Processes in the Development of Mathematics in Kindergarten Children from Title 1 Schools

Matthew E. Foster^a

Jason L. Anthony^a

Doug H. Clements^b

Julie H. Sarama^b

^aUniversity of Texas Health Science Center at Houston

^bUniversity of Denver

Corresponding Authors' Contact Information:

Matthew E. Foster
Children's Learning Institute
University of Texas Health Science Center
7000 Fannin Street, Suite 2373D
Houston, TX, 77030 (United States of America)
Phone: 1-713-500-3725
Fax: 1-713-500-0386
E-mail: Matthew.E.Foster@uth.tmc.edu

Co-authors' Contact Information:

Jason L. Anthony
Children's Learning Institute
University of Texas Health Science Center
7000 Fannin Street, Suite 2377
Houston, TX 77030 (United States of America)
Phone: 1-713-500-3704
Fax: 1-713-500-0386
E-mail: Jason.L.Anthony@uth.tmc.edu

Doug H. Clements
University of Denver
Katherine R. Ruffatto Hall 154
1999 East Evans Avenue
Denver, CO 80208-1700 (United States of America)
Phone: 1-303-871-3983
E-mail: Douglas.Clements@du.edu

Julie H. Sarama
University of Denver
Katherine R. Ruffatto Hall 154
1999 East Evans Avenue
Denver, CO 80208-1700 (United States of America)
Phone: 1-303-871-2895
E-mail: Julie.Sarama@du.edu

Disclaimer: The authors report no conflicts of interest. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the funding source, the Institute of Education Sciences or the US Department of Education.

PREDICTORS OF KINDERGARTEN MATH ACHIEVEMENT

Processes in the Development of Mathematics in Kindergarten Children from Title 1 Schools

Early math achievement is critical for placing children on a positive educational trajectory. Children who start behind in mathematics tend to stay behind (Duncan et al., 2007; Jordan, Kaplan, Ramineni, & Locuniak, 2009; Stock, Desoete, & Roeyers, 2010; Toll, Van der Ven, Kroesbergen, & Van Luit, 2011). In particular, early difficulties with whole numbers interfere with learning fractions, which subsequently impedes algebraic learning (National Mathematics Advisory Panel, 2008). Indeed, one of the strongest predictors of later school achievement is early math achievement (Duncan et al., 2007), predicting children's reading achievement better than early literacy skills (Duncan et al., 2007; Duncan & Magnuson, 2011; Koponen, Salmi, Eklund, & Aro 2013), and predicting math achievement through age 15 (Watts, Duncan, Siegler, & Davis-Kean, 2014). Further, evidence of widespread differences in early math achievement (Geary, 2006; Mullis, Martin, & Arora, 2012; National Research Council [NRC], 2009; Sarama & Clements, 2009) and that children from low-income and minority backgrounds persistently score below their middle-income peers (Geary, 1993; Griffin, Case, & Siegler, 1994; Lee, 2002; National Association of Educational Progress, 2007, 2013; NRC, 2009; Sarama & Clements, 2009; Saxe, Guberman, & Gearhart, 1987; Siegler, 1993) have led to attempts to improve math education in the United States. For example, comprehensive math standards that begin in kindergarten, called the *Common Core State Standards for Mathematics*, have recently been adopted by 42 states and the District of Columbia (National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010).

Given the importance of early math achievement and the persistent achievement gap between children from low-income and minority backgrounds and their majority peers, it is important to advance the field's understanding of cognitive and linguistic processes underlying its early development in these children. This knowledge can be used to inform instructional math

programs and screenings for mathematics learning difficulties. There is growing consensus concerning which cognitive and linguistic processes are important to early math development (and math disabilities) (e.g., Geary, 1994; Fletcher, Lyon, Fuchs, & Barnes, 2006). Although intelligence is known to be related to the development of cognitive, linguistic, and mathematics skills (Geary, 1993, 2007; Noël, 2009; Primi, Ferrão, & Almeida, 2010; Stock et al., 2009), recent research suggests that vocabulary is involved in solving many different types of math problems (Hooper, Roberts, Sideris, Burchinal, & Zeisel, 2010; LeFevre, Fast, Skwarchuk, Smith-Chant, Bisanz, Kamawar, 2010; Foster, Sevcik, Ronski, & Morris, 2014; Praet, Titeca, Ceulemans, & Desoete, 2013). Evidence also indicates that phonological processing abilities (PPAs) are related to children's early math achievement (Baddeley, 1986; Bull & Johnston, 1997; Clarke & Shinn, 2004; Dehaene, 1992; Dehaene, Piazza, Pinel, & Cohen, 2003; Geary, Hoard, Byrd-Craven, Nugent, & Numtee, 2007; Hecht, Torgesen, Wagner, & Rashotte, 2001; Vukovic, 2012). In the following section, we will review these predictors.

Predictors of Early Math Achievement

Vocabulary. Research demonstrates that vocabulary competencies predict later numeracy scores (Praet et al., 2013; Purpura, 2011). In particular, receptive vocabulary is thought to be related to children's ability for acquiring vocabulary in the number system (LeFevre et al., 2010), whereas expressive vocabulary helps children express relationships inherent in mathematical problems (Rothman & Cohen, 1989). Receptive vocabulary refers to the understanding of words (e.g., 'big', 'more', 'three') and word classes (or parts of speech). Expressive vocabulary, however, refers to the bank of words used to communicate when speaking or writing. Given that vocabulary is essential for learning through classroom instruction, children entering into formal education (i.e., kindergarten) with poor vocabulary are likely at a disadvantage when it comes to

mathematical and other areas of learning. Children rely on their vocabulary knowledge to help them understand spoken math statements (e.g., “Three plus two equals five.”) and to help them understand written math statements (e.g., $3 + 2 = 5$). With regard to written math statements, children must clearly understand the meaning of arabic numerals (e.g., 3), operational symbols (e.g., +), and concepts embedded within the statement (e.g., equality—that the quantities on the left and right side of the ‘equals’ sign must be the same; Munro, 1979).

Phonological Processing Abilities (PPAs). Wagner and Torgesen (1987) outline three PPAs and describe their relations with reading acquisition. All three PPAs have also been linked to the development of basic mathematics skills and conceptualized within the weak phonological representation hypothesis (see Simmons & Singleton, 2008). This hypothesis posits that poorly specified phonological representations can result in poor performance on math tasks that involve the retention, retrieval or manipulation of phonological codes (e.g., retrieving number words, solving arithmetic facts, and counting speed; Hecht et al., 2001; Robinson, Menchetti, & Torgesen, 2002; Simmons & Singleton, 2008). Phonological awareness (PA) refers to the sensitivity to and the ability to manipulate the sound structure of one’s oral language. With regard to mathematics, PA helps children manipulate individual words in the number sequence (Krajewski & Schneider, 2009) and encode verbal information (i.e., phonological representations for mathematical terms and operators) when solving arithmetic problems (Hecht et al., 2001; Robinson et al., 2002; Simmons & Singleton, 2008).

Rapid automatized naming (RAN) refers to the efficiency of retrieving phonological codes from long-term memory. RAN may be important for solving arithmetic problems through an influence on children’s ability to quickly retrieve arithmetic facts and when linking the appropriate fact or facts to a particular problem in an effort toward arriving at a solution (Geary,

1993; Hecht et al., 2001; Kaye 1986). For instance, RAN is involved when children need to retrieve phonological name codes for numbers from long-term memory to solve arithmetic problems (Dehaene, 1992; Geary, 1993; Kaye, 1986). Quick and efficient retrieval of phonological name codes decreases the likelihood that a child will forget the association between an arithmetic problem and its solution. In other words, cognitive resources are freed as RAN improves and one can attend to other aspects of problem solving, which are needed when learning more complex mathematics skills (Bull & Johnston, 1997; Geary, 1993; Hecht et al., 2001; Kaye, 1986).

Phonological short-term memory (STM) is the non-executive component of working memory that involves the coding and rehearsing of verbal information in a sound-based representation system for temporary storage (Baddeley, 1986; Torgesen, 1996). This limited capacity processing resource helps children actively maintain the math task in mind as he or she decides on a course of action for solving it. For instance, consider the following verbally presented math problem. “There are five red balloons. Three of them popped. How many balloons are left?” In this problem, the child has to hold the problem in memory while deciding on a course of action (i.e., add or subtract the balloons). The child then solves the problem by retrieving a solution from long-term memory or by using a count-based strategy (cf. Geary, 1993 or Fuson, 1988). While executing a course of action (e.g., counting backward from 5), the child has to actively maintain the original problem in mind. If not, he or she may forget the association between the arithmetic problem and its solution. Thus, when a child counts backward to solve $5 - 3 = \underline{\quad}$ (i.e., 5..., 4, 3, 2, to reach the solution, 2) he or she must keep the original problem in mind in order to both remember how far to count backwards and to connect the result of the counting strategy to the original problem context. In short, limited processing resources such as

short-term storage for phonological information could interfere with learning arithmetic facts, interfere with mathematical development, and could limit one's ability to solve math problems.

