47%
	No, tuition is too high	6	19%
How would you describe your child's present progress in public school?	Above average	16	50%
	Average	12	37%
Why was your child taken out of the L.V. program?	Reached age limit	16	50%
	Didn't like the program anymore	6	19%
If you had the choice to make over, would you again have your child in the L.V. program?	Yes	24	75%
	No	5	16%

Village program was because they needed day care for their child. Almost two thirds of the parents thought that the program had made their child a better student in school. Twenty-eight of the thirty-two parents responded that their child was doing average or above average work in public school. Twenty-four parents said that if they had the choice to make over again, they would once more send their children to the Learning Village. All responses to this questionnaire are shown in Appendix E.

The responses given on the questionnaire completed by the former Learning Village children appear in Table 11. Six of the thirty children could not remember being in the program, and they did not complete the questionnaire. All other twenty-four children responded that they enjoyed being in the program. Most children could not think of anything they didn't like about the program. When asked what type of school they would rather attend, fifteen of the twenty-four children chose a type similar to the Learning Village, and only five chose a type similar to the school they were currently attending. All responses to this questionnaire are shown in Appendix F.

Table 11

Most Frequent Responses To Questionnaire Given To Former Learning Village Children

Question	Response	Freq.	Percentage of Responses
Do you remember being in the Learning Village Program?	Yes	24	80%
	No	6	20%
Did you like going to the Learning Village?	Yes	24	100%
What do you remember most about the program?	The play periods	5	16%
	The rewards	3	9%
What did you like best about the program?	Playing with toys, games, or in gym	7	28%
	No response or don't know	3	12%
What didn't like about the program?	Don't know or no response	19	79%
	School was year round	1	4%
What are things you had at the L.V. that you don't have in your present school?	No response or don't know	9	30%
	Free time	5	17%
What type of school would you rather attend?	One like the Learning Village	15	62%
	School I'm going to now	5	20%

DISCUSSION

Significant differences were found between experimental and control children on the reading section of the MAT, and the Language Arts section of the Teacher Rating Scale. In the present study, data concerning I.Q. levels, or socio-economic backgrounds of the subjects were not available. In addition, some children in the experimental group were matched with control children of the opposite sex, or different age level. Therefore, some question exists as to whether the two groups were properly matched. The data presented in this study suggest that in most areas except reading, both groups have similar abilities. While this does not necessarily prove that the two groups were properly matched, there is no conclusive evidence to indicate otherwise. As mentioned earlier, in any study using the post facto experimental design, some control problems are inevitable.

In looking at the data, in all cases where significant differences were found between experimental and control groups, significant differences were not found between the black children of these groups. In most cases, however, the black experimental children did have higher scores than the black control children.

It is obvious from the data that the white former Learning Village children have the highest scores in all

comparisons. Whether these children benefited more from the Learning Village program than the black children, or whether they were more advanced upon entering the program is not known. Most of the white children paid tuition for the Learning Village program, while most of the black children came from families on public assistance. This suggests different social backgrounds. As mentioned earlier, environmental factors present before, during, and after preschool programs can influence the effects of such programs. Different environments may be one of the reasons why the black and white children of the experimental group obtained different scores on the various comparisons presented in this study.

No general conclusions can be made from the correlations shown in this study. Table 2 shows significant correlations between MAT scores and time spent in the Learning Village program, but Table 8 shows slight negative correlations between time spent in the program and scores on the Teacher Rating Scale. The same is true for the above scores and the age of the subject upon entering the program. The reasons for these apparent discrepancies are not known.

It is interesting to note that higher correlations were found between MAT and Teacher Rating Scale scores for the experimental group than the control group. Perhaps

the former Learning Village children are in the habit of showing their abilities more so, as a result of being rewarded for doing this in the program. Of course, this is only a speculation.

