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Abstract

The study contributes to the ongoing debate regarding the significance of the socio-emotional learning (SEL) curriculum and its significance concerning the development of children’s socio-emotional competencies. To address this gap in the literature, a quantitative study into the influence of socio-emotional learning curriculum on children’s development in kindergarten classrooms was explored. The study was guided by four (4) hypotheses namely; Hypothesis one (1): There is no statistical difference in the pre-test social skills of the participants based on age, Hypothesis two (2): There is no statistical difference in the post-test social skills of the participants based on age, Hypothesis three (3): There is no statistically significant difference in the pre-test social skills of the participants based on gender, Hypothesis four (4): There is no statistical difference in the post-test social skills of the participants based on gender. The study’s findings revealed that the intervention was robust because it enhanced and promoted the socio-emotional competencies of the participants. It was recommended that future research works on this issue should explore another socio-cultural context to determine whether similar or divergent findings would be established. This electronic document is a “live” template. The various components of your paper [title, text, heads, etc.] are already defined on the style sheet, as illustrated by the portions given in this document.
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1. Introduction

There has been a growing concern regarding the high incidence of violent acts
by young people in the media. There is, therefore, the need for pragmatic steps to be taken to stem this tide before the dreams of young people become shattered because emotional stability plays a significant role in the lives of all sundry and this implies that socio-emotional learning has become a critical element within the school setting. But the quest to develop young children’s capacity to relate well with other people and accept differing understandings of others is a complicated conversation; and along a path to tread both within the home and the school settings. A nexus can be discerned between one’s socio-cultural context and the individuality that children bring to the learning setting which in turn, promotes and develops children’s ability to tolerate divergent thoughts and relate well with other children from all walks of life within and outside the school. The setting within which one is natured plays a significant part in children’s socio-emotional development. This is not surprising because these elements constitute vital variables that promote and develop children’s social and emotional knowledge and understanding.

And the requisite competencies directly linked to it such as drive, self-worth, poise, resilience, and coping stratagems. But the question that arises is how socio-emotional elements develop in young children, which has always not been an easy task since it takes a lot of experience and skill to develop children’s socio-emotional proficiencies.

Previous research evidence over the past decade consistently has proven that socio-emotional competencies that young children bring to the learning context determine to some extent their academic achievement in preceding years (Huffman, Mehlinger, & Kerivan, 2000; Merrell, 2008). The path regarding how a young child learns to relate and accept contrary views of their peers and others shows how complicated the conversations relating to the personal traits children bring to the learning context. And how the interplay between the uniqueness of children and children’s socio-cultural context feeds into children’s development. But the question that arises is, variables accounting for the development of both the social and emotional competencies of young people. Developing these skills appear to be a process because it takes an individual who has insights and understanding regarding how these relationships are forged in shaping these competencies (Hawkins et al., 1992). Arguably, children’s exposure to the love and caring environment and experiences they gain within the context of activity-based learning settings is often defined by sharing ideas regarding how to accomplish a task assigned to them in class. This is significant because it provides a leeway for them to interact with their peers and share ideas which is often reinforced by insights from their teachers and their peers who are more capable. This is significant because the development of children’s socio-emotional competencies is an active process.

In essence, the experiences children gain from adults and relationships children forge with their more capable peers enable them better able to develop social and emotional skills. Strained peer relationships and the lack of effective means of enhancing children’s emotional development are symptomatic of children
who lack social and emotional competencies (Hartup, 1983). But activity-based learning environment provides an interactive learning environment, however, when children do not react constructively in such an environment, that could be a sign of a developmental challenge. In effect, in children’s social and emotional competence, development is a process but not an event. On this score, Malik, F. & Marwaha, R. (1998) perceive that the first 6 years of a child’s life are critical moments regarding social and emotional development. And any impediment at any one of the developmental stages is or is likely to negatively influence the child’s current and future modes of interaction, relationships with peers, and level of tolerance or otherwise of dissenting views. The interactions between children and their peers and adult support within and outside the school context particularly in deprived communities where children have to eke out a living by themselves serve as a basis for developing the competencies in question. In essence, such children tend to develop social and emotional skills which in turn help them overcome the vicissitudes of life and unpleasant experiences therein. This explains why Espinoza (2010) succinctly describes such children as over-comers or will-powered. Because their lives are defined by deprivation which in turn, shapes them to understand that challenges are critical elements of life. And socio-emotional skills play a significant role in shaping children’s resilience in this respect. And this explains why Gulberg (2009) posits that in-home settings where children are overly protected are likely to fail in life because they have not learned how to deal with life challenges. Providing children learning experiences that provide room for them to develop the spirit of concern regarding the feelings of their peers and how to resolve their differences amicably enhances and promotes children’s development in diverse ways. This explains why direct interactions between early childhood educators are significant because learning is an active process and children learn by doing (Borg, 2009).

