Spring 2010

Cultural Differences: Their Effect on Social Skill Development

Ashley Jay
Providence College

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.providence.edu/socialwrk_students

Part of the Social Work Commons

http://digitalcommons.providence.edu/socialwrk_students/62

It is permitted to copy, distribute, display, and perform this work under the following conditions: (1) the original author(s) must be given proper attribution; (2) this work may not be used for commercial purposes; (3) users must make these conditions clearly known for any reuse or distribution of this work.
CULTURAL DIFFERENCES:
THEIR EFFECT ON SOCIAL SKILL DEVELOPMENT
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Providence, Rhode Island
The level of social skill that is acquired by a child can be determined by the culture in which they are brought up. The culture of a country provides certain “guidelines” for the upbringing of children and, most importantly, the structure of their schooling. Within this schooling, children are taught the proper social behaviors. The external environment competes with natural born, biological tendencies of a child along with their home/family influences. The potential connection between culture and social skill development was examined through daycare surveys in which teachers from two countries answered questions regarding the social skill level of their students. Seven children in the United States and twenty-five children in China were evaluated by daycare providers. These results were discussed in comparison with the countries’ culture along with specific examples drawn from the amount of bullying present in later school grades. The study found that in comparison of the United States data with the Chinese data that a country’s culture does not have any effect on the social skill development of its’ children. The results proved independent of the specified cultural characteristics. This, in turn, also does not affect the frequency of bullying found in later school years.
Outline

I. Introduction
   A. Kindergarten as the first universal experience
      1. beginning of social skill development
         a. definitions (social skill, prosocial, antisocial, competency)
      2. social skill development definition
      3. foundational experiences
   B. Social skills as predictor of future success
      1. within academics, peer relationships
      2. can become pro social or anti social
      3. anti social skill development into negative peer interaction
         a. bullying

II. Main Points
   A. Social skill importance is in relation to different countries
      1. United States as an independent country
      2. China as an interdependent country
      3. Denmark as independent
      4. culture of the country can effect the type of peer group experiences they offer
   B. Mandated peer group experience
      1. United States – not until kindergarten
      2. China – not until kindergarten, did not place importance on kindergarten until later on in 20th century
      3. Denmark – children are placed in daycare and preschool as early as possible
      4. The age at which children begin interacting with peers and learning appropriate behaviors can effect their social skill development
   C. Bullying
      1. definition
      2. examples
      3. how it can result from antisocial skill development

III. Opposing Points
   A. Social skill is in relation to the biology of a child, not the environment
   B. Group experience does not have the sole bearing on the social skill development of a child
      1. kindergarten teachers may personally adapt curriculum to their own values
   C. Bullying is not only from anti social skill development
      1. some children are more aggressive than each other
      2. personality differences
      3. the victims of bullying are not because of poor social interaction but rather they are different than the “norm” and bullies only point those differences out
IV. Hypothesis
   A. the amount of social skill development that children experiences can relate to their future peer interactions
   B. Does more social skill development decrease the amount of bullying experienced in later elementary and middle school?

V. Methodology
   A. Convenience sample
      1. Rhode Island (data gathered previous year)
      2. China (data set already available)
   B. Social skill questionnaire given to teachers from kindergarten classrooms
      1. Independent – amount of social skill development
      2. Dependent – amount of bullying experienced
   C. Correlational statistical measures to determine relationship between two variables
   D. Findings

VI. Conclusion
   A. social skill development in kindergarten children can effect the way they interact with peers later on in school
      1. hypothesis – more social skill development leads to less bullying
      2. results
      3. concluding statement
   B. implications
      1. social work practice – teachers will be able to alter their curriculum to better develop social skills in those children who are at-risk
      2. social work research – will correlate to separate bodies of work (bullying and early social skill development)
      3. social work policy – influence the mandated curriculum of daycares and preschools, along with kindergarten.
Introduction

Kindergarten is the first universal experience for children that introduces them to basic educational concepts and is designed to develop their social skills. The concepts include numbers, colors, shapes and letters. Countries differ on regulations regarding when children begin schooling, but kindergarten is the first mandated education. In this foundational year, crucial experiences occur, specifically social interaction with their peers. The interaction may or may not be shaped by the type of social skill development that is found within the classroom curriculum.