Studies of the Prediction of Mathematics

Phonological Processing Abilities (PPAs) and Vocabulary. PA, RAN, STM, and vocabulary have all been found predictive of early math achievement, depending on the mathematical task and the age of the population assessed (Baddeley, 1986; Bull & Johnston, 1997; Clarke & Shinn, 2004; Geary, Hoard, Byrd-Craven, Nugent, & Numtee, 2007; Hecht et al., 2001; Foster et al., 2014; Krajewski & Schneider, 2009). A seminal study by Bryant et al. (1990) accounted for the influences of socioeconomic status (SES), receptive vocabulary, and general intelligence in its examination of the relation between PA and arithmetic achievement. Although SES, general intelligence, and PA measured at 4 and 5 years of age were significant predictors of arithmetic achievement at 6 years of age, vocabulary was not. Another seminal study (Hecht et al., 2001) accounted for the influences of vocabulary and the autoregressor effect of prior math ability in its examination of the predictive relations of PPAs with arithmetic achievement. Vocabulary and prior math ability significantly predicted arithmetic achievement at each time period under study (i.e., second to fifth, second to third, third to fourth, and fourth to fifth). The study by Hecht et al. (2001) also showed that RAN and STM significantly predicted arithmetic achievement from second to third grade, after accounting for prior math ability. However, of the three PPAs, only PA significantly predicted arithmetic achievement, after accounting for prior math ability during the remaining time periods. Collectively, findings from these studies indicate that, from among PPAs, PA tends to be the strongest and most robust predictor of math achievement. They also suggest that RAN and STM may be more involved in early math development when children are learning arithmetic facts rather than in later math development.

PREDICTORS OF KINDERGARTEN MATH ACHIEVEMENT

With regard to the mixed findings concerning the relation between vocabulary and arithmetic achievement, it is unclear if this discrepancy is due in part to the different measures used in these studies. Hecht et al. (2001) employed an *expressive* measure of vocabulary, while Bryant et al. (1990) employed a *receptive* measure of vocabulary.

More recent studies have directly modeled the interrelated nature of PPAs and other linguistic skills in their predictions of math achievement in young children. For instance, in a sample of preschool and kindergarten children, LeFevre et al. (2010) modeled a factor indexed by PA, vocabulary, and RAN and found the factor to account for substantial variance in math achievement measured two years later. In a more recent study of monolingual and bilingual kindergarten students, Kleemans, Segers, and Verhoeven (2011) found PA and grammatical ability were *directly* related to concurrent math achievement, whereas fluid intelligence and working memory were *indirectly* related to math achievement through PA and grammatical ability. A study of Finnish students reported that PA, RAN, and STM assessed in kindergarten were predictive of math achievement assessed in third grade (Koponen et al., 2012). Finally, Vukovic (2012) found that early numerical skills and PA influenced growth in mathematics from kindergarten to third grade. In summary, research indicates that PPAs and vocabulary are predictive of early math achievement and math development. Moreover, their relations with mathematics appear to be in part independent of the influence of intelligence.

Early Mathematics Knowledge. Of course, the most palpable predictor of later math achievement is prior math achievement (Bodovsky & Youn, 2011). Research has shown that knowledge of mathematics in preschool correlates .46 with tenth grade math achievement (Stevenson & Newman, 1986) and successfully predicts math achievement through age 15, even after accounting for early reading, cognitive skills, and family and child characteristics (Watts et

al., 2014). For many topics and abilities, initial knowledge predicts learning and later knowledge (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 1999; Jimerson, Egeland, & Teo, 1999; Maier & Greenfield, 2008; Thomson, Rowe, Underwood, & Peck, 2005; Wright et al., 1994). However, the effect of early knowledge of mathematics is unusually strong and notably persistent (Duncan, Claessens, & Engel, 2004). Further, the rate of growth of mathematical skills is faster among those with higher, rather than lower, initial mathematical skills (Aunola, Leskinen, Lerkkanen, & Nurmi, 2004). Across six studies, the strongest predictor of later achievement was school-entry math skills (Duncan et al., 2007). Moreover, this result has been replicated within the context of holding children's pre-school cognitive ability, behavior, and other important background characteristics constant (Romano, Babchishin, Pagani, & Kohen, 2010).

The Current Study

Empirical research has provided ample evidence to conclude that intelligence, PPAs and to a lesser extent, vocabulary, are related to early math achievement. However, the exact nature of the interrelations between intelligence, PA, RAN, STM, vocabulary, and domains of math achievement are not clear. Studies that have simultaneously included all of these relevant predictors within a comprehensive framework for understanding early math achievement are scarce; and the inclusion of intelligence as a predictor is inconsistent. A comprehensive investigation that includes intelligence and each linguistic skill that is potentially implicated in math achievement is necessary to clarify prior research findings, as findings of unique predictive relations are conditional on the variables included in a model as well as the variables that are absent from a model.

In addition to a dearth of studies that have examined early math achievement using a comprehensive framework, even fewer have modeled autoregressor effects. Most of the studies

discussed above have either modeled concurrent relations (e.g., Kleemans et al., 2011) or have modeled longitudinal relations without accounting for initial levels of math achievement (i.e., the autoregressor) (e.g., Bryant et al, 1990; LeFevre et al., 2010; Kleemans et al., 2011; Koponen et al., 2012). The danger in not accounting for autoregressor effects is that the predictive association of PPAs, vocabulary, and intelligence could be spurious, tertiary variables associated with prior levels of math achievement (Wagner & Torgesen, 1987). By accounting for autoregressor effects, the present study aims to extend extant research by providing a more rigorous evaluation of the predictive utility of cognitive and linguistic skills. Thus, the first aim of the present study is to examine the extent to which fluid intelligence, PA, RAN, STM, and vocabulary uniquely predict children's math outcomes at the end of kindergarten, while accounting for the influences of the autoregressor.

The predictive value of fluid intelligence, PA, RAN, STM, and vocabulary also may differ according to the type of mathematics skills being predicted. Therefore, two different math outcomes were included in the present study to permit comparison of the predictive value of each variable as they relate to separate math domains (i.e., numeracy and applied problems). The first domain, numeracy, is comprised of several early number competencies that include the ability to discern the value of small quantities immediately, make judgments about numbers and their magnitudes (e.g., 4 is closer to 3 than 6), recognize numerals, understand the concepts underlying the procedures for counting (e.g., ordinality, cardinality, etc.; see Gelman & Gallistel, 1978), count objects, compose numbers (e.g., 3 and 2 makes 5), and decompose numbers (e.g., 5 take away 2 is 3). In contrast, applied problems require children to listen to a verbally presented math problem, recognize the arithmetic operation to be followed, perform the relevant calculation(s), and contextualize the answer in units of the original applied problem.

PREDICTORS OF KINDERGARTEN MATH ACHIEVEMENT

Because numeracy and applied problems represent potentially separate math domains, children may rely on different cognitive and linguistic skills when solving items from each domain. For example, while fluid intelligence is expected to be related to both math domains, PA and RAN may be more strongly related to numeracy achievement than to applied problems achievement. This is because many early number competencies require the efficient retrieval of well specified phonological codes for number words (Logie & Baddeley, 1987). Phonological STM, however, may be more strongly related to applied problems achievement because phonological codes for numbers and the other relevant verbal information must be maintained in temporary phonological storage while the child utilizes calculation procedures to solve related problems (Bull & Johnston, 1997). Vocabulary too may be more strongly related to applied problems achievement because children interpret verbally presented math problems within their language structures (Munro, 1979) and any problems with comprehending the verbal information may interfere with or delay subsequent mathematical processing. Thus, the second aim of the present study is to investigate if patterns of relations among hypothesized predictors and math achievement vary as a function of math domain (i.e., numeracy and applied problems).

Method

Participants

Participants included three annual cohorts of kindergarten children who participated in a randomized controlled evaluation of two computerized tutoring programs, *Earobics Step 1* and *Building Blocks*. The present sample included 208 monolingual English children (106 female students and 102 male students) who attended 37 classrooms housed in nine Title 1 schools. The percentage of students eligible for free or reduced lunch at each school ranged from 70% to 98% ($M = 92.2$, $SD = 8.6$). Participants ranged in age from 5.03 to 6.70 years ($M = 5.62$ years, $SD =$

PREDICTORS OF KINDERGARTEN MATH ACHIEVEMENT

0.32 years) and most represented ethnic minorities: 62% were African American, 32% Hispanic/Latino, 3% mixed ethnicity, 2% Caucasian, and 1% other. At the beginning of kindergarten, most participants achieved low average or below average scores on norm referenced standardized tests of verbal ability ($M = 84$, $SD = 14$) and nonverbal ability ($M = 78$, $SD = 10$), as estimated by the *Expressive One Word Picture Vocabulary Test* (EOWPVT; Brownell, 2000) and a composite of the *Copying* and *Pattern Analysis* subtests from the *Stanford-Binet fourth edition* (SB-4; Thorndike, Hagen, & Sattler, 1986). Note that while participants achievement on measures of nonverbal ability confirmed their risk status, their standardized scores of math achievement on the *Applied Problems* subtest of the *Woodcock-Johnson III Tests of Achievement* (WJ-III; Woodcock, McGrew, & Mather, 2001) was well within the range of typical achievement at the end of kindergarten ($M = 99.01$, $SD = 12.76$).