Children’s socio-emotional competencies are enhanced when the teaching and learning context is interactive which in turn, provides room for them to share ideas regarding how to accomplish a task assigned to them academically (Aviles, Anderson, & Davila, 2006). Because these competencies help children to effectively function within the school setting which in turn, helps them succeed in their academic pursuits because social-emotional competencies enhance children’s attention span, which forms a critical tied to children’s development in diverse ways (Fredrickson & Branigan, 2005). Social-emotional learning currently forms a critical component in early childhood education and teachers tend to use activity-based small group learning contexts to promote children’s development by proving room for them to interact and share ideas as to how to accomplish a task assigned to them (Klein, 2002). Interactions are at two levels; between teachers and children as well as parents and children are critical variables in shaping the social and emotional competencies of young children, which in turn enhances their success in school. The development of young children is largely influenced by socio-emotional competencies that are largely informed by adults who understand the nature of children and how they learn to interpret
with care and concern and a demonstrable interest in addressing issues of concern that children raised in class.

Reports from the media are replete with incidents that suggest the disintegration of civility and safety largely driven by mean-spirited impulse running amok. Nonetheless, the news simply is a reflection of a creeping sense of emotions out of control which has become a common feature in our lives and those around us. None of us is insulated from such emotional lessons children learn at school and within the home, settings tend to shape children’s emotional fabric making us adept or inept regarding emotional intelligence. And one’s ability to relate well with others. This explains why one’s ability to rein in an emotional impulse, read the innermost feelings of others, and relate well with others are significant in life. This claim is in tandem with Aristotle’s assertion that the “rare skill” is to be angry with the right purpose and in the right ways. In essence, providing children a wide range of abilities that they can draw on to succeed in life should form a critical part of every childhood education (Bredekamp, 2014). This is significant because research evidence (Payton, Weissberg, Durlak, Dymnicks, Taylor, Schelling, & Pachan, 2008) suggests that emotionally sound people can manage their feelings and effectively deal with the emotional outburst, always have an added advantage in every sphere of life. This claim is in tandem with the study’s finding which concluded that emotionally competent people tend to succeed in life because they can well manage their feelings and read and the feelings of others (Wilkinson & Chia-Pin Kao, 2019). One’s ability to read the feelings of other people is likely to have an edge in every sphere of life. Because they are likely not hurt the feelings of others. In essence, the human repertoire of competencies is not limited to only the cognitive which tends to focus largely on word number competencies. Because children need to develop a variety of competencies that they can draw on to succeed in life (Coleman, 2008). In effect, it is good to care about children’s competencies about how to read and write but more importantly, to be concerned about the overall wellbeing of the child.

Anecdotal evidence points to the significant roles socio-emotional competencies play in the lives of young children. In essence, it equips young children with the ability to tolerate divergent views, relate well with others who disagree with them on several issues. And the growing recognition of the capacity of these values to engender peace and harmony in society and as well equip young people with the requisite skills to cope with Visccitude of life has generated scholars’ attention in exploring these phenomena (Merrell, Juskelis, Tran, & Buchanan, 2008; Oberle, Schonert-Rehordt-Reicht, Hertzman, & Zumbo, 2014).