In addition to differences in reading abilities between experimental and control groups, Table 3 also shows significant differences in the areas of vocabulary, ability to express thoughts clearly, and general intelligence. Some teachers expressed difficulty in rating the children in this last area. Since no other I.Q. levels for these children were available, it is difficult to determine whether the ratings given by the teachers were accurate. However, there is no reason to indicate they are any more inaccurate than standardized I.Q. tests.

The experimental group as a whole was given a mean rating of 6.35 in the area of general intelligence, whereas the control group was given a mean rating of 5.54. This was a significant difference. The differences in reading abilities found between groups may have been due to differences in I.Q. levels, but if this was the case, differences would also be expected in mathematics, and the other areas compared in this study. Such differences were not found. Inasmuch as the two groups could not be matched according to I.Q. levels, there is a possibility that differences in reading abilities between groups were due to differences in intelligence, rather than

participation in the Learning Village program.

As indicated in Table 9, significant differences were not found between experimental and control groups in past teacher evaluations. The data used in this comparison were incomplete. Thirteen of the thirty-seven forms returned by the teachers could not be used because they were either left blank, or completed incorrectly. One reason this occurred may be that the verbal instructions given were not well understood. Written instructions, which were included with the Teacher Rating Scale forms, were not given with the past teacher evaluation forms. In all future studies of this type, written instructions should be issued with all forms to be completed.

The responses given by the parents on the questionnaire indicate that they are pleased with the Learning Village program, and think it has benefited their children. As was reported, many of these parents needed day care for their children, but they also wanted them to be exposed to a learning environment. As was indicated, most parents thought the program had made their children better students in public school.

A few negative comments concerning the Learning Village program were also made. Some parents said that the tuition rate was too high, and others thought too many student teachers were used. These parents wanted more certified teachers in the program. However, most

of the responses were favorable. This seems to indicate that the support for such compensatory programs is still very high, despite the negative publicity given them.

All of the former Learning Village children who were interviewed replied that they enjoyed being in the program. Play periods, free time, and similar activities were indicated as what they liked best about the program. Most of these same activities were also indicated as what the children had in the Learning Village, but not in present schools. Since the children are missing many of the activities they enjoyed the most in the program, it may be that the change from the Learning Village to public school was a somewhat punishing experience for them. If this is the case, it is not surprising that two thirds of these children would rather attend a school similar to the Learning Village. Changing from a highly reinforcing environment to one that is less reinforcing may be one reason why gains made in preschool are often lost in public school.

The results of this study do not totally agree with the findings of Camacho. Significant differences between experimental and control groups were found in the present study, while none were reported by Camacho. There are several differences between the two studies. The control groups used in both studies were made up of different children, although exactly the same procedures were used

to select them. The same children made up both experimental groups, but the number of children in the groups is different. Camacho divided the experimental group into two sections in order to compare scores of the Metropolitan Achievement and (school) Readiness sections. Only the achievement section was used in the present study, and scores from the most recent administration of the MAT were obtained. In addition, several of the experimental children were eliminated from the study of Camacho because they had not taken all of the tests. Ten children were also eliminated from the experimental group of the present study, but this was after MAT scores were recorded for these children. The distinctions given above may account for the different results obtained in the two studies.

The findings of this study seem to correspond more with the evaluations of children in the Learning Village presented earlier in this report than the Camacho study. Several of those evaluations indicated that the reading program of the Learning Village was more advanced than the mathematics program. This seems to agree with the findings of this study.

All of the children who made up the experimental group of this study have been out of the program from two to six years. In that time, the Learning Village has

undergone many changes. It is therefore difficult to make predictions for children currently enrolled in the program based on the findings of this study. Since the specific procedures used in the Learning Village in the past are not known, no valid comparisons can be made with present procedures. The general goals of the program, however, remain essentially the same. Since changes in the program are inevitable, perhaps more frequent evaluations should be made so that future predictions of children in the program can be more accurate.