Procedures

After obtaining active parental consent and child assent, children were tested individually at their school during the school day. Completion of the test battery required approximately two hours. However, testing was typically spread across two testing sessions that occurred within a given week. Children were assessed at the beginning of the school year (i.e., September) and again at the end of the school year (i.e., April). Measures from the larger assessment battery that were selected for inclusion in the present study included tests of fluid intelligence, vocabulary, PA, RAN, STM, and numeracy from the beginning of the school year, and tests of numeracy and applied problems from the end of the school year. The test of Applied Problems was not administered at the beginning of the school year.

Measurement Instruments

Intelligence. Fluid intelligence was assessed using the *Copying* and *Pattern Analysis*

PREDICTORS OF KINDERGARTEN MATH ACHIEVEMENT

subtests from the SB-4. The *Copying* subtest requires examinees to either reproduce block models (items 1 through 12) or draw geometric designs, such as lines, rectangles, and arcs, that are shown on cards (items 13 through 28). Items 1 through 6 of the *Pattern Analysis* subtest require examinees to complete puzzles. Items 7 through 42 require replication of visual patterns through manipulation of shaded blocks. Standardized administration and scoring procedures were followed. It is important to highlight that these subtests index fluid (or nonverbal) intelligence within the context of understanding spatial and geometric relations. Internal consistency was calculated for the SB-4 nonverbal composite, which was restricted to the highest item administered (see Table 1 for reports of reliability indices).

Vocabulary. Children's vocabulary was estimated using the EOWPVT, which presents examinees with colored line drawings that depict an action, object, category, or concept. Children were asked by an examiner to verbally respond to prompts such as "What is this?", "What is she doing?", and "What are these?" Standardized administration and scoring procedures were followed.

Phonological Awareness (PA). PA was assessed with an elision multiple choice task and an elision free response task (Anthony, Lonigan, Driscoll, Phillips, & Burgess, 2003; Lonigan, Burgess, Anthony, & Barker, 1998; Lonigan, Wagner, Torgesen, & Rashotte, 2002). Previous research with these same measures has found them to demonstrate good convergent validity with measures of the same construct and good discriminant validity with measures of different but related constructs (Anthony et al., 2006; Anthony, Williams, McDonald, & Francis, 2007; Dunlap et al., 2014). The elision tasks assessed children's ability to identify a word from an array of four pictures or to produce a target word that resulted from deletion of part of a stimulus word (e.g., *farm* without /f/). Both elision tasks spanned three levels of linguistic complexity such that

PREDICTORS OF KINDERGARTEN MATH ACHIEVEMENT

each task included some items that required deletion of syllables, deletion of onsets, and deletion of phonemes that were not onsets. Children were administered all 11 multiple choice trials and all 29 free response trials.

Rapid Autonomized Naming (RAN). Efficiency of phonological access to lexical storage was assessed with RAN for objects. *Rapid Object Naming* was chosen rather than *Rapid Letter Naming* because of our sample's low achievement. Specifically, we did not want children's letter knowledge (or lack of) to confound measurement of efficiency of access to well specified phonological codes. *Rapid Object Naming* required children to name pictures of four common objects as quickly as they could. The stimulus card consisted of seven rows of four pictures. The pictures illustrated single syllable words common in young children's vocabularies (i.e., car, ball, dog, tree). Each row presented the same four pictures in a random order, and the first row served as practice for the remainder of the task. The number of errors made during naming of all 28 pictures and the number of minutes and seconds elapsed were recorded. Each trial was scored as the number of pictures correctly named per minute. Children were administered two trials that were usually, although not always, administered on the same day.

Phonological Short-term Memory (STM). The non-executive component of working memory, phonological STM, was assessed with the *Memory for Words* subtest from the *Preschool Comprehensive Test of Phonological and Print Processing* (PCTOPPP; Lonigan, Wagner, Torgesen, & Rashotte, 2002). The *Memory for Words* task measured children's ability to reproduce a list of one-syllable words in the same order that they were presented by an examiner. The measure included 21 items. Items were divided into seven groups of three items each, according to the number of words to be recalled on a given item. The first group of three words required repetition of one word, the second group of items required repetition of two

PREDICTORS OF KINDERGARTEN MATH ACHIEVEMENT

words, and so on. Standardized administration and scoring procedures were followed.

Numeracy. Children's math achievement at the beginning and end of the school year was assessed with the *Research-based Early Math Assessment* (REMA; Clements, Sarama, & Liu, 2008). Items from the number concepts strand were administered, but items from the geometry strand were not administered. Core mathematics skills within the number concepts strand include verbal counting, object counting, number recognition and subitising, number comparison, number sequencing, numeral recognition, number composition and decomposition, and adding and subtracting. General concepts and processes, such as part-whole thinking, and the corresponding processes of composition and decomposition, classification, and seriation were woven throughout the core areas enumerated above. Standardized administration and scoring procedures were followed.

Applied Problems. Children's math achievement at the end of the school year also was assessed using the *Applied Problems* subtest of the WJ-III. The *Applied Problems* subtest requires children to analyze and solve verbally presented math problems. For example, when looking at a stimulus page that depicts five ducks, two of which are swimming, the child is asked, "How many ducks are in the water?"

Results

Pre-analysis Data Inspections

All bivariate relations were linear and in the expected direction. Descriptive analyses revealed no floor or ceiling effects and found minimal evidence of non-normality (see Table 1). Because students had participated in supplemental individualized computer administered training in either PA or mathematics as part of the larger project, all variables were examined for mean differences between experimental groups. Multilevel ANCOVAs accounting for classroom

nesting, found that the groups did not differ on any of the pretest or posttest variables (see Table 2). Moreover, a two-group confirmatory factor analytic model that constrained the 28 pairs of like covariances to equality across the groups characterized these data extremely well ($\chi^2 = 31.82, p = .06, CFI = .98, TLI = .96, RMSEA = .06$). Thus, pre-analysis data inspections ruled out both mean differences between experimental groups and covariance differences between groups. Finally, potential moderation effects were directly ruled out as well by testing the interaction between group and each independent variable in separate multilevel ANCOVA models used to predict end of year numeracy scores ($F_s = 0.21$ to $3.07, p_s > .08$) and again when used to predict end of year applied problems scores ($F_s = 0.04$ to $2.72, p_s > .10$). There was no evidence of intervention related moderation of the prediction of either math outcomes. The thorough investigation of groups' equivalence strongly supported pooling these data across experimental conditions. Therefore, all subsequent analyses were performed using the sample as a whole, without including experimental group in the models.

Age was included in initial correlational analyses (see Table 3) because raw scores were being evaluated. However, age was not reliably associated with any of the independent variables or dependent variables and was therefore ignored in subsequent analyses. Vocabulary, PA, RAN, and fluid intelligence (but not STM) were significantly correlated with children's numeracy at posttest. All predictors were correlated with applied problems at posttest. Because STM was not correlated with numeracy posttest scores it was not included in subsequent analyses used to predict children's numeracy scores at posttest. Finally, the two math outcomes were only moderately correlated ($r = .61, p < .001$). This finding suggests that although there is overlap in skills assessed by these measures, they may index different mathematical skill sets, which may explain why STM was correlated with one math outcome but not the other.

PREDICTORS OF KINDERGARTEN MATH ACHIEVEMENT

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics

Variables	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>Skew</i>	<i>Kurtosis</i>	<i>Reliability</i>
Fluid intelligence	78.40	9.91	60	109.0	.61	-.29	.90 ^a
PA	17.01	8.06	4.0	41.0	.75	-.13	.90 ^a
RAN	39.74	10.23	21.5	87.0	1.35	3.60	.66 ^b
STM	9.85	2.30	0	16.0	-1.21	2.95	.73 ^a
Vocabulary	45.40	12.14	15.0	86.0	.37	.52	.83 ^a
Numeracy-pretest	13.51	5.74	2.0	31.0	.29	-.02	.86 ^a
Numeracy-posttest	20.34	6.67	3.0	37.0	.11	-.13	.87 ^a
Applied problems	18.46	3.68	2.0	27.0	-.88	1.92	.87 ^a

Note. $N = 208$; *SD* = standard deviation; ^a= Cronbach's alpha for the current sample; ^b=

Pearson's r ; PA = phonological awareness; RAN = rapid automatized naming; STM = short-term memory. All values are reported in raw score units except for fluid intelligence and RAN.

Fluid intelligence is reported in standard score units, while RAN is reported in number of seconds to name all 28 objects.