Although several scholars have shown many interests of late in children’s socio-socio-emotional competencies and have become a subject of interest currently, a review of the socio-emotional competence literature suggests that relatively, few theoretical works have been done (CASEL, 2013). In essence, there appears to be a dearth of research to explore the phenomenon in question. Previous studies focused on socio-emotional competencies and how it evolves and develops in young children within the kindergarten contexts (Wong, Li-Chang,
And other variables influence children’s 21st-century skills such as reflection which is remotely tied to emotional and social competencies. Other studies focus on the influence of socio-emotional competencies on children’s development (Wilkinson & Chia-Pin, 2019). Notwithstanding these works, little is known about socio-emotional competencies and how it evolves, and the specific types of activities appropriate for developing these competencies to enhance children’s development. The major issue to address is how socio-emotional competencies positively influence children’s learning in the kindergarten setting. In this vein, we hypothesized that the socio-emotional competencies of the participants would significantly improve whereas the incidence of unacceptable behaviors would significantly lessen after the intervention has been done. It was further hypothesized that the participants in the control group would not exhibit substantial changes in each of the cases (Wong, Li-Chang, & Siu, 2014).
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2. Methodology

The pre-test, intervention, and post-test quantitative action research design was used to determine the effect of socio-emotional competencies on children’s academic performance.

2.1. Participants

The participants which comprised (N 31) were recruited from three kindergarten classrooms within the Cape Coast Metropolis using a convenient sampling technique. The children were selected from kindergartens 1, 2, and 3 in four (4) different schools. Children who are known by their teachers and parents to have socio-emotional management difficulties were recruited. The participants were engaged in a series of activities to enhance and promote their socio-emotional development. In effect, random sampling was used to allot 16 pupils to the control group, whereas 15 pupils were allotted to the intervention group.

2.2. Procedure

To make it possible for the children to participate in the socio-emotional curri-
culum activities the consent of their parents was sought. Through a random sampling procedure, the participants were assigned to either the intervention or the control group. First, the intervention group was engaged in curriculum activities. And afterward, the control group followed suit.

2.3. Outcome Measures

The early Childhood version of the social skill rating system (SSRS; Gresham & Elliott, 1990) was used to determine the socio-emotional behaviors of the participants which defined the outcomes of the intervention program that the participants were engaged in. In effect, the instrument was designed to determine the social skills and problematic behaviors that children bring to the learning context. The SSRS has key elements such as parent-rated and teacher-rated scales. The version related to parents has 55 items that intend to explore the social scales and problematic behaviors children bring to the learning context. Responses to the items were put on a three-point scale defined by responses such as Never, Sometimes, and Always. The parenting aspect of children’s social skills consisted of 4 item scales Cooperation, Assertion, Responsibility, and Self-Control. The problematic behavior contained 17 items made up of 3 subscales “externalizing”, “internalizing” and “hyperactivity” (Gresham & Elliott, 1990).

Children’s Socio-Emotional Learning Curriculum (Zhou and Jessse, 2012) and objectives linked tied to it.

| Construct          | Learning Outcomes                                                                 |
|--------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Introduction       | Outline of the curriculum rules, prospects, expectations                          |
| Self-Awareness     | Knowing, thinking, and doing                                                      |
|                    | Understanding why I do what I do                                                  |
|                    | Understanding one’s mood and feelings                                             |
|                    | I know when am moody                                                             |
|                    | I can read people’s faces when they are angry                                    |
| Social Awareness   | I recognize how people feel by looking at their facial expressions                 |
|                    | It is easy for me to understand why people feel the way they do                   |
|                    | If someone is sad, angry, or happy, I believe I know what they are thinking       |
|                    | I understand why people react the way they do If a friend is upset, I have a pretty good idea why |
| Self-Management    | I can stay calm in stressful situations                                           |
|                    | I can stay calm and overcome anxiety in new or changing situations                |
|                    | I can stay calm when things go wrong                                              |
|                    | I can control the way I feel when something bad happens                           |
|                    | When am upset with someone, I will wait till I have calmed down before discussing the issue? |
Continued

| Relationship Management | Responsible Decision-Making |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| I will always apologize when I hurt my friend unintentionally | When making decisions, I take into account the consequences of my actions |
| I always try and comfort my friends when they are sad | I ensure that there are more positive outcomes when making a choice |
| I try not to criticize my friend when we quarrel | I weigh the strengths of the situations before deciding on my action |
| I am tolerant of my friend’s mistakes | I consider the criteria chosen before making a recommendation |
| I stand up for myself without putting others down | I consider the strengths and weaknesses of the strategy before deciding to use it |

3. Findings

3.1. Demographic Profile of Participants

The demographic profile of participants was examined, and the findings are presented in Figure 1.