The primary purpose and goal for most compensatory preschool programs is that participants attain a high or at least average level of achievement in future education. In order to determine whether these goals are being met, evaluations of preschool programs should be based on actual achievement levels of former participants, rather than I.Q. tests, or tests that are used to predict future achievement. Standardized tests often result in inaccurate predictions of future achievement, and don't really point out if the goals of the program are being met. Including the types of evaluations used in the typical school setting, as was done in the present study, will directly indicate whether the goals of the program are being met, at least for the children who are being evaluated.

At this time it seems appropriate to report the control problems encountered in this study. At the start

of this study, it was decided that each child in the experimental and control groups be individually tested, so that various control problems found in other studies could be reduced. This, however, could not be done because the administrators of the public schools felt it would disrupt the normal classroom procedure. This problem may be encountered in other studies.

Another problem was that over half of the former Learning Village children could not be located. Most of these children no longer lived at the same address, or had the same phone number as was listed in the Learning Village files. Since unlisted telephone numbers can not be divulged, some of the parents and children could not be contacted.

It was mentioned that initially some of the principals involved in this study were reluctant to participate. One reason for this may have been the status of the author (e.g., graduate student completing a degree requirement). Another reason may have been the types of data required, and the recent privacy laws. These laws require prior consent of parents before any data can be released. The enforcement of these laws has not been uniform because in some areas the laws are unclear. For example, in certain situations where the data are to be used for statistical purposes only, and no identification of the subject is given, such permission may not be necessary.

It seems that in the future, such laws will become more stringent, and the types of data used in this study will be very difficult to obtain.

In the present study, the time necessary to contact and obtain permission slips from parents was not very great. The number of parents involved was not very large, and this was not a major problem. It may be a problem when the size of the sample groups is very large, or when there is difficulty contacting the parents (as when the parents have no phone, or unlisted telephone numbers). In such cases, the recent privacy laws may influence the type of preschool study that can be done.

During the course of the study, several of the children in the experimental group had to eliminated due to several factors. One was that a principal refused to participate in the study, and therefore, five of the children who were enrolled in that school could not be used. The reasons why this principal decided not to participate in this study are not known.

Another factor was that several classroom teachers had more than two former Learning Village children in their classes. In these situations it was decided that the teachers complete forms for only two children, so that hastily phrased responses would not be given. Two additional children were thus removed from the experimental group.

The third factor was that it was found that two former Learning Village children had left the local school system shortly after the beginning of the school year. This, therefore, reduced the number of children in the experimental group to thirty-seven.

Another problem encountered was that some children had changed classrooms, or school buildings during the course of the school year. It was decided that former (rather than the present) classroom teachers be asked to complete the data forms, because the children had been in this first class when the MAT tests had been given.

The main problems with the completion of questionnaires given to the former Learning Village children and their parents centered on obtaining the most recent telephone numbers of these families. It was already reported that only half of these families still had the same numbers that appeared on the Learning Village files. In the cases where these families had unlisted numbers, the children and parents could not be contacted. In addition to this problem, some children were no longer living with their parents, or the parent who knew the most about the program was not available.

Some of the above problems may be able to be reduced. It may be legal to obtain permission slips from parents while the children are in the program. These permission slips would have to be valid for several years, so that

future evaluations could be possible.

In addition, it may also be helpful to determine as best as possible the schools the children in the program will be attending. Doing so may make it easier to locate these children in the future. Also, closer ties should be developed with local school systems, so that frequent evaluations will be possible.

CONCLUSION

The data presented in this study suggest that some lasting benefits can be derived from compensatory pre-school programs. Many of these benefits can be non-academic. The following quote illustrates the personal interactions that often take place in such programs. When asked what he liked best about the Learning Village program, a former student participant replied, "When something went wrong you could talk to somebody and they would make you feel better."

REFERENCES

Bayley, N., Bayley Scales of Infant Development. New York: Psychological Corporation, 1968.