PREDICTORS OF KINDERGARTEN MATH ACHIEVEMENT

Table 2

Tests of Mean Differences Between Experimental Groups

Variables	<i>PA Group</i>		<i>Math Group</i>		<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Fluid intelligence	7.45	3.50	7.77	3.49	1, 170	1.79	.38
PA	17.25	10.33	16.77	10.33	1, 170	.18	.67
RAN	39.30	13.14	40.19	13.14	1, 170	.39	.53
STM	9.58	3.14	10.12	3.13	1, 170	3.07	.08
Vocabulary	43.97	16.32	46.77	16.25	1, 170	2.89	.09
Numeracy-pretest	13.87	7.53	13.08	5.91	1, 168	1.00	.32
Numeracy-posttest	19.74	8.52	20.93	8.52	1, 170	1.66	.20
Applied problems	18.12	5.22	18.82	5.18	1, 170	2.11	.15

Note. PA = phonological awareness; RAN = rapid automatized naming; STM = short-term memory. All values are reported in raw score units except for RAN, for which number of seconds to name all 28 objects is reported.

Overview of Data Analysis Plan

Raw scores were used in all statistical analyses, which were performed using SAS 9.3 (SAS Institute, 2010). To account for the multi-level structure of the data (i.e., children nested within classrooms), analyses were performed using Proc Mixed with students' classroom identified as the level two random intercept. Proc Mixed provides hypothesis tests for the variance and covariance components of random variability at level 1 (child level) and level 2

PREDICTORS OF KINDERGARTEN MATH ACHIEVEMENT

(classroom level) of the model. Thus, the fixed effects of hypothesized level 1 predictors (i.e., intelligence, vocabulary, PPAs, autoregressor) on children's math outcomes (i.e., numeracy or applied problems) was investigated while accounting for variability at the classroom level (level 2 random intercept). Noteworthy is that all predictors were grand mean centered at wave one, which was approximately one month after children entered kindergarten.

Table 3

Correlations

Variables	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.
1. Age	-.08	.08	-.02	.03	.12	.13	.11	.01
2. Fluid intelligence	---	.32***	-.19**	.13	.32***	.35***	.34***	.37***
3. PA		---	-.29***	.22**	.53***	.51***	.49***	.51***
4. RAN			---	-.11	-.15*	-.31***	-.34***	-.28***
5. STM				---	.22**	.10	.10	.29***
6. Vocabulary					---	.39***	.32***	.43***
7. Numeracy-pretest						---	.70***	.56***
8. Numeracy-posttest							---	.61***
9. Applied problems								---

Note. PA is phonological awareness; RAN is rapid automatized naming; STM is short-term memory. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

In an effort to clarify conflicting findings of prior research and to fully understand the roles of cognitive and linguistic processes in early math development, three multilevel regression

models were evaluated for both math outcomes. One, the “autoregressor model” included a random intercept to reflect classroom nesting and a fixed effect of pretest numeracy scores. Two, the “processes model” included a random intercept and fixed effects of pretest scores obtained on tests of PA, RAN, STM, fluid intelligence, and vocabulary. Three, the “full model” included a random intercept and fixed effects of pretest scores obtained on tests of PA, RAN, STM, fluid intelligence, vocabulary, and numeracy. By accounting for prior levels of math achievement, relations between the remaining predictors and end of year math achievement were not confounded with the level of mathematics skills with which students entered kindergarten (Hecht et al., 2001). Finally, we examined the standardized estimates and the amount of change in each model’s pseudo- R^2 (referred to as R^2 throughout)¹ to decompose the predictive variance into that which was shared or unique.

Predictors of Numeracy Achievement

Evaluation of the level 2 variance in the autoregressor model of the prediction of numeracy scores suggested that classrooms did not reliably differ in their average numeracy scores at posttest ($B = 1.04, p = .23$). There was only a small amount of variance in posttest numeracy scores that was attributable to classroom nesting ($\rho = .045$). Further, numeracy scores at pretest significantly predicted 49% of the variability in numeracy scores at posttest (see Table 4). The processes only model revealed that the cognitive and linguistic processes accounted for 32% of the variance in numeracy scores at posttest. Fluid intelligence, PA, and RAN significantly predicted unique variation in numeracy posttest scores, while vocabulary did not. Thus, more variation in numeracy posttest scores was accounted for by the autoregressor than by the group of predictors. In the full model, numeracy posttest scores were simultaneously regressed on the autoregressor and all remaining cognitive and linguistic predictors. The full

model explained 54% of the variance in numeracy posttest scores, which was a small improvement over the autoregressor model (i.e., $\Delta R^2 = .05$). In the full model, the autoregressor, fluid intelligence, and PA uniquely predicted numeracy posttest scores, whereas RAN and vocabulary did not.

Predictors of Applied Problems Achievement

Evaluation of the level 2 variance in models of the prediction of applied problems posttest scores suggested that classrooms did reliably differ in their average applied problems scores at posttest ($B = 1.49, p = .02$). However, only a small portion of variance in this outcome was attributable to classroom nesting ($\rho = .16$). Because the Applied Problems subtest was not administered at the beginning of the school year, the numeracy pretest was used as the autoregressor. The autoregressor model demonstrated that numeracy scores at pretest significantly predicted applied problems scores at posttest, accounting for 32% of its variability. The processes only model revealed that cognitive and linguistic processes accounted for 38% of the variance in applied problems posttest scores. In this model, all cognitive and linguistic variables except RAN significantly predicted unique variation in the applied problems outcome (see Table 4). In the full model, the autoregressor, fluid intelligence, PA, and STM significantly predicted unique variance in applied problems, whereas RAN and vocabulary did not. Together, the six predictors in the full model explained 46% of the variance in performance on the applied problems outcome, which reflects a sizable increment in variance explained over the autoregressor only model (i.e., $\Delta R^2 = .14$). Of the predictors, the autoregressor, IQ, PA, and STM accounted for significant unique variation in applied problems scores at posttest.

Discussion

The present study sought to advance the fields understanding of cognitive and linguistic processes that are important for kindergarten math achievement. We built upon prior research by comprehensively including many theoretically and empirically informed predictors of mathematics, by utilizing a longitudinal framework, by including an autoregressor, by investigating the relations of hypothesized predictors with two different math outcomes, and by accounting for classroom nesting. This comprehensive framework yielded somewhat different accounts of the relations among cognitive processes, linguistic skills, and math achievement than those reported in prior research.

When predicting numeracy achievement, correlational results indicated that children who entered kindergarten with relatively higher levels of fluid intelligence, PA, RAN, and vocabulary evidenced relatively higher levels of numeracy at the end of kindergarten. Subsequently, multiple regression analysis demonstrated that the predictive associations of PA and RAN with numeracy were independent of fluid intelligence. However, PA and fluid intelligence were the only significant unique predictors of numeracy achievement after controlling for prior numeracy skills.

When predicting applied problems achievement, correlational results indicated that children who entered kindergarten with relatively higher levels of fluid intelligence, PA, RAN, STM, and vocabulary evidenced higher levels of achievement for solving applied problems at the end of kindergarten. Subsequent multiple regression analysis demonstrated that the predictive associations of PA, vocabulary, and STM with applied problems were independent of fluid intelligence. However, fluid intelligence, PA and STM were the only significant unique predictors of applied problems achievement after controlling for prior numeracy skills.

PREDICTORS OF KINDERGARTEN MATH ACHIEVEMENT

Table 4

Level 1 Results of the Prediction of Kindergarten Math Achievement

		Numeracy				Applied problems			
Model	Independent Variable(s)	<i>B (S.E.)</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>R</i> ²	<i>B (S.E.)</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>R</i> ²
Autoregressor Model					.49				.32
	Numeracy-pretest	4.95 (.35)	14.20	< .001		2.21 (.22)	10.22	< .001	
Processes Model					.32				.38
	Fluid intelligence	1.71 (.53)	3.22	.002		.96 (.28)	3.46	< .001	
	PA	2.36 (.48)	4.90	< .001		1.15 (.25)	4.35	< .001	
	RAN	-1.33 (.42)	-3.13	.002		-.42 (.22)	-1.90	.058	
	Vocabulary	.39 (.47)	.83	.41		.52 (.21)	2.53	.01	
	STM	--- ^a	---- ^a	---- ^a		.58 (.25)	2.33	.02	
Full Model					.54				.46
	Numeracy-pretest	3.98 (.41)	9.70	< .001		1.42 (.24)	5.94	< .001	
	Fluid intelligence	.88 (.45)	1.96	.05		.63 (.27)	2.37	.02	
	PA	1.09 (.42)	2.58	.01		.68 (.24)	2.75	.01	
	RAN	-.67 (.36)	-1.87	.06		-.18 (.20)	-.86	.39	
	Vocabulary	-.11 (.40)	-.29	.77		.41 (.23)	1.77	.08	
	STM	--- ^a	---- ^a	---- ^a		.59 (.19)	3.10	.002	

Note. PA is phonological awareness; RAN is rapid automatized naming; STM is short-term memory. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$. $N = 208$. ¹STM was not included in analysis of numeracy because pre-analysis data inspection found that it was not reliably associated with numeracy.