The study’s findings in Figure 1 revealed that the same proportion of males (n = 6, 50%) and females (n = 6, 50%) participated in the study. The age distribution showed that 5 participants representing 41.7% were 6 years old, 4 participants representing 33.3% were 6 years old, and 3 represented (25.0%) participants were involved in the study. These demographic characteristics of the participants were significant to the study because they provided room for comparative analysis to be done regarding the participants directly linked to the study variables.

3.2. Findings

The variables included in the study were social skills and problem behaviours. Descriptive statistics directly linked to the pre-test are shown in Table 1.

The information in Table 1 showed that the mean score for problem behaviour (M = 2.10, SD = 0.705) was higher than the mean score for social skills (M = 1.76, SD = 0.705). In essence, the study’s findings revealed that the standard deviation fell within the ±3 threshold, suggesting that the normality of data was attained (Mooi, Sarstedt, & Mooi-Reci, 2018). Based on the interpretation of the scale of measurement, the findings imply that the participants exhibited more problem behaviours than social skills. To ascertain whether there was a statistically significant difference in the pre-test between the social skills and problem behaviours, the paired sample t-test was employed to analyze the data, and the findings are shown in Table 2.
The paired sample t-test results in Table 2 revealed that, the difference between the mean scores for problem behaviour ($M = 2.10, SD = 0.705$) and social skills ($M = 1.76, SD = 0.705$) was not statistically significant [$t (11) = −1.007, p > 0.05$ (2-tailed), 95% CI ($−1.088, 0.405$)]. There was therefore the need to carry out a post-test on these variables, and the descriptive statistics are presented in Table 3.

A comparative analysis of the variables based on the pre-test and post-test suggests that the mean score on social skills increased by 0.88 over the pre-test after the implementation of the intervention, as contained in the post-test results. Analysis of the standard deviations suggests that the data were normal as proposed by Mooi et al. (2018). The study’s findings suggest that the social skills of the participants improved largely because of the intervention. The study’s findings are consistent with the philosophy behind the interpretation of the
Table 3. Descriptive statistics on post-test.

| Variables       | Mean | N  | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|-----------------|------|----|----------------|-----------------|
| Social Skills   | 2.64 | 12 | 0.179          | 0.052           |
| Problem Behavior| 1.57 | 12 | 0.820          | 0.237           |

Source: Fieldwork Data, 2021. Note: High scores indicate greater levels of social skills; high scores indicate greater levels of problem behaviours.

scale, which tends to suggest that higher scores signify greater improvement of children’s social skills largely due to the efficacy of the intervention put in place.

It can be concluded that the intervention was robust and that explains why the social skills of the participants improved significantly. In the case of problem behaviour, the study’s findings revealed that the score for problem behaviour reduced by 0.53 after the execution of the intervention. In line with the tenets of interpretation of the scale which suggests that higher scores imply greater levels of problem behaviour. By implication, the decrease in the scores for problem behaviour suggests that problem behaviour reduced after the implementation of the intervention. In essence, the intervention helped to improve the behaviour of the participants. It can therefore be concluded that the intervention was highly effective because it provided a leeway to unearth the differences between the mean scores which in turn, has proven to be statistically significant. The paired sample t-test was used to analyze the data, the results are presented in Table 4.

The paired sample t-test findings in Table 4 established that there was a statistically significant difference in the mean scores for social skills and problem behaviour \([t (11) = 4.393, p < 0.05 \text{ (2-tailed), 95% CI (0.532, 1.601)}]\). By implication, the study’s findings imply that the intervention has caused a substantial improvement in the social skills, and decreased the occurrence of problem behaviour among the participants.

Hypothesis 1

There is no statistically significant difference in the pre-test social skills of the participants based on age.