Social skill is defined as a child’s knowledge of and ability to use a variety of social behaviors that are appropriate to a given interpersonal situation and that are pleasing to others in each situation (Welsh & Bierman, 1997). Specific behaviors are given the label of “positive” or “negative” based on whether they help the child form healthy social relationships. Positive social skills are said to be:

1) the ability to make and keep friends,
2) empathy
3) sharing with others
4) accepting peer ideas
5) joining others in play


Negative, or problem, behavior is identified as:

1) fighting with others
2) getting angry easily
3) arguing with others


The social skills that are learned in kindergarten have proven strong predictors of later success or failure in academics, peer relationships, social interactions and school
adjustment. Children who have acquired the essential social skills have a higher academic achievement in later grades as well as becoming more successful in adult, social relationships (Welsh & Bierman, 1997, Pellegrini & Glickman, 1991).

The negative peer relationships have often become some form of bullying in later elementary and middle school. The children who bully appear to lack social skills from positive foundational experiences in the kindergarten years. Bullying rates can differ between countries as each country puts a varied emphasis on social skill development. Denmark is a society that infuses participation in school from a very early age, thus increasing the amount of peer interaction and opportunity for positive interaction. In elementary age children, 18.3% experience some form of bullying as reported for all Nordic (Sweden, Norway & Denmark) countries (Nordhagen, Nielsen, Stigum & Johlert, 2005). The United States has a similar approach in that it emphasizes independence but not from such the early age (Wang & Pomerantz, 2007). In the United States, 19% of the same aged children suffer from bullying (Dake, Price & Telljohann, 2003). On the other end of the spectrum, the People’s Republic of China has a more interdependent and interpersonal connectedness theme with their 14.9% of their elementary school age children experiencing bullying (Wang & Pomerantz, 2007 & Ng & Tsang, 2008). This can account for a change in the emphasis on schooling and social skill development. The social norms and tradition of countries reach through to all levels of that society such as the schooling and its’ curriculum.

Social skill development in young children is the issue prevalent as more children begin to have their first peer experiences in kindergarten. In the United States, 70%
of children are enrolled in kindergarten (Facts for Features, 2007). Denmark has a 98% enrollment rate for kindergarten (Bennett et al., 2001). China’s rate is severely lower than the preceding two countries with 44.6% (Xiang, 2009). The vast difference in urban versus rural areas can account for such a low number. Urban areas average about 80% whereas rural areas only 35% attend kindergarten (Xiang, 2009). These percentages show that more of the world’s children are becoming involved in peer interactions at an earlier age and how many children could be affected by poor social skill development.

Main Points

Amount of Money Spent

If a country views social skills as more valuable, it will be more inclined to spend a greater amount of money in such programming (Education Statistics, 2008). In contrast, those countries that place less emphasis will not be spending as much money. The percentage of a country’s income that is directed towards social skill development in education will also have an effect on the ability of a child to acquire the positive social skills and utilize them correctly in later peer relations.

The amount of money spent on daycare/ early childhood care in the United States makes up 5.6% of the GDP (gross domestic product) and 14.4% of the total government spending (Education Statistics, 2008). Those percentages keep them in the middle compared with Denmark and China. Denmark, as a country that has a large number of children in early childhood care and a philosophy conducive to social skill development, spends 8.4% (of the GDP) and 14.4% of their total government expenditure (Education
Statistics, 2008). With the smallest amount of money spent on such care, China records 1.9% and 13% respectively (Education Statistics, 2008).

