

*

(金東一)**

(裴星稷)***



215

가

가

4

37

4

가

* (2001)

2002 3

**

1.

,
 ,
 (, , , 2002).
 가 (Strahan, 1988),
 가
 , 가
 (acquisition deficit)
 (performance failure) 가 .
 (Gresham &
 Elliot, 1990).
 McFall(1982)
 , Gresham(1983)
 ,
 , 가
 , Spence(1991)
 ,
 (, , , 2002).
 가
 ,
 (Gresham, 1992),
 ,
 (Yssledyke & Algozzine, 1995).

가

가

가 (rating)

가

가

(Witt, et al., 1998).

2.

가

가

가

가

가

(, , , 2002).

가

1.

(, ,) 215

가 67 31.2% , 148

68.8% (, 2000)

20 가 68 31.6% 30 가 34 15.8% , 40

92 42.8%, 50 21 9.8% . 40 가

가 40 .
 5 21 , 5 가 70
 32.6% , 6 10 가 14 6.5%
 . , 21 가 (131 ,
 61.9%). 16 .
 , 1 38 , 2 36 , 3 39 ,
 4 32 , 5 28 , 6 39 ,
 40.26 , 7.52 .

2.

, , , .
 . 30 ,
 20 , 10
 . 60 가
 37 (, 1996; , 1996;
 Yssledyke & Algozzine, 1995) 5 .
 , , , 4
 . (Yssledyke & Algozzine, 1995),
 , , ,
 .
 1() 5()
 . , 가
 3 ,
 . 가

1(1), 2(1), 3(1), 4(1), 5(1)

가

,

,

가

3.

,

가

, 4 (, , ,)

, 4 (, , ,)

, .

, , , .

1.

(3.86),

(3.78),

(3.71),

(3.69),

(3.63),

(3.54)

3.5

(< 1 >).

,

.

가

가

,

,

< 1> . ()

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	()
.	0	20	37	112	46	3.86 (.86)
.	2	15	46	117	34	3.78 (.83)
.	1	25	59	77	51	3.71 (.97)
.	4	19	52	103	36	3.69 (.91)
.	1	27	58	93	35	3.63 (.91)
.	3	28	68	68	36	3.54 (.96)
.	3	36	72	60	43	3.49 (1.03)
.	5	29	65	89	26	3.48 (.95)
.	2	27	76	88	20	3.46 (.86)
.	3	27	79	76	28	3.46 (.92)
.	6	32	80	77	18	3.42 (1.63)
.	1	41	80	69	21	3.32 (.91)
.	14	51	55	55	38	3.24 (1.19)
.	12	49	88	58	6	2.99 (.91)
가	14	59	99	32	8	2.86 (.90)
.	11	64	93	35	8	2.83 (.89)

(3.55) ,

(2.55) ,

(1.84)

2.

가

< 2>

< 2>

()

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	()
	0	28	65	96	25	3.55 (.86)
	7	21	64	94	28	3.54 (.95)
	4	22	78	86	24	3.49 (.89)
	12	41	71	71	20	3.21 (1.03)
	11	42	85	65	12	3.12 (.95)
	27	37	87	60	12	3.06 (1.00)
	33	52	58	52	19	2.87 (1.20)
(性)	33	47	81	41	11	2.77 (1.09)
	19	65	87	37	5	2.74 (.92)
	28	67	87	34	7	2.74 (.93)
	21	56	97	33	5	2.74 (.92)

(3.55),

(3.54),

(3.49)

가

(174),

(132),

(125),

(119)

, 3.45 , 4.22 , 3.88

3.

(3.67) < 3> (3.89), (3.81), 가

< 3> ()

()	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	()
	3	24	34	84	67	3.89 (1.02)
	8	21	30	98	56	3.81 (1.05)
	15	18	37	95	47	3.67 (1.12)
	11	23	63	81	33	3.48 (1.04)
	5	18	82	85	18	3.45 (.86)
	18	27	60	80	24	3.31 (1.10)
	15	30	68	82	16	3.26 (1.02)
	54	27	34	45	50	3.05 (1.52)
	54	36	28	34	59	3.04 (1.57)

가 , 가 가 (179), (83), 가

(76)

(2.49) ,

(3.09) .

(2.64) ,

4.

(3.65),

(3.51),

(3.46)

(< 4>) .

< 4>

()

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	()
	7	19	52	96	37	3.65 (.98)
	7	15	76	92	23	3.51 (.89)
	14	26	48	93	29	3.46 (1.08)
	6	28	75	83	19	3.38 (.92)
	11	25	82	79	14	3.28 (.94)
	11	31	85	67	18	3.24 (.97)
	19	35	65	64	28	3.22 (1.14)
	19	45	87	54	6	2.91 (.97)
	65	32	28	31	54	2.89 (1.60)
	31	53	84	38	5	2.68 (1.00)
	59	40	56	45	12	2.58 (1.25)

(n=152),

(n=140),

(n=95)

(3.58),

(2.52),

(1.47)

4

가

가

. 123 (58.9%)

73 (34.9%)

, 13 (6.2%)

가

(19),

(17),

(10)

가

가

5.