This hypothesis aimed to compare the participants on their social skills during the pre-test about their age. The one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test was employed to analyze the data, and the results are illustrated in Table 5. Levene’s test was used to check the homogeneity of variance assumption, and the findings showed that this assumption was not violated (Levene’s Statistic = 3.724; \(p = 0.66\)). The ANOVA results showed that the mean score of the participants whose ages were 6 years (\(M = 1.80, SD = 0.469\)), 7 years (\(M = 1.71, SD = 0.824\)), and 8 years (\(M = 1.76, SD = 0.570\)) on the pre-test social skills were not statistically significant \([F(2, 11) = 0.032, p > 0.05]\). As a consequence, the null hypothesis was supported. It can be discerned that the age of the participants did not account for differences in the pre-test social skills of the participants.

Hypothesis 2
Table 4. Paired sample t-test results.

| Paired Differences | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | t    | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|--------------------|------|----------------|-----------------|------------------------------------------|------|----|----------------|
| Pair 1 SS-PB       | 1.067| 0.841          | 0.243           | 0.532-1.601                               | 4.393| 11 | 0.001          |

*p < 0.05 (2-tailed Note: SS (Social Skills); PB (Problem Behaviour). Source: Fieldwork Data, 2021.

Table 5. Descriptive statistics and ANOVA results for age and pre-test social skills.

| Age (yrs) | N  | M    | SD   | Std. Error | 95% Confidence Interval for Mean | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F    | Sig. |
|-----------|----|------|------|------------|---------------------------------|----------------|----|-------------|------|------|
| 6         | 4  | 1.80 | 0.469| 0.235      | 1.06-2.55                       | 0.025          | 2  | 0.013       | 0.032| 0.968 |
| 7         | 5  | 1.71 | 0.824| 0.368      | 0.68-2.73                       | 3.551          | 9  | 0.395       |      |      |
| 8         | 3  | 1.79 | 0.297| 0.171      | 1.05-2.53                       | 3.577          | 11 |             |      |      |
| Total     | 12 | 1.76 | 0.570| 0.165      | 1.40-2.12                       |                |    |             |      |      |

*p < 0.05; (Levene’s Statistic = 3.724; p = 0.66).

There is no statistically significant difference in the post-test social skills of the participants based on age.

The ANOVA test was used to test this hypothesis. Before the analysis, Levene’s test was used to test the homogeneity of variance, and the results in Table 6 revealed that this assumption was satisfied (Levene Statistic = 3.113; p = 0.094). The ANOVA analysis showed that the mean scores of the participants’ ages 6 years (M = 2.59, SD = 0.090), 7 years (M = 2.71, SD = 0.239), and 8 years (M = 2.58, SD = 0.172) on the post-test social skills were not statistically significant [F(2, 11) = 0.622, p > 0.05], therefore the null hypothesis was supported. The study’s results implied that the age of the participants did not matter regarding the differences in the post-test social skills.

Hypothesis 3

There is no statistically significant difference in the pre-test social skills of the participants based on gender.

In this hypothesis, the paired sample t-test was used to analyze the data, and the findings are presented in Table 7. The results indicated the assumption of homogeneity was sustained (Levene’s Statistic = 0.461; p = 0.512). The t-test result showed that there was no statistically significant differences in the mean scores for males (M = 1.97, SD = 0.632), and females (M = 1.55, SD = 0.454) in relation to their pre-test social skills [t (10) = 1.344, p > 0.05, 2-tailed, 95% CI (−0.281, 1.135)]. The study’s findings suggest that gender did not affect the social skills of the participants.

Hypothesis 4

There is no statistically significant difference in the post-test social skills of the participants based on gender.
Table 6. Descriptive statistics and ANOVA results for age and post-test social skills.

| Age (yrs) | N  | M   | SD  | Std. Error | 95% Confidence Interval for Mean | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F   | Sig. |
|-----------|----|-----|-----|------------|---------------------------------|----------------|----|-------------|-----|------|
|           |    |     |     |            | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |               |    |             |     |      |
| 6         | 4  | 2.59| 0.090| 0.045      | 2.44          | 2.73          | 0.043 | 2 | 0.622       | 0.558 |
| 7         | 5  | 2.71| 0.239| 0.107      | 2.41          | 3.00          | 0.311 | 9 | 0.035       |      |
| 8         | 3  | 2.58| 0.172| 0.099      | 2.16          | 3.01          | 0.354 | 11|            |      |
| Total     | 12 | 2.64| 0.179| 0.052      | 2.52          | 2.75          |       |   |             |      |

$p < 0.05$ (2-tailed); (Levene Statistic = 3.113; $p = 0.094$).