When more money is spent on early childhood care, there is more money available to spread throughout the different aspects of care, one being social skill development. With only 1.9% (China) of the GDP directed towards daycare and early childhood care, it makes it difficult for a country to put a quality effort into each area of development (Education Statistics, 2008). The consequences of limited spending will affect the children who participate in this kind of care. A smaller amount of resources will only inhibit the children in care from positive growth and functioning. The other end of the money spending spectrum has Denmark. This country places a large emphasis on the early childhood development and strongly encourages participation. With a large percentage of the population being enrolled in daycare/early childhood care, the country spends a considerable more amount of money in that area. Their increased spending allows the early childhood care facilities to improve their environments into better learning spaces for children. The children in these type of environments have more of an opportunity to acquire appropriate social skills and become more socially adjusted in their later years.

Age of Entrance

The entrance age (when they begin formal schooling in kindergarten) can effect the amount of time a child has to develop and form the appropriate social behavior. If a child is of a younger age when they begin school, they will have more time to have those foundational experiences which lead to positive social interactions and relationships. However, it can also take away from the amount of time a child has to spend in a less
formal setting of daycare or early childhood care. The time before formal schooling also provides opportunity for social development as these programs have the ability to teach children social behavior and guide antisocial skills into more pro-social and appropriate. Mandating kindergarten at an older age could provide the child with more opportunity, before entering school, to improve their social relations.

The formal education system in China has children beginning primary school at age six. However, their “kindergarten” is a full day program for those children who are three to six years old (Vaughan, 1993). A smaller percentage of the children from that range actually attend the program (Vaughan, 1993). In this aspect, Chinese children have the opportunity to develop socially from age three, but it is not mandated until age six. In the United States, the age in which children enter kindergarten based on the state (Weil). The state determines the entrance age; some states allow four year olds to enroll, while others are five or six years old (Weil). The difference in entrance ages across this country can account for changes in the proficiency of social skills among children.

Finally, Denmark has a more defined structure in their education before the mandatory age of seven when children enter school (Engberg, 1989). Kindergartens in Denmark are for those children between three to six or seven years old. However, the country also provides preschool classes that are designed for those children five to six years old (Engberg, 1989). The amount of structured care that is available to the Danish and the amount of children that participate in such leads to a large amount of their population being exposed to their same age (and development level) peers.
Countries’ Philosophy

The type of social skill development, with its’ potential to affect the amount of bullying experienced in later school, is dependent upon the country’s philosophy. An overall pattern of thinking can have a trickle-down effect to the specifics of educational curriculum. Therefore, the amount of time spent developing children’s social skills can be in relation to what a county views as important.

The United States is primarily focused on an individualistic attitude. The values of the country focus the development of children into self-sufficient, autonomous individuals (Grouling). This type of viewpoint leads to an educational curriculum that encourages the children to work on their own towards the goal of individual freedom. Children are encouraged to control their own futures and destiny (Grouling). Within the early years of schooling, this could take form in free play. Children are given the chance to pick their own activities within the classroom as they are designed with various different types of play available. This theme of child self determination has resulted from the democratic system of beliefs that governs the United States (Rideout, 2006). Within this framework, people are taught to be individuals with their own ideas and thoughts (Rideout, 2006). In a kindergarten classroom, this can be shown through the aforementioned activities available. Having the ability to choose helps the child to become more self-sufficient and begin to establish the democratic system within their minds.

As Denmark has a large majority of their young children population in some form of structured care, their goal is offer each child “optimal development of body and mind in environments which stimulate the verbal and social development of the child and the
development of independence and personality” (Engberg, 1989). These classrooms and teaching philosophies rely on a certain amount of organization but also leave a large amount of room in each day for the children to make their own choices whether it be indoor or outdoor play and developing activities such as painting, clay, wood and textiles (Engberg, 1989). The social development of these Danish children is considered essential as they are taught cooperation and consideration for others (Engberg, 1989).