Becker, W.C., "Some Necessary Conditions for the Controlled Study of Achievement and Aptitude." In Green, D.R. (ed.) The Aptitude-Achievement Distinction. Monterey, California: CBT McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1974.

Bereiter, C., & Engelmann, S., Teaching Disadvantaged Children in the Preschool. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1966. Pp. 47-65.

Bissell, Joan, "The Cognitive Effects of Preschool Programs for Disadvantaged Schools." Bethesda, Maryland: National Institute of Child and Humar Development, 1970.

Bloom, B.S., Stability and Change in Human Characteristics. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.

Bloom, B.S., Compensatory Education for Cultural Deprivation. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1965.

Brigham, T.A., & Sherman, J.A., "An Experimental Analysis of Verbal Imitation in Preschool Children." Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1968, 1, 151-158.

Caldwell, Bettye, M., "A Decade of Early Intervention Programs: What We Have Learned." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1974, 4, 491-496.

Camacho, Margarita, "A Follow-Up Study of the Kalamazoo Learning Village." Unpublished specialist's project, Western Michigan University, August, 1975.

Deutsch, Martin, "The Disadvantaged Child and the Learning Process." In Passon, A.H. (ed.) Education In Depressed Areas. New York: Bureau Publications, Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1963.

DiLorenzo, L., & Salter, R., "An Evaluative Study of Pre-Kindergarten Programs for Educationally Disadvantaged Children: Follow Up and Replication." Exceptional Children, 1968, 35, 111-119.

Durost, W.N. (ed.) Metropolitan Achievement Tests. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1960.

Engelmann, S., & Bruner, E.C., Distar Reading. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1969.

Gates, A.I., & MacGinitie, W.H., Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1965.

Grey, S.W., & Klaus, R.A., "An Experimental Preschool Program For Culturally Deprived Children." Child Development, 1965, 36, 887-898.

Hamilton, Jack, "An Assessment of Project Head Start in Kalamazoo." Unpublished master's thesis, Western Michigan University, August, 1966.

Haring, N., Hayden, A.H., & Nolen, P.A., "Accelerating Appropriate Behaviors of Children in a Head Start Program." Exceptional Children, 1969, 35, 773-786.

Hart, B.M., & Risley, T.R., "Establishing Use of Descriptive Adjectives in the Spontaneous Speech of Disadvantaged Preschool Children." Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1968, 1, 109-120.

Hellmuth, Jerome (ed.) Disadvantaged Child. Volume 3. New York: Bruner-Mazel, Inc., 1972. Pp. 447-450.

Hyman, I.A., & Kliman, D.S., "First Grade Readiness of Children Who Have Had Summer Head Start Programs." Training School Bulletin, 1967, 63, 163-167.

Jastak, J.F., & Jastak, S.R., The Wide Range Achievement Test: Manuel. Wilmington, Delaware: Guidance Associates, 1965.

Jensen, A.R., "How Much Can We Boost I.Q. and Scholastic Achievement?" Harvard Educational Review, 1969, 39, 1-123.

Karnes, M.B., Hodgins, A., & Teska, J.A., "An Evaluation of Two Preschool Programs For Disadvantaged Children: A Traditional and Highly Structured Experimental Preschool." Exceptional Children, 1968, 34, 667-676.

Lesler, K., & Fox, R.E., "An Evaluation of a Head Start Program in a Low Population Area." Journal of Negro Education, 1969, 38, 46-54.

Mendelsohn, R., "Is Head Start a Success or Failure?" In Hellmuth, J. (ed.) Disadvantaged Child. Volume 3. New York: Brunner-Mazel, Inc., 1970. 447-460.

Office of Economic Opportunity, Catolog of Federal Assistance Programs. Washington, D.C., 1967. Pp. 554.

Ozer, M.N., & Milgram, N.A., "The Effects of a Summer Head Start Program: A Neurological Evaluation." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1967, 37, 331-332.