PREDICTORS OF KINDERGARTEN MATH ACHIEVEMENT

In regard to the autoregressor, beginning of year numeracy scores accounted for substantial amounts of variation in end of year math outcomes. Specifically, numeracy scores in the fall of kindergarten accounted for 49% and 32% of the variance in numeracy and applied problems scores obtained in the spring of kindergarten, respectively. Strong autoregressor effects are consistent with prior research in mathematics (Locuniak & Jordan, 2008; Jordan et al., 2009; Mazzocco & Thompson, 2005). Collectively, these findings suggest that it may be beneficial for systematic mathematics instruction to begin prior to kindergarten. Indeed, research has demonstrated that early mathematics skills are malleable and that high-risk students benefit from early math instruction (see Clements & Sarama, 2008; Clements, Sarama, Spitler, Lange & Wolfe, 2011; Griffin et al., 1994; Starkey, Klein, & Wakeley, 2004). Thus, engaging preschool age children in numeracy activities and games should become the norm, as these experiences may serve as a foundation from which young children develop knowledge of the symbolic number system (Geary, 1995; Levine, Jordan, & Huttenlocher, 1992).

The strong autoregressor effects also suggest that it may be beneficial to screen for mathematics learning difficulties upon entry into kindergarten. Other studies have demonstrated that kindergarten numeracy is predictive of math achievement at the end of second and third grade over and above the effects of supporting cognitive competencies (Locuniak & Jordan, 2008; Jordan et al., 2009; Mazzocco & Thompson, 2005). Moreover, Jordan et al. (2009) demonstrated that numeracy at the beginning of kindergarten predicted numeracy growth as well as children's math achievement trajectories through third grade as measured by norm referenced measures. Given the strong relationship between numeracy and math achievement trajectories, screening for mathematics learning difficulties should begin when most children enter into formal schooling during kindergarten. In doing so, identified children can be provided the

opportunity to participate in prevention services before the onset of severe deficits (Fuchs et al., 2007; Stock et al., 2010).

From among the cognitive and linguistic predictors, the strong relation between fluid intelligence and math achievement is especially interesting and noteworthy given that our measures of fluid intelligence arguably assessed many mathematically-based competencies (i.e., patterning, geometry, mental rotation, and symbolic problem solving). Our findings that fluid intelligence predicted numeracy and applied problems achievement suggest that spatial and geometric skills contribute to children's mathematical development over and above early numeracy skills. Specifically, spatial and geometric properties that children understand at school entry may support learning of numeracy skills that develop during the school year (e.g., mathematical operations). The present results similarly support the argument that fluid intelligence or spatial and geometric competencies supports the development of applied problems.

As hypothesized according to prior research (Hecht et al., 2001; Kleemans et al., 2011), PA uniquely predicted both numeracy and applied problems achievement. However it is important to keep in mind that PA only uniquely accounted for about 1.25% to 5% of the variance in end of kindergarten numeracy and applied problems, respectively, once accounting for prior math achievement, IQ, and other linguistic competencies. These findings are consistent with the results of many studies (e.g., Bryant et al., 1990; Foster et al., 2014; Koponen et al., 2012; LeFevre et al., 2010; Wise et al., 2008).

The present study's confirmation of unique effects of PA in the development of both numeracy skills and applied problems suggests that PA is involved in a wide array of mathematics skills beyond simple arithmetic. That is, numeracy tasks and applied problems both

appear to rely on the manipulation, retrieval, and retention of phonological codes. Indeed, speech sound processes are used when counting and when solving arithmetic problems (Geary, 1993; Logie & Baddeley, 1987). When solving arithmetic problems, children first translate terms and operators into a speech-based code (Campbell, 1998; Dehaene, 1992). The child then retrieves a phonologically-stored solution from long-term memory or processes phonological information when using count based strategies to calculate (e.g., *sum* or *counting all* strategy and *counting up* or *min* strategy; Geary et al., 1999; Siegler & Shipley, 1995; for review see Siegler & Robinson, 1982). Alternatively, the association of PA with math achievement could reflect a common reliance on working memory resources. Working memory is defined as “the ability to hold and preserve available information and [simultaneously] conduct manipulations on this information” (Shaul & Schwartz, 2014, p. 752). Elision tasks, like those used in the present study, require a child to keep an auditory stimulus (e.g., “batman”) in short-term storage while processing auditory instructions (i.e., delete the word part “man”) and executing the processes needed to arrive at a solution (i.e., “bat”). In accord with Baddeley’s (Baddeley, 1986; Baddeley & Hitch, 1974) multi-component model, the central executive system interacts with the phonological loop during on-line processing of such tasks. Specifically, the phonological loop holds verbal information (e.g., “Say batman without man” or “How much is two plus three?”) in mind via rehearsal processes of (sub)articulation, while the central executive coordinates activities involved (e.g., elision or addition) in arriving at a solution. In short, PA elision tasks and solving math problems similarly draw from working memory resources.

The present study also provides a fine-grained analysis of which cognitive and linguistic processes predict two somewhat different math outcomes. For example, after accounting for classroom nesting and prior math ability, fluid intelligence and PA predicted both numeracy and

applied problems outcomes, whereas STM only predicted the applied problems outcome. These findings bolster evidence (e.g., De Smedt, Taylor, Archibald, & Ansari, 2010) that the quality of long-term phonological representations and/or working memory resources rather than size of short-term phonological storage is/are important for early development in numeracy skills. Alternatively, STM may not have been associated with numeracy in the present study because children used manipulatives when solving test items on the REMA. The use of manipulatives likely reduces the amount of phonological information that children must keep in temporary storage, mitigating the need for taxing STM. In contrast, results pertaining to applied problems suggest that solving such problems draws on both STM capacity and the quality of phonological representations (and/or working memory resources). Increased short-term memory capacity probably helps children maintain the entire verbally presented mathematical problem in temporary storage (Baddeley, 1986; Raghubar et al., 2010). Additionally, STM capacity may be especially important when children have to rule out extraneous information, decide on arithmetic strategies, and execute calculation procedures. It also is likely that short-term storage is taxed when children are solving verbally presented math problems because they are holding information in mind while processing additional information to arrive at a solution (Swanson, 2004). Thus, solving applied problems may be associated with an increased verbal load compared to solving numeracy problems.

With respect to RAN, correlational results indicated that RAN was significantly correlated with posttest math achievement, such that more efficient access and retrieval of phonological information was associated with higher numeracy scores and higher applied problems scores at the end of kindergarten. However, RAN's predictive associations with numeracy and solving applied problems lessen when fluid intelligence and other PPAs were

included in the statistical model, and they essentially disappeared when pretest math achievement was statistically controlled. It is important to note that our findings differ from those reported in other studies and these differences may be explained by methodological differences among studies. For example, that Koponen et al. (2013) found RAN predictive of latter math achievement but that we did not can probably be explained by the present study's inclusion of fluid intelligence and prior levels of math achievement in the analyses. Similarly, the study by Hecht et al. (2001), which found RAN predictive of math achievement, did not statistically control for individual differences in fluid intelligence, even though it did control for differences in vocabulary and prior math achievement. Another methodological difference between the present study and that of Hecht et al. (2001) is that the latter study included a latent RAN variable comprised of six indicators, three of which were RAN for digits. Other research (e.g., Clark & Shinn, 2004) has shown that similar number fluency measures are indeed predictive of young children's achievement with solving applied problems. It is therefore possible that a domain-specific relation exists between RAN tests and math achievement such that RAN for numbers is important but RAN for objects is not. Finally, the nature of the math outcomes used in the present study may also help explain the weak relations identified between RAN and math achievement. Specifically, the present study's math outcomes had scores that indexed accuracy of children's responses without regard to how long it took children to complete the test items. One would expect math measures that consider both accuracy and latency in their scoring to be more closely associated with RAN.

With regard to vocabulary, its predictive relations with math achievement were weaker than expected. That vocabulary was not predictive of numeracy achievement is consistent with other research and suggests that early numerical skills may develop relatively independent of

general language ability (e.g., Feigenson, Dehaene, & Spelke, 2004; Geary, 2007; Gelman & Butterworth, 2005). For applied problems achievement, vocabulary significantly predicted unique variation in scores within the processes model. This finding is consistent with those reported by LeFevre et al. (2010), suggesting that vocabulary is related to math achievement on measures that require language-mediated responses. However, after controlling for prior numeracy skills within the full model, vocabulary was not a significant predictor of unique variation for applied problems. This collective pattern of results suggests that children largely draw on their early number competencies (i.e., autoregressor) and to a lesser extent early geometric and spatial skills (i.e., fluid intelligence), long-term phonological representations and short-term storage resources when solving numeracy and applied problems.