The main philosophy that guides Chinese education is the Confucian traditions and socialist ideals (Weil). Given this, the kindergarten classrooms are largely based on whole group activities. The entire classroom of children are involved in one activity together as led by the teacher (Weil). These children are not given many opportunities to work independently or in small groups. They are also not given the chance to pick their own activities as compared to typical American classrooms. The Chinese classroom does not have designated areas: dramatic play, kitchen play, sand area, water area, which further inhibits their ability to become individuals. The overall theme is for children to accustom themselves to other people, which is largely based on the socialist ideal (Weil). The important social skills that are developed include altruistic behavior and nurturing characteristics. Chinese children, observed in a classroom, have been shown to be helping other children and sharing toys without being prompted (Weil). Teachers in these classrooms encourage the children to have respect for others and help each other. The children are encouraged to maintain a “good face” in front of the group at all times. When children are not behaving or keeping up with progress of the group, they are singled out by teachers in an attempt to force them to change (Weil). From this early age, children are taught that it is crucial to be on task with the rest of their peers.
Opposing Points

Childhood Upbringing

The problem of bullying, however, is not only attributed to those children who form poor social relationships in childhood, specifically kindergarten. These children have also been seen to result from other types of upbringing, not solely reliant on the quality of social skill development. The other causes of bullying do not result from the child but more so the biology and other factors not under the control of a child.

In young childhood, a majority of learning results from the parents and interaction that takes place between child and parent. Parents are usually regarded as the “teachers” and child as the “student”, so as parents have more irritable exchanges as well as a lack of parents to control appropriate interaction, the child learns this behavior (Patterson, 1986). This behavior is then translated into peer interaction when they begin school. With some children, this learning that has already occurred can not be reversed even when starting school at such an early age. Children have been observed to show better interaction with peers when they have a good relationship with their mother (Patterson, 1986). Therefore, the type of social interaction that occurs with children in the first years of school may not be a result of the quality/quantity of social skill development instituted in the classroom.

Parenting Skills

The type of parenting is also shown to have an effect on the socialization, positive or negative, found in the subsequent children. Specific parenting skills are the ability to resolve crises as well as teaching pro social behaviors and controlling the antisocial behaviors (Patterson, 1986). The skills a parent maintains are determinants of a child’s learning, behavior and application of that behavior in the classroom with peers (Patterson,
The idea of parenting skills ultimately procures that a child is somewhat “helpless” to the type of social behavior they learn as it results from the preexisting skills of their parents.

First Stages of Life

The first few months of life, for a child, that are spent with their primary caregiver have also been shown to affect the type of social development that will result in the following years. The visual stimulation that is given to an infant, and in increasing complexity, can be related to an affinity for looking at faces (Hartup 1986). The preference for familiar stimuli, usually around four to five months, also has an effect on the social responsiveness of a child. As the child begins to recognize familiar faces, such as its’ mother, the mother responds with discriminate smiling which in turns reinforces the child’s recognition (Hartup, 1986). These early preferences (and subsequent positive encouragement from caregivers) can translate into higher social functioning in relationships.

Attachment

The type of attachment formed to the caregiver can determine the type of relationships and social skills acquired for children. Those children who are labeled with secure attachment (use caregiver as a base for exploration) are historically found to be more successful in later peer relationships, more frequently imitated, more popular and respond to other with more positive affect (Sroufe & Fleeson, 1986). Children with either anxious/avoidant (withhold contact and avoid caregiver) or anxious/resistant (unable to use caregiver as a base and not comforted by contact) were found to be more dependent on teachers in school. Those with anxious/avoidant attachment approach
teachers in indirect ways and slowly show their dependence (Sroufe & Fleeson, 1986). The anxious/resistant children have the same level of dependency but will show it in frequent low levels as they wait to be invited into all social situations.

All of this early childhood development may play an active part in the mental capacity of each child to perceive and interpret the social situations they participate in. Studies have been shown to prove that the ability of a child to accurately interpret their academic and social performance increase with age. Therefore, it is difficult to attribute a lot of responsibility on the child for their social interaction, skills and ability when they just begin schooling.