Parker, D., Covell, H.M., LaForge, P.J., Paternoster, L. M., Quinn, T.J., & Fisher, L.E., The SRA Reading Laboratory. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1959.

Reiber, M., & Womack, M., "The Intelligence of Preschool Children as Related to Ethnic and Demographic Variables." Exceptional Children, 1968, 34, 609-614.

Robinson, Donald, "Head Start in Mississippi." Phi Delta Kappan, 1965, 47, 91-95.

Ross, R.F., "Pupil Development Survey of Project Head Start Participants." Education, 1972, 92, 99-107.

Scott, J., "Critical Periods in Behavioral Development." Science, 1962, 138, 949-955.

Shipman, V., Disadvantaged Children and Their First School Experience. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1973.

Smith, M.S., & Bissell, J.S., "The Impact of Head Start: The Westinghouse-Ohio Head Start Evaluations." Harvard Educational Review, 1970, 40, 51-104.

Spicher, H.H., & Bartel, N.R., "The Mentally Retarded." In Johnson, G.O., & Blank, H.D. (eds.) Exceptional Children Research Review. Washington, D.C.: Council For Exceptional Children, 1968. Pp. 215-220.

Stanley, J.C. (ed.) Preschool Programs For The Disadvantaged. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972. Pp. 22-34.

Temp, G., & Anderson, D., Project Head Start, 1966. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1967.

Ulrich, R.E., Louisell, S.E., & Wolfe, M., "The Learning Village: A Behavioral Approach to Early Education." Educational Technology, 1971, 11, 32-45.

Ulrich, R.E., Alessi, G.J., & Wolfe, M., "The Learning Village: An Alternate Approach to Traditional Education." In Packham, D., Cleary, A., & Mayes, T. (eds.) Aspects of Educational Technology, Volume 5. London: Pitman Publishing Co., 1971. Pp. 13-25.

Weikart, D., "Preschool Programs: Preliminary Findings." The Journal of Special Education, 1967, 1, 163-181.

Weikart, D., "Relationship of Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning in Preschool Education." In Stanley, J. (ed.) Preschool Programs For The Disadvantaged. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972. Pp. 22-34.

Westinghouse Learning Corporation and Ohio University, The Impact of Head Start: An Evaluation of the Effect of Head Start on Children's Cognitive and Affective Development. Office of Economic Opportunity, Springfield, VA.: U.S. Government Clearinghouse, 1969.

Wolff, M., & Stein, A., "Head Start Six Months Later." Phi Delta Kappan, 1967, 48, 349-350.

Zigler, E., & Butterfield, E.C., "Motivational Aspects of Changes in I.Q. Test Performance of Culturally Deprived Nursery School Children." Child Development, 1968, 39, 1-14.

APPENDIX A

Introductory Letter

I am a graduate student in psychology at Western Michigan University. As part of my M.A. degree program, I am evaluating the Kalamazoo Learning Village, which is an experimental preschool. Part of this evaluation involves comparing children who were in the Learning Village program with similar children without a Learning Village experience. I would greatly appreciate your help by completing the following forms for children who are in your class. Some of these children were in the Learning Village program, and others were not. The name of the child, and the directions appear at the top of the form. Please compare each child to the other children in your class. Each form should take only a few minutes, and the information will be used for statistical purposes only.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME

SALVATORE CULLARI

If there are any questions about the form, or what the information will be used for, please call 345-1548.

APPENDIX B

Teacher Rating Scale

PLEASE RATE THIS PUPIL ON THE FOLLOWING CATEGORIES USING THE SCALE BELOW. ASSIGN A WHOLE NUMBER AND PLACE IT IN THE SPACE PROVIDED. YOUR RATING COMPARES THE PUPIL TO HIS OR HER CLASSMATES.