< 5>

(.24),

(.34),

(.21),

(.30)

< 7>

(.12), (14) .30

.74,, .65

.61

< 7>

	.32**							
	.33**	.33**						
	.34**	.46**	.54**					
	.25**	.47**	.46**	.61**				
	.12	.46**	.46**	.45**	.74**			
	.31**	.30**	.39**	.44**	.52**	.47**		
	.14	.54**	.38**	.50**	.54**	.53**	.31**	
	.34**	.43**	.43**	.65**	.48**	.37**	.47**	.60**

* p<.05 , ** p<.01

< 8>

(.42), (.36), (.33)

(.16), (.15) .60

-.19

가

(.60),

(.56),

(.52) .(16)

(.60) .71

(.67),

(.56), (.52)

< 8>

	.42**								
	.15*	-.19**							
	.28**	.14*	.25**						
	.29**	.32**	.14*	.56**					
	.19**	.42**	.06	.33**	.71**				
	.21**	.05	.34**	.31**	.36**	.33**			
	.16*	.41**	.01	.20**	.35**	.45**	.32**		
	.18**	.60**	-.28**	.15*	.43**	.52**	.12*	.58**	
	.36**	.41**	.05	.34**	.47**	.52**	.28**	.41**	.56**
	.33**	.36**	.10	.31**	.51**	.52**	.42**	.47**	.52**
									.67**

* p<.05 , ** p<.01

6.

가 . 가 37 8

가 가 . 가

가 (2.25) (1.89)가 .
가

6 10 3

가 .

가 . 6 10

(Crobach Alpha) (.78, .80,
.88, .82),

< 9>

가 . ,

-17

(.20)

< 9> , ,

	.			
	.14	.14	.16	.12
	-.03	-.05	-.18**	-.17*
	.05	.13	.06	.09

* p<.05 , ** p<.01

3가 (

)
가

(不偏不黨)

가

가

가

, , , , ,

58.9%

, 34.9%

, 6.2%가

4

가

가

가

가

.70

.74,

.65

가

.60

-19

-28

가

가

가

가

, , , ,

Geelan, 1988; Center & Wascom, 1986).

가 가 ,

가

(Seidel & Vaughn, 1991).

가

가 가

가 ,

가

가

가



- (2000).
- (1998).
- , , (2002). , . 2001
- (1996). (SSRS) . , 17(1). 12- 25.
- (1996). , .
- Baum, D. D., Duffelmeyer, F., & Geelan, M.(1988). Resource teacher perceptions of the prevalence of social dysfunction among students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*. 21(6), 11-26.
- Center, D. B., & Wascom, A. M.(1986). Teachers perceptions of social behavior in learning disabled and socially normal children and youth. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*. 19(7), 420-425.
- Finn, J. D. (1989). Withdrawing from school. *Review of Educational Research*,. 59(2), 117-142.
- Gresham, F. M.(1983). Social validity in the assessment of children's social skills: Establishing standards for social competency. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*. 1, 15-30.
- Gresham, F. M.(1992). Social skill and learning disabilities: Causal, concomitant, or correlation? *School Psychology Review*, 21(3), 348-360.
- Gresham, F. M & Elliot, S. N.(1990). *Social skills rating system*. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service.
- Seidel, J., & Vaughn, S.(1991). Social alienation and the LD school dropout. *Learning Disabilities Research*, 6(3), 152-157.
- Spence, S. H.(1991). Developments in the assessment of social skills and social competence in children. *Behavior Change*, 8. 22-34.
- Strahan, D.(1988). Life on the margins: How academically at-risk early adolescents view themselves and school. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 8(4), 1-18.
- Witt, J. C., Elliott, S. N., Daly, E. J. Gresham, F. M., & Kramer, J. J.(1998). *Assessment of*

at-risk and special need children(2nd ed.) Boston: McGraw Hill.

Ysseldyke, J. & Algozzine, B.(1995). *Special education: A practical approach for teachers.*
Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

* 2002 11 12 / 1 2003 2 11 / 2 2003 2 20

* : , 『 』 『 』 .

e-mail : professorsorkim@korea.com

* : () ,

e-mail : baesungjik@nannail.net

Abstract

Elementary Teachers' Perception on the Social Skill Problems of Students

Kim, Dong-il* ·Bae, Sung-Jik**

Social skills for elementary students are so critical that the future learning and adult life of a particular individual depend on this social aspect of the development. Despite of the importance of social skills, studies of social skills were underestimated and even relied upon very few systematic data. In this study, the subjects of this study were 215 elementary school teachers in a Metropolitan area. The teachers' perception on social skill problems survey consisted of 4 categories, encompassing emotional and behavior, communication, problem solving, and social norm. Means and standard deviations, reliabilities, and factor loadings of the each category of the social skill problem were reported. One limitation of this study is a potential sample bias (i.e., geography and school level). The results of this study included 1) priority and estimated prevalence of social skill problems 2) correlations on items in each categories and reliability (Cronbach's Alpha: .80), 3) teacher's gender, experience and attitudes didn't show the systematic relations with perceptions on social skill problems. The implications of social skills not only for the elementary students but also for the students with learning disabilities were discussed.

■ **Key Words** : social skill, elementary school, teacher, emotion and behavior, communication

* Seoul National University

** University of Kansas