Family Structure

The age of each parent to the child, when born, is also being examined as a determinant to the child’s development, including social. Although there have been no significant differences in the age of the mother, the age of the father to the child has a bearing on the type of relationship formed. Older fathers seem to have a more positive, warm, encouraging and communicative relationship with their child than younger fathers (Hartup, 1986). Therefore, the child of a young father is more likely to have poor development and skills. The economic status of the family in which a child is born into is also determining. If the family is poor and struggling, thus increases their stress level and negatively affecting the relationship with their child (Hartup, 1986). The parents are not able to focus a necessary amount of time on the child to encourage skill and facilitate development. This explanation can also be expanded to the greater category of stress in general (Hartup, 1986). Any type of stress in a family or caregiver to a young child has an effect on the child’s development.
The family make-up and dynamic can play a role in determining the behavior of a child. Studies have been conducted to determine whether the “traditional” family versus the “non-traditional” family has any bearing on the type of development that follows for any children born into those families. “Traditional” is regarded as white, upper middle class, two parent, married families. “Non-traditional” can encompass anything such as single mothers, unwed parents, open relationships or those living in communes (Weisner, 1986). It has been hypothesized that children who are born into families that emphasize different values (as opposed to those traditional) will develop behavior that may be regarded as outside of the norm and expected (Weisner, 1986). However, such studies have not been completed to determine whether these children have effects in their later life.

A major source of stress in a family is divorce. Divorce, as it becomes more prevalent in present society, has the ability to affect the development and behavior of children in the family. Studies have shown that children, especially boys, are more likely to become less compliant and more aggressive immediately following a divorce (Hartup, 1986). Mothers, as well, become more authoritarian with their children which could be a possible cause of the children’s deviant behavior as well. However, after a period of time, balance is usually restored to the family although “balance” is highly subjective in comparison with each family (Hartup, 1986).

The quality of sibling relations, in specific their age, functions as a determinant of development. An older sibling, first born child, is shown to provide guidance and teaching to those younger siblings (Hartup, 1986). These second born children are more accepting of directions when the older is four years (as opposed to two) older (Hartup,
Although the actual output and later effects of sibling relationship have yet to be examined, the “teaching” of older siblings is important to the learning of a younger child.

Sex Segregation

The inevitability of sex segregation within schools can also have a significant effect on the type of behavior that results. From the entrance into school, boys and girls separate themselves. “Girl’s tables” and “boy’s tables” form during lunch time in the cafeteria as well as different groups of play during recess. The type of play that results in each group is dependent on the gender (Thorne, 1986). Girls are more likely to play in small groups and participate in calm, easy activities. Boys play in large groups or teams and are usually found to be more aggressive and rough (Thorne, 1986). As much as these definitions can be seen as stereotypes, a majority of children fall into these categories leading some children to continue the more aggressive behavior they developed in childhood into later life.

Hypothesis

The level of importance placed on social skill development is related to a country’s culture and this will lead certain children to become more socially adept than others. Those without this quality may showcase some of their negative social skills in the form of bullying.

Methodology

A convenience sample was used to obtain the data used in this research study. Two separate data sets were acquired from two different countries. The United States sample, in the amount of seven children, was taken from an elementary school in a
medium-sized city in Rhode Island. The Chinese sample, in the amount of 25, was taken from a daycare facility.

**Variables**

The independent variable of social skill is defined as a child’s knowledge of and ability to use a variety of social behaviors that are appropriate to a given interpersonal situation and that are pleasing to others in each situation. This variable was measured by the score of each child on the daycare placement survey which has questions answered by the teacher. The survey required teachers to answer questions such as “child is eager to begin new tasks” and “this child will invite bystanders to join in play”. The survey was scored on a Likert-like scale of 1-5, with 1 representing “never” and 5 representing “always”.

The other independent variable of culture is described as the customary beliefs, social forms and material traits shared by people in a place or time (“Culture”, n.d.). It was measured by the amount of (recorded) money spent in early childhood programming, age of entrance for children into school and countries’ philosophy towards social skill.

The dependent variable of bullying is defined as forcing one’s way by aggressively or intimidation (“Bullying”, n.d.). It was measured by the (reported) percentage by each country in which a sample of daycare data was taken from.

As there was a small (7) sample size used in the United States dataset, it makes it difficult to generalize to the entire country. The external validity of these findings can only be generalized to the Northeast region of the country as the small sample was taken from a state within the region. It is probable that social skill trends will differ throughout the country. On the face, the daycare placement survey answers the question of social
skill development among children in the facility. The questions on the survey are extensive and wide-ranging.