Table 7. Descriptive statistics and paired sample t-test results for gender and pre-test social skills.

| Variable  | Gender | N  | M   | SD  | Std. Error | Mean  | t    | df  | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
|-----------|--------|----|-----|-----|------------|-------|------|-----|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Social Skills | Male   | 6  | 1.97| 0.632| 0.258      | 1.344 | 10   | 0.209| 0.427           | 0.318             | -0.281               | 1.135                  |
|           | Female | 6  | 1.55| 0.454| 0.185      |       |      |     |                 |                  |                     |                       |

$p < 0.05$ (2-tailed); (Levene’s Statistic = 0.461; $p = 0.512$).

Table 8. Descriptive statistics and paired sample t-test results for gender and post-test social skills.

| Variable  | Gender | N  | M   | SD  | Std. Error | Mean  | t    | df  | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
|-----------|--------|----|-----|-----|------------|-------|------|-----|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Social Skills | Male   | 6  | 2.70| 0.124| 0.051      | 1.235 | 10   | 0.245| 0.125           | 0.101             | -0.101               | 0.351                  |
|           | Female | 6  | 2.57| 0.214| 0.088      |       |      |     |                 |                  |                     |                       |

$p < 0.05$ (2-tailed); (Levene’s Statistic = 0.533; $p = 0.482$).

The paired sample t-test was applied to test this hypothesis, and the results are shown in Table 8. In this Table, results pointed out that the assumption of homogeneity was fulfilled (Levene’s Statistic = 0.533; $p = 0.482$). The result showed that there was no statistically significant differences in the mean scores for males (M = 2.57, SD = 0.124), and females (M = 2.70, SD = 0.214) in relation to their post-test social skills [t (10) = 1.235, $p > 0.05$, 2-tailed, 95% CI (−0.101, 0.351)].

4. Discussion

The study in question critically explored the extent to which socio-emotional learning curricula tend to influence young children within the context of socio-emotional competencies in kindergarten settings. The study’s findings brought to the fore that, the problematic behaviours that the participants exhibited reduced drastically after the intervention has been done. However, the control group did not exhibit any changes concerning their socio-emotional competencies. As a consequence, there was a remarkable difference when a comparative analysis was done regarding the conduct and problematic behaviours of the two
The study’s findings further revealed that the efficacy of the socio-emotional programme was extremely significant because to some extent it largely influences the reduction of children’s problematic behaviours. In essence, the hypothesis was validated. It can, therefore, be deduced from the study’s findings that the programme was very comprehensive in terms of addressing socio-emotional challenges that have become the bane of young people within the study context and beyond. There is, therefore, the need for a similar study to be carried out in another socio-cultural context to establish whether similar or contradictory study findings are likely to emerge in other socio-cultural contexts.

In the same vein, the study’s findings suggest that there was a tremendous increase in terms of the participant’s socio-competences. As a consequence, the efficacy of the programme in question is not in doubt and should be replicated in other kindergarten settings to determine whether similar study findings or contradictory study findings will emerge. This is significant because it will shed light regarding whether the context of children is a determinant concerning the development of children’s socio-emotional competencies.

Weakness

Several challenges define this study because the participant’s socio-emotional competencies were largely based on a written scale. As a consequence, the data was not rich enough to unearth the nuances that might have accounted for the inherent disparity regarding the variant socio-emotional competencies that were unearthed in the study’s findings. A qualitative study is needed to unearth the nuances regarding the disparity inherent in the socio-emotional competencies of the study’s participants.

5. Conclusion

It can be discerned from the study’s findings that, the socio-emotional learning programme (SEL) was highly effective in addressing the socio-emotional challenges that several kindergarten children within the research context and by extension across several kindergarten settings are currently going through. This is significant because it will create awareness regarding how pervasive young children’s socio-emotional challenges have become. This is not surprising because the development of children’s socio-emotional competencies is not an event but a process. In essence, all stakeholders must be brought on board to fashion out an effective mechanism for stemming this tide.
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