Another interesting finding from the present study was that at the end of the year children's classrooms differed in their average scores on applied problems but not in their average scores on numeracy. The absence of kindergarten classroom effects for numeracy may be attributed to the preverbal or innate nature of early number competencies (Feigenson et al., 2004). Arguably, two core systems underlie early number competencies. The first is an approximate magnitude system that enables inexact estimation of relatively large quantities, magnitudes, or size (Geary, 2007). The second system provides for precise representation of small numbers of individual objects (sets of three to four items) and represents information about their continuous or non-numerical properties (see Feigenson et al., 2004). Both systems become integrated with the symbolic, verbal number system and provide a foundation for the development of more sophisticated mathematics skills (Feigenson et al., 2004; Geary, 2006; 2007; Spelke, 2000). Because these systems are preverbal, classrooms of children with minimal formal education would not necessarily be expected to significantly differ with respect to

corresponding mathematics skills. In contrast, classroom variation in competence with applied problems may be due to classroom instructional practices that target children's knowledge of the verbal number system (Case & Griffin, 1990; Geary, 1995; Levine et al., 1992). For instance, it may be that classrooms that practiced solving story problems or classrooms that used a particular mathematics curriculum were those that on average, scored better for applied problems.

Finally, it is important to note that the results of the processes model and the full model are conditional on the variables included in the analyses. When the effects of the autoregressor are not taken into consideration as in the processes model, there is a risk of over estimating the true relations between the predictors and the math outcomes. In contrast, when the effects of the other variables are conditional on the autoregressor as in the full model, there is a risk of underestimating the true relations between the predictors and math outcomes. This is because some predictive variance in the math outcomes is shared by the autoregressor and the other predictors. This shared variance is typically ascribed to the autoregressor even though cognitive and linguistic processes may have had a role in the development of early numeracy. Despite this caution in the interpretation of the present findings, the strong autoregressor effects suggest that cognitive and linguistic processes may not be as uniquely influential in the development of mathematics as authors of previous studies have asserted. The magnitude of their true influence probably lies somewhere between the magnitudes found in the full and processes only models.

Limitations and Future Studies

One, the present findings should not be generalized beyond the population of ethnic minority kindergarten children in Title I schools in the US. For example, the relations between cognitive and linguistic skills and mathematical outcomes may differ in other populations of

children whose profile of achievement is more characteristic of typical development and learning in kindergarten. Two, the present study did not include a pretest specific to applied problems.

This may have influenced the difference in the variance accounted for by the numeracy autoregressor in end of year numeracy ($R^2 = .49$) compared to applied problems ($R^2 = .32$). As a consequence, variables such as vocabulary and STM may be accounting for more variance in applied problems, a measure that has a relatively high verbal load, than expected had an autoregressor specific to applied problems been employed in predictive analyses. Thus, using the numeracy pretest as the autoregressor in analyses concerned with the prediction of applied problems may have underestimated the true autoregressive relation for this outcome. As a result, this study may have overestimated relations of the other predictors with applied problems. While this may be a limitation, it should be noted that the numeracy pretest scores correlated similarly with applied problems posttest scores ($r = .56$) and numeracy posttest scores ($r = .70$).

Additionally, the correlation between numeracy pretest and applied problems scores is consistent with other reports (e.g., Jordan et al., 2009), suggesting that the present findings are generalizable. As it may be, future studies could benefit from including a true autoregressor for applied problems. Three, as illustrated in our findings, the relations between cognitive processes and mathematics development is complex. It is unclear how specific spatial and geometric skills as indexed by our measure of general fluid intelligence are related to domains of mathematics development. Additional research is therefore needed to disentangle the relations between specific spatial and geometric skills, general nonverbal ability, and specific mathematical competencies. Four, to rule out the possibility that null effects concerning RAN were a consequence of how we measured RAN, how we measured math achievement, or both, future work should include RAN for digits, RAN for objects, and math outcomes that do and do not

include a timed component. Such an assessment battery is needed to disentangle the relations between RAN and mathematics and to investigate the potential for a domain-specific effect (e.g., RAN numbers) or a method-specific effect (i.e., timed tasks). Finally, we did not include measures that directly assessed working memory or executive functioning. Working memory is one of several cognitive processes that are involved in the control and coordination of information and is included under Brocki and Bohlin's (2004) definition of executive functions. As it may be, future studies would benefit from including measures that explicitly assess the central executive, phonological loop, and visual-spatial sketchpad within a comprehensive framework that considers the effects of cognitive and linguistic predictors, including prior mathematical ability, on math achievement in kindergartners as in the present study. Doing so could help explicate how the brain processes mathematical information during the first year of children's formal schooling and the unique roles of correlated abilities such as working memory, phonological loop functioning, PA, and vocabulary.

Conclusion

Early math achievement is critical for placing children on a positive educational trajectory. After controlling for autoregressive effects and classroom nesting, fluid intelligence and PA significantly predicted posttest numeracy achievement but these predictors accounted for a small increment in predictive accuracy over the autoregressor only model. Similarly, fluid intelligence, PA, and STM significantly predicted competence with applied problems, after controlling for autoregressive effects and classroom nesting. The present findings extend the extant literature and provide further evidence that PA is linked to the development of a wider array of math domains than just arithmetic achievement. They also indicate that fluid intelligence and/or early spatial and geometric understanding is important to the development of both

numeracy and applied problems. Additionally, a more fine-grained view of development was provided and suggests that children rely on the quality of long-term phonological representations rather than their short-term storage when solving numeracy related problems. In contrast, solving applied problems appears to rely on both the quality of children's phonological representations and their short-term storage capacity. Although the relations of fluid intelligence, PA, STM and math outcomes are reliable and arguably important, they were small in comparison to children's pretest scores. Thus, the present findings underscore the importance for providing planned math instruction in preschool and screening for mathematics learning difficulties at kindergarten entry. Engaging children in early number activities can provide them with needed experiences for developing early number competencies; whereas, screening for mathematics learning difficulties in kindergarten permits identified children to participate in prevention services before the onset of severe deficits.

Footnotes

¹Note that while R^2 is reported throughout the study, R^2 within multilevel models yield pseudo- R^2 because the estimation of variance components changes depending on the variables in the model (see Singer & Willett, 2003).

Acknowledgements

This material is based on research that was supported by the Department of Education Institute of Education Sciences (DOE/IES) under Grant No. R305A080196 and this article was written with the support of DOE/IES grant R324B110007, awarded to the University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston.

References

- Anthony, J. L. (2008). Efficacy of Earobics Step I in English Language Learners and low SES minority children: R305A080196 [data file and code book]. University of Texas Health Science Center Houston: U.S. Department of Education.
- Anthony, J. L., Lonigan, C. J., Driscoll, K., Phillips, B. M., & Burgess, S. R. (2003). Phonological sensitivity: A quasi-parallel progression of word structure units and cognitive operations. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 38, 470-487.
- Anthony, J. L., Williams, J. M., McDonald, R., Corbitt-Shindler, D., Carlson, C. D., & Francis, D. J. (2006). Phonological processing and emergent literacy in Spanish speaking preschool children. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 56, 239-270.
- Anthony, J. L., Williams, J. M., McDonald, R., & Francis, D. J. (2007). Phonological processing and emergent literacy in younger and older preschool children. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 57, 113-137. doi:10.1007/s11881-007-0008-8
- Aunola, K., Leskinen, E., Lerkkanen, M., & Nurmi, J. (2004). Developmental dynamics of math performance from preschool to Grade 2. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 96(4), 699-713. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.96.4.699
- Baddeley, A. D. (1986). *Working memory*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Baddeley, A. D., & Hitch, G. J. (1974). Working memory. In G. H. Bower Editor, *The psychology of learning and motivation* (Vol. 8, pp. 47-89). New York: Academic Press.
- Bodovski, K. & Youn, M. -J. (2011). The long term effects of early acquired skills and behaviors on young children's achievement in literacy and mathematics. *Journal of Early Childhood Research* 9(1), 4-19. doi:10.1177/1476718X10366727
- Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (2008). Mind and brain. In M. Immordino-

PREDICTORS OF KINDERGARTEN MATH ACHIEVEMENT

- Yang (Ed.), *The Jossey-Bass reader on the brain and learning* (pp. 89-105). San Francisco, CA, US: Jossey-Bass.
- Brocki, K. C., & Bohlin, G. (2004). Executive functions in children aged 6 to 13: A dimensional and developmental study. *Developmental Neuropsychology*, 26(2), 571-593.
doi:10.1207/s15326942dn2602_3
- Brown, T. A. (2006). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research*. New York, Guilford Press.
- Brownell, R. (2000). *Expressive one-word picture vocabulary test manual*. Novato, CA: Academic Therapy Publications.
- Bryant, P. E., MacLean, M. M., Bradley, L. L., & Crossland, J. J. (1990). Rhyme and alliteration, phoneme detection, and learning to read. *Developmental Psychology*, 26(3), 429-438.
doi:10.1037/0012-1649.26.3.429
- Bull, R., & Johnston, R. S. (1997). Children's arithmetical difficulties: Contributions from processing speed, item identification, and short-term memory. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 65(1), 1-24. doi:10.1006/jecp.1996.2358
- Clarke, B., & Shinn, M. R. (2004). A Preliminary investigation into the identification and development of early mathematics curriculum-based measurement. *School Psychology Review*, 33(2), 234-248.
- Clements, D. H., & Sarama, J. (2008). Experimental evaluation of the effects of a research-based preschool mathematics curriculum. *American Educational Research Journal*, 45(2), 443-494. doi:10.3102/0002831207312908
- Clements, D. H., & Sarama, J. (2014). *Learning and teaching early math: The learning trajectories approach* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