Questions, in the survey, are posed along with their opposite to determine internal reliability, such as “this child becomes alarmed or frightened easily, and becomes restless or jittery when routines are changed or new people come to visit” and “this child is eager to begin new tasks”.

Data Analysis

For the reliability, Cronbach’s alpha was used on the positive and negative behavior statements. For the United States and China, comparing means was used through a T-test.

Findings

The section of the questionnaire that focused on the positive behaviors produced a Cronbach’s alpha of .910 (see Table 1). This statistic shows that the statements designed to measure positive behavior have a 91% reliability. The negative behavior statements had a reliability coefficient of .368 (see Table 2). Therefore, the negative behavior measurement is not as reliable, with a 36.8% reliability.

Comparing the United States and China’s means for the positive and negative behaviors resulted in the United States scoring higher. For positive behavior totals, the United States dataset produced a mean of 109.29 with China having a 90.52 (see Table 3). For negative behavior, the United States produced an average score of 34.12 and China, 52.88 (see Table 4). Therefore, the United States has more positive social skill behavior and less negative social skill behavior than children in China.
In the category of security, however, the Chinese children scored better than the United States children. The United States children had an average score 1.57 (with the higher score meaning more insecure) and China with 1.40 (see Table 5). The same trend held in ratings of altruism (with the higher score meaning less altruistic) as the United States’ mean was 1.86 and China 1.64 (see Table 6). Overall, the Chinese children were rated as being more secure and altruistic than their United States counterparts.

Without separating countries, females (n = 15) showed more positive behaviors with a mean of 99.33 compared with the males (n = 17) of 90.47 (see Table 7). Similarly, the female negative behavior was lower, 47.93, than the males, 49.53 (see Table 8). Female children also fared better in ratings of security and altruism. The female mean for security was 1.27, the males was 1.59 (see Tale 9). For altruism, females were rated as more altruistic, 1.47, than males, 1.88 (see Table 10). Further, correlations were drawn between positive and negative behavior totals with birth order. This produced a significant (p < .05) correlation of -.383 for negative behavior and birth order. This correlation can show that as birth order decreases (meaning the child is born later in the family such as second or third born), negative behavior increases.

Conclusion

This research study has been designed to determine whether the culture of two different countries impacts the level of focus on social skill development. The effectiveness of such development was measured in the form of percentage of bullying reported by each of the countries. As the culture of a country was defined in terms of amount of money spent on early childhood programming, age of entrance and philosophy, it was believed that these characteristics had the greatest effect on the
positive social skill development in later childhood. It was also argued that a child’s social skills are not the result of the aforementioned characteristics but rather the biological aspect which includes sex, family structure and overall upbringing. Through statistical procedures, it was found that culture has played a role in the type of social skill development. Although it was hypothesized that Chinese children would show more positive behavior due to their country’s focus on Confucian values and traditions, the United States data held more positive social skills. Negative social skills were also found to be more prevalent in Chinese children as opposed to the United States. This contradicts part of the research hypothesis. However, the amount of money spent on early childhood education and daycare remains in line with the results of the study. China, as a country, spent the least amount of money in this area which could have had an effect on the lack of positive social skills observed. Regarding the age of entrance, Chinese children were also mandated to enter schooling at a later age which could have contributed to their social skill development which was behind that of the United States.

The results of this study have also contradicted the action of bullying as a result of poor social skill development. With the results showing China as having the lower level of social skills, their reported bullying percentage is lower than the United States. It seems the contrary should be true if social skill development were to have an effect on later school years’ bullying. However, this research study does not support that idea. The study does not support the idea that more social skill development in early childhood education affects the frequency of bullying experienced in the later years of school.

As correlations were drawn between positive and negative behavior totals, regardless of country, with birth order, a negative correlation between birth order and
negative behavior was found. This supports the idea that the amount of negative behaviors will increase as the birth order decreases.