POOR OR LOW 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 GOOD OR HIGH

I. GENERAL INTELLIGENCE _____

II. SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT
- A. Social Maturity _____
- B. Social Acceptance by Peers _____

III. EMOTIONAL DEVELOPMENT
- A. Self-Confidence _____
- B. Initiative _____
- C. Persistence _____
- D. Attention Span _____

IV. PHYSICAL AND MOTOR DEVELOPMENT
- A. Gross Motor Coordination _____
- B. Fine Motor Coordination _____

V. LANGUAGE ARTS
- A. General Reading Ability _____
- B. Comprehension _____
- C. Vocabulary _____
- D. Expresses Thoughts Clearly _____
- E. Contributes to Group Discussion _____
- F. Ability to Listen _____
- G. Ability to Express Ideas In Writing _____
- H. Spelling _____

VI. GENERAL ABILITY IN MATHEMATICS

A. Ability to Read, Count, and Write Numbers _____

B. Concepts _____

C. Computation _____

D. Problem Solving _____

APPENDIX C

Permission Slip

DEAR PARENT

MY NAME IS SAL CULLARI. I AM A GRADUATE STUDENT IN PSYCHOLOGY AT WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY. I AM DOING A STUDY ON PRESCHOOL EDUCATION, WHERE I AM COMPARING A GROUP OF CHILDREN WHO WENT TO THE KALAMAZOO LEARNING VILLAGE, WITH A GROUP OF SIMILAR CHILDREN WHO DID NOT. I WOULD LIKE PERMISSION TO OBTAIN ACADEMIC INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR CHILD TO USE IN THIS STUDY. ALL INFORMATION WILL BE USED FOR STATISTICAL PURPOSES ONLY. THANK-YOU.

PARENT'S SIGNATURE

_____

APPENDIX D

Past Teacher Evaluations

CHILD'S NAME PARENT'S PHONE #

AREA	EVALUATION
CURRENT READING LEVEL	
READING	
FIGURES OUT NEW WORDS	
UNDERSTANDS WHAT IS READ	
FINDS NEEDED INFORMATION	
SEEMS TO ENJOY READING	
MATHEMATICS	
UNDERSTANDS NUMBER CONCEPTS	
KNOWS BASIC NUMBER FACTS	
THINKS CLEARLY IN PROBLEM SOLVING	

(IF SUB AREAS ARE DIFFERENT THAN ONES ABOVE, PLEASE MAKE CORRECTIONS)

APPENDIX E

Parent Questionnaire

1. In general, do you feel the Learning Village program benefited your child greatly, somewhat, or very little?

Responses

(19)	Greatly
(12)	Somewhat
(1)	Very little

2. In what ways has it benefited your child the most?

(11)	The interactions with other children
(6)	No response or don't know
(5)	The general learning situation there
(3)	Academically
(2)	In reading
(2)	Prepared him for public school
(1)	Gave child sense of achievement
(1)	Improved his speech
(1)	Child developed independence

3. How did you find out about the program?

(9)	Can't remember
(7)	From someone at Western Michigan U.
(5)	From my case worker
(5)	From a friend
(3)	From Roger Ulrich
(1)	School was in neighborhood
(1)	Involved in original program

4. What did you like best about the program?

(7)	That they taught at an early age
(4)	Transportation to and from school
(3)	Student-teacher ratio
(3)	The teachers who taught there
(3)	The individual attention given to child
(2)	Staff interaction with children
(2)	The reading program
(2)	Thought the whole program was good
(2)	The unstructured program

(2) Social interactions that occured
(1) The field trips
(1) Can't think of anything
(1) No grades were given
(1) Son enjoyed going there
(1) The learning environment
(1) I didn't like the program

5. What didn't you like about the program?

(16) No response or can't think of anything
(4) Too many student teachers
(2) Not enough certified teachers
(2) The use of rewards in the program
(2) Too many changes occured in the program
(1) I could not speak to all of the teachers
(1) Not enough interaction among children
(1) Too much emphasis on learning
(1) Lack of an adequate language program
(1) It was too different than public school
(1) Should have had more supervised activities
(1) Poorly organized academic program