- Clements, D. H., Sarama, J. H., Spitler, M. E., Lange, A. A., & Wolfe, C. B. (2011). Mathematics learned by young children in an intervention based on learning trajectories: A large-scale cluster randomized trial. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, 42(2), 127-166.
- Clements, D. H., Sarama, J. H., & Liu, X. H. (2008). Development of a measure of early mathematics achievement using the Rasch model: The Research-Based Early Maths Assessment. *Educational Psychology*, 28(4), 457-482. doi:10.1080/01443410701777272
- Dehaene, S. (1992). Varieties of numerical abilities. *Cognition*, 44(1), 1-42. doi:10.1016/0010-0277(92)90049-N
- Dehaene, S., Piazza, M., Pinel, P., & Cohen, L. (2003). Three parietal circuits for number processing. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, 20(3-6), 487-506. doi:10.1080/02643290244000239
- De Smedt, B., Taylor, J., Archibald, L., & Ansari, D. (2010). How is phonological processing related to individual differences in children's arithmetic skills? *Developmental Science*, 13(3), 508-520. doi:10.1111/j.1467-7687.2009.00897.x
- Duncan, G. J., Classens, A., & Engel, M. (2004). The contributions of hard skills and socio-emotional behavior to school readiness Evanston, IL: Northwestern University.
- Duncan, G. J., Dowsett, C. J., Claessens, A., Magnuson, K., Huston, A. C., Klebanov, P., & ... Japel, C. (2007). School readiness and later achievement. *Developmental Psychology*, 43(6), 1428-1446. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.43.6.1428
- Duncan, G. J., & Magnuson, K. (2011). The nature and impact of early achievement skills, attention skills, and behavior problems. In G. J. Duncan & R. Murane (Eds.). *Whither opportunity? Rising inequality and the uncertain life chances of low-income children*.

(pp. 47-70).

Dunlap, S., Anthony, J. L., Wu, W., Crawford, A., Millner, K., Landry, S., & Ciancio, D. (2015).

Teachers' instructional behaviors predict student learning: Initial validation of the Teacher Behavior Rating Scale-Kindergarten version. Manuscript submitted for review.

Feigenson, L., Dehaene, S., & Spelke, E. (2004). Core systems of number. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 8(7), 307–314. doi:10.1016/j.tics.2004.05.002

Fletcher, Lyon, Fuchs, & Barnes, (2006). *Learning disabilities: From identification to intervention.* Guilford Publications, Inc.

Foster, M. E., Sevcik, R. A., Ronski, M., & Morris, R. D. (2014). The effects of phonological awareness and naming speed on mathematics skills in children with mild intellectual disability. *Developmental Neuropsychology*. Advance online publication. doi:10.3109/17518423.2013.843603\

Fuchs, L. S., Fuchs, D., Compton, D. L., Bryant, J. D., Hamlett, C. L., & Seethaler, P. M. (2007). Mathematics Screening and Progress Monitoring at First Grade: Implications for Responsiveness to Intervention. *Exceptional Children*, 73(3), 311-330.

Fuson, K. C. (1988). *Children's counting and concepts of number.* New York, NY: Springer-Verlag Publishing.

Geary, D. C. (1993). Mathematical disabilities: Cognitive, neuropsychological, and genetic components. *Psychological Bulletin*, 114, 345–362.

Geary, D. C. (1994). *Children's mathematical development: Research and practical applications.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Geary, D. C. (1995). Reflections of evolution and culture in children's cognition: Implications for mathematical development and instruction. *American Psychologist*, 50(1), 24-37.

doi:10.1037/0003-066X.50.1.24

- Geary, D. C. (2006). Development of mathematical understanding. In D. Kuhl & R. S. Siegler (Vol. Eds.), *Cognition, perception, and language, Vol 2* (pp. 777–810). W. Damon (Gen. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology* (6th Ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Geary, D. C. (2007). An evolutionary perspective on learning disability in mathematics. *Developmental Neuropsychology*, 32(1), 471-519. doi:10.1080/87565640701360924
- Geary, D. C. (2011). Cognitive predictors of achievement growth in mathematics: A 5-year longitudinal study. *Developmental Psychology*, 47(6), 1539-1552. doi:10.1037/a0025510
- Geary, D. C., Hoard, M. K., Byrd-Craven, J., Nugent, L., & Numtee, C. (2007). Cognitive mechanisms underlying achievement deficits in children with mathematical learning disability. *Child Development*, 78(4), 1343-1359. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2007.01069.x
- Geary, D. C., Hoard, M. K., & Nugent, L. (2012). Independent contributions of the central executive, intelligence, and in-class attentive behavior to developmental change in the strategies used to solve addition problems. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 113(1), 49-65. doi:10.1016/j.jecp.2012.03.003
- Gelman, R., & Butterworth, B. (2005). Number and language: How are they related? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 9(1), 6-10. doi:10.1016/j.tics.2004.11.004
- Gelman, R., & Gallistel, C. R. (1978). The child's understanding of number. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Griffin, S., Case, R., & Siegler, R. S. (1994). Classroom lessons: Integrating cognitive theory and classroom practice. In K. McGilly (Ed.), *Rightstart: Providing the central conceptual prerequisites for first formal learning of arithmetic to students at risk for school failure*

PREDICTORS OF KINDERGARTEN MATH ACHIEVEMENT

- (pp. 25-50). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Hecht, S. A., Torgesen, J. K., Wagner, R. K., & Rashotte, C. A. (2001). The relations between phonological processing abilities and emerging individual differences in mathematical computational skills: A longitudinal study from second to fifth grades. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 79(2), 192-227. doi:10.1006/jecp.2000.2586
- Hooper, S. R., Roberts, J., Sideris, J., Burchinal, M., & Zeisel, S. (2010). Longitudinal predictors of reading and math trajectories through middle school for African American versus Caucasian students across two samples. *Developmental Psychology*, 46(5), 1018-1029. doi:10.1037/a0018877
- Jimerson, S., Egeland, B., & Teo, A. (1999). A longitudinal study of achievement trajectories: Factors associated with change. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 91(1), 116-126. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.91.1.116
- Jordan, N. C., Kaplan, D., Ramineni, C., & Locuniak, M. N. (2009). Early math matters: Kindergarten number competence and later mathematics outcomes. *Developmental Psychology*, 45(3), 850-867. doi:10.1037/a0014939
- Kaye, D. B. (1986). The development of mathematical cognition. *Cognitive Development*, 1(2), 157-170. doi:10.1016/S0885-2014(86)80017-X
- Kleemans, T., Segers, E., & Verhoeven, L. (2011). Precursors to numeracy in kindergartners with specific language impairment. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 32(6), 2901-2908.
- Koponen, T., Salmi, P., Eklund, K., & Aro, T. (2013). Counting and RAN: Predictors of arithmetic calculation and reading fluency. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 105(1), 162-175. doi:10.1037/a0029285

PREDICTORS OF KINDERGARTEN MATH ACHIEVEMENT

- Krajewski, K., & Schneider, W. (2009). Early development of quantity to number-word linkage as a precursor of mathematical school achievement and mathematical difficulties: Findings from a four-year longitudinal study. *Learning and Instruction, 19*(6), 513-526. doi:10.1016/j.learninstruc.2008.10.002
- Lee, J. (2002). Racial and ethnic achievement gap trends: Reversing the progress toward equity? *Educational Researcher 31*(1), 3-12.
- LeFevre, J., Fast, L., Skwarchuk, S., Smith-Chant, B. L., Bisanz, J., Kamawar, D., & Penner-Wilger, M. (2010). Pathways to mathematics: Longitudinal predictors of performance. *Child Development, 81*(6), 1753-1767. doi:10.1111/j.1467- 8624.2010.01508.x
- Levine, S. C., Jordan, N. C., & Huttenlocher, J. (1992). Development of calculation abilities in young children. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 53*(1), 72-103. doi:10.1016/S0022-0965(05)80005-0
- Locuniak, M. N., & Jordan, N. C. (2008). Using kindergarten number sense to predict calculation fluency in second grade. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 41*(5), 451– 459. doi:10.1177/0022219408321126
- Logie, R. H., & Baddeley, A. D. (1987). Cognitive processes in counting. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, And Cognition, 13*(2), 310-326. doi:10.1037/0278-7393.13.2.310
- Lonigan, C. J., Burgess, S. R., Anthony, J. L., & Barker, T. A. (1998). Development of phonological sensitivity in 2- to 5-year-old children. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 90*(2), 294-311.
- Lonigan, C. J., Wagner, R. K., Torgesen, J. K., & Rashotte, C. (2002). *Preschool Comprehensive Test of Phonological and Print Processing*. Florida State University.