Overall, this completed research study does not show a correlation between the characteristics (age of entrance, philosophy, money spent) of a country and the development of both positive and/or negative social skills. The culture of a country does not have an effect on the quality of social skill development for its’ young children as the more positive cultural values from the country of China did not produce more socially adept children than the United States. Further, once the social skills have been developed, they do not affect the amount of bullying found in later years.

Implications

Practice

For those working in the school system, namely teachers and school social workers, the findings of this research study will better allow them to structure their individual styles and focus. By identifying the at-risk populations for poor social skill development, teachers can work to remedy the problem at an earlier age. Teachers can then incorporate better development of these skills into their own curriculum and teaching styles. Targeting the problem at a younger age will decrease the chances of bullying in later school years regardless of the country.

Research

This type of research also bridges a gap between two separate bodies of work. The correlation that has been drawn between bullying and early social skill development further incorporates the school environment with social work. As bullying takes place in schools, it could often be overlooked as strictly part of the educator and administrator’s
duties. The current research study is able to provide more support to the most at-risk populations by realizing a joint responsibility between teachers, administrators and school social workers. This joint responsibility can then be further elaborated into collaboration between the multiple professionals that work within the school system. By realizing this common ground, they can work together to foster better, more successful environments for these school age children.

Policy

In social work policy, the mandated curriculum for daycares and preschools has the ability to change. Although this research study does not offer specific suggestions for change in curriculum, there is the recognition of successful programs that result in more positive social skill development than others. Taking cues from the programs that are most effective can provide inspiration for change in other areas. If we are able to realize what the most important aspects of early childhood programming need to be, it can then formulated into universal policy. Some of these important aspects can be taken from the United States’ policy within school system as it has proven to be more beneficial to children than in China. Incorporating more of the same policies from programs across the United States, and making them mandatory, will work to foster more socially adept children.
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Table 1

Reliability of Positive Behavior Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>N of Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.910</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

Reliability of Negative Behavior Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>N of Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.368</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

Positive Behavior Totals Compared by Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PositiveBehaviorTotal United States</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>109.2857</td>
<td>13.36306</td>
<td>5.05076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>90.5200</td>
<td>16.12224</td>
<td>3.22445</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

Negative Behavior Totals Compared by Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NegativeBehaviorTotal United States</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34.1429</td>
<td>2.73426</td>
<td>1.03345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>52.8800</td>
<td>11.42118</td>
<td>2.28424</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

Security of Child Compared by Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This child is secure/insecure</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.5714</td>
<td>.78680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.4000</td>
<td>.57735</td>
<td>.11547</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

*Altruism of Child Compared by Country*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.8571</td>
<td>.89974</td>
<td>.34007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.6400</td>
<td>.48990</td>
<td>.09798</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7

*Positive Behavior Totals Compared by Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex, N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male, 17</td>
<td>90.4706</td>
<td>18.56447</td>
<td>4.50255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female, 15</td>
<td>99.3333</td>
<td>14.86927</td>
<td>3.83923</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8

*Negative Behavior Totals Compared by Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex, N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male, 17</td>
<td>49.5294</td>
<td>12.43542</td>
<td>3.01603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female, 15</td>
<td>47.9333</td>
<td>13.63015</td>
<td>3.51929</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9

*Security of Child Compared by Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex, N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male, 17</td>
<td>1.5882</td>
<td>.71229</td>
<td>.17276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female, 15</td>
<td>1.2667</td>
<td>.45774</td>
<td>.11819</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10

Altruism of Child Compared by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think this child is altruistic/not altruistic</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.8824</td>
<td>.60025</td>
<td>.14558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.4667</td>
<td>.51640</td>
<td>.13333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11

Correlations between Positive Behavior, Negative Behavior and Birth Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PositiveBehavior Total</th>
<th>NegativeBehavior Total</th>
<th>Birth Order in Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PositiveBehavior Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.597**</td>
<td>.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NegativeBehavior Total</td>
<td>-.597**</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.383*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth Order in Family</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>-.383*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Table 12

*Birth Order in Family*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix i

Daycare Questionnaire