6. What were the main reasons for sending your child to the Learning Village?

(17) Needed day care for child
(8) Thought the program would benefit the child
(7) So the child could learn some skills
(3) So child could interact with children his age
(1) My son had a reading problem
(1) My child was hyperactive, and I thought the program would help
(1) I liked the teachers in the program

7. What changes should have been made in the program?

(20) No response or don't know
(3) Have more certified teachers
(2) Don't have reward system
(2) Make the program more structured
(1) Have more interactions among children
(1) Have the program more as it was in beginning
(1) Make it similar to public school
(1) Have more supervised activities
(1) Have a more equal black/white ratio

8. Did you ever work in the Learning Village?

(26) No
(5) Yes, as a teacher
(1) Yes, as a nurse

9. Do you feel the Learning Village has made your child a better student in school?

(15) Yes
(6) No
(5) Probably yes
(4) Don't know
(2) In some ways

10. Have you, or would you like to send your other children to the Learning Village?

(15) Yes
(6) No, tuition is too high
(6) Yes, if the program had remained the same
(2) No, my other children don't need the program
(2) No, I don't like the people working there
(1) No, I don't like the program anymore

11. How would you describe your child's present progress in school?

(16) Above average
(12) Average
(4) Below average

12. Why was your child taken out of the program?

(16) Reached age to go to public school
(6) I didn't like the program anymore
(3) I was home again
(2) I didn't like the people working there
(2) Tuition was too high
(2) Elementary program was dropped
(1) I didn't like the black/white ratio

13. If you had the choice over again, would you again enroll your children in the Learning Village program?

(24) Yes
(5) No
(3) Don't know

APPENDIX F

Child Questionnaire

1. Do you remember when you were in the Learning Village?

Response	
(24)	Yes
(6)	No

2. Did you like going to the Learning Village?

(24)	Yes

3. What do you remember most about the Learning Village?

(5)	The play periods
(3)	Getting rewards
(3)	Playing in the playground
(2)	Taking naps
(2)	The field trips
(2)	The teachers
(2)	Playing in the trailer
(2)	Having different kinds of classes
(1)	I learned to read
(1)	Playing with the toys
(1)	The parties
(1)	The movies
(1)	The science classes
(1)	Having a lot of friends
(1)	Going swimming
(1)	The sewing classes
(1)	It was a fun school
(1)	Playing in the gym

4. What did you like best about the Learning Village?

(3)	Playing with toys
(3)	Playing games
(3)	Don't know or no response
(3)	How they taught the subjects
(2)	Having parties
(2)	The field trips
(2)	The food was free
(1)	Playing in the gym
(1)	The teachers
(1)	There wasn't a lot of work to do

(1) The free time we had
(1) I liked everything
(1) The playground
(1) When something went wrong you could talk to somebody, and they would make you feel better.

5. What didn't you like about the Learning Village?

(19) Can't think of anything or no response
(1) Didn't have a gym teacher
(1) School was year round
(1) The classes
(1) A lot of kids teased me
(1) The time out periods

6. What are some things you had at the Learning Village that you don't have in your present school?

(9) Don't know or no response
(5) Free time
(3) Time to play
(2) Toys
(2) Library in class
(1) Snack periods
(1) Changing rooms for classes
(1) The teachers were better there
(1) Games
(1) Classes like sewing and swimming
(1) Less kids in the class
(1) Free lunches
(1) Lots of field trips
(1) Play materials

7. If you had a choice, what type of school would you rather attend, one like the Learning Village, or one like the school you're presently attending?

(6)	Learning Village	(Why?)	I don't know
(4)	Learning Village		I don't like the school I'm going to now
(2)	Learning Village		I had more free time
(2)	Learning Village		I liked the teachers
(1)	Learning Village		Because of the free lunches
(4)	Either school is good		

(3)	Present school	(Why?)	I like it there
(2)	Present school		It's closer to my house