PREDICTORS OF KINDERGARTEN MATH ACHIEVEMENT

- Maier, M. F., & Greenfield, D. B. (2008). Paper presented at the Institute of Education Science 2007 Research Conference. Washington, DC: Institute of Education Science.
- Mazzocco, M. M., & Thompson, R. E. (2005). Kindergarten predictors of math learning disability. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*, 20(3), 142–155.
doi:10.1111/j.1540-5826.2005.00129.x
- Mullis, I. V. S., Martin, M. O., & Arora, A. (2012). *TIMSS 2011 International results in mathematics*. The International Study Center, Boston College, Lynch School of Education. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED544554>
- Munro, J. (1979). Language abilities and math performance. *Reading Teacher*, 32, 900-915.
- National Assessment of Educational Progress. (2007). *The Nation's Report Card*. Retrieved from http://www.nationsreportcard.gov/math_2007/
- National Assessment of Educational Progress. (2013). *The Nation's Report Card*. Retrieved from http://www.nationsreportcard.gov/reading_math_2013/#/gains-by-group
- National Association for the Education of Young Children and the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (2002). Early childhood mathematics: Promoting good beginnings.
Retrieved from <https://www.naeyc.org/files/naeyc/file/positions/psmath.pdf>
- National Governors Association Center for Best Practices, Council of Chief State School Officers. (2010). *Common Core State Standards*. Washington D.C.: National Governors Association Center for Best Practices, Council of Chief State School Officers.
- National Mathematics Advisory Panel. (2008). *Foundations for success: The final report of the National Mathematics Advisory Panel*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- National Research Council. (2009). Mathematics learning in early childhood: Paths toward

excellence and equity. (C. T. Cross, T. A. Woods, & H. Schweingruber, Eds.).

Washington, DC: The National Academies Press

Noël, M. (2009). Counting on working memory when learning to count and to add: A preschool study. *Developmental Psychology*, 45(6), 1630-1643. doi:10.1037/a0016224

Passolunghi, M., Vercelloni, B., & Schadee, H. (2007). The precursors of mathematics learning: Working memory, phonological ability and numerical competence. *Cognitive Development*, 22(2), 165-184. doi:10.1016/j.cogdev.2006.09.001

Praet, M., Titeca, D., Ceulemans, A., & Desoete, A. (2013). Language in the prediction of arithmetics in kindergarten and grade 1. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 27, 90-96. doi:10.1016/j.lindif.2013.07.003

Primi, R., Ferrão, M., & Almeida, L. S. (2010). Fluid intelligence as a predictor of learning: A longitudinal multilevel approach applied to math. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 20(5), 446-451. doi:10.1016/j.lindif.2010.05.001

Purpura, D. J., Hume, L. E., Sims, D. M., & Lonigan, C. J. (2011). Early literacy and early numeracy: The value of including early literacy skills in the prediction of numeracy development. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 110(4), 647-658. doi:10.1016/j.jecp.2011.07.004

Raghubar, K. P., Barnes, M. A., & Hecht, S. A. (2010). Working memory and mathematics: A review of developmental, individual difference, and cognitive approaches. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 20(2), 110-122. doi:10.1016/j.lindif.2009.10.005

Robinson, C. S., Menchetti, B. M., & Torgesen, J. K. (2002). Toward a two-factor theory of one type of mathematics disabilities. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*, 17(2), 81-89. doi:10.1111/1540-5826.00035

PREDICTORS OF KINDERGARTEN MATH ACHIEVEMENT

- Romano, E., Babchishin, L., Pagani, L. S., & Kohen, D. (2010). School readiness and later achievement: Replication and extension using a nationwide Canadian survey. *Developmental Psychology*, 46(5), 995-1007. doi:10.1037/a0018880
- Rothman, R. W., & Cohen, J. (1989). The language of math needs to be taught. *Academic Therapy*, 25(2), 133-142.
- Sarama, J. & Clements, D. H. (2009). *Early childhood mathematics education research: Learning trajectories for young children*. New York: Routledge.
- SAS Institute. (2002–2006). *SAS release 9.3* [computer software]. Cary, NC: Author.
- Saxe, G. B., Guberman, S. R., & Gearhart, M. (1987). Social processes in early number development. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 52(2), 162. doi:10.2307/1166071
- Shaul, S., & Schwartz, M. (2014). The role of the executive functions in school readiness among preschool-age children. *Reading and Writing*, 27(4), 749-768. doi:10.1007/s11145-013-9470-3
- Siegler, R. S. (1993). Contributions of psychology to science and mathematics education. In L. A. Penner, G. M. Batsche, H. M. Knoff, & D. L. Nelson (Eds.), *The challenge in mathematics and science education: Psychology's response* (pp. 341-366). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Simmons, F. R., & Singleton, C. (2008). Do weak phonological representations impact on arithmetic development? A review of research into arithmetic and dyslexia. *Dyslexia: An International Journal of Research and Practice*, 14(2), 77-94. doi:10.1002/dys.341
- Singer, J. D., & Willett, J. B. (2003). *Applied longitudinal data analysis: Modeling change and event occurrence*. New York: Oxford University Press.

PREDICTORS OF KINDERGARTEN MATH ACHIEVEMENT

- Spelke, E. S. (2000). Core knowledge. *American Psychologist*, 55(11), 1233-1243.
doi:10.1037/0003-066X.55.11.1233
- Starkey, P., Klein, A., & Wakeley, A. (2004). Enhancing young children's mathematical knowledge through a pre-kindergarten mathematics intervention. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 19(1), 99-120. doi:10.1016/j.ecresq.2004.01.002
- Stevenson, H. W., & Newman, R. S. (1986). Long-term prediction of achievement and attitudes in mathematics and reading. *Child Development*, 57(3), 646-659. doi:10.2307/1130343
- Stock, P., Desoete, A., & Roeyers, H. (2010). Detecting children with arithmetic disabilities from kindergarten: Evidence from a 3-year longitudinal study on the role of preparatory arithmetic abilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 43(3), 250-268.
doi:10.1177/0022219409345011
- Swanson, H. (2004). Working memory and phonological processing as predictors of children's mathematical problem solving at different ages. *Memory and Cognition*, 32(4), 648-661.
doi:10.3758/BF03195856
- Thomson, S., Rowe, K., Underwood, C., & Peck, R. (2005). "Numeracy in the early years: Project Good start." Australian Council for Educational Research, Camberwell, Victoria, Australia.
- Thorndike, R. L., Hagen, E. P., & Sattler, J. M. (1986). *Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale: Fourth Edition*. Itasca, IL: Riverside Publishing.
- Toll, S. M., Van der Ven, S. G., Kroesbergen, E. H., & Van Luit, J. H. (2011). Executive functions as predictors of math learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 44(6), 521-532. doi:10.1177/0022219410387302
- Torgesen, J. K. (1996). A model of memory from an information processing perspective: The

PREDICTORS OF KINDERGARTEN MATH ACHIEVEMENT

- special case of phonological memory. In G. R. Lyon & N. A. Krasnegor (Eds.), *Attention, memory, and executive function* (pp. 157–184). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes.
- Vukovic, R. A. (2012). Mathematics difficulty with and without reading difficulty: Findings and implications from a four-year longitudinal study. *Exceptional Children*, 78(3), 280-300.
- Wagner, R. K., & Torgesen, J. K. (1987). The nature of phonological processing and its causal role in the acquisition of reading skills. *Psychological Bulletin*, 101(2), 192-212.
doi:10.1037/0033-2909.101.2.192
- Watts, T. W., Duncan, G. J., Siegler, R. S., & Davis-Kean, P. E. (2014). What's past is prologue: Relations between early mathematics knowledge and high school achievement. *Educational Researcher*. Advance online publication. doi:10.3102/0013189X14553660
- Wise, J. C., Pae, H., Wolfe, C. B., Sevcik, R. A., Morris, R. D., Lovett, M., & Wolf, M. (2008). Phonological awareness and rapid naming skills of children with reading disabilities and children with reading disabilities who are at risk for mathematics difficulties. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*, 23(3), 125-136. doi:10.1111/j.1540-5826.2008.00270.x
- Woodcock, R. W., McGrew, K. S., & Mather, N. (2001, 2007). *Woodcock-Johnson III Tests of Achievement*. Itasca, IL: Riverside Publishing.
- Wright, R. J. (1994). A study of the numerical development of 5-year-olds and 6-year-olds. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 26(1), 25-44.