

THE CURRENT STATUS OF CHILD STUDY CENTRES
IN DEGREE GRANTING INSTITUTIONS IN CANADA

by

DONA MAE COATES

B.A., University of Saskatchewan, 1951
Dip. C.S., University of Toronto, 1952

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF EARLY CHILDHOOD

We accept this thesis as conforming to
the required standard

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

August, 1979

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study.

I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the Head of my Department or by his representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of Early Childhood

The University of British Columbia
2075 Wesbrook Place
Vancouver, Canada
V6T 1W5

Date August 31, 1979

ABSTRACT

This study is designed to identify and describe child study centres operated by Canadian degree-granting institutions in 1978. The implications of the results are relevant to the efforts of those who are engaged in studying young children, those who are applying knowledge to the development of programs and practices and those who are providing guidance to parents and workers who interact with children day-to-day.

Child study centres were identified by an enquiry mailed to administrators in the fifty degree-granting institutions in Canada. Twenty institutions were found to operate child study centres as defined for this investigation.

Information describing the child study centres was gathered by means of a survey questionnaire mailed to each of the twenty persons named by their administrator. This included basic descriptions of the centres and information about aspects of the children's programs, faculty responsibility for and involvement with the centres, relative importance of the functions performed by the centres, policy making, supports and comment on the centres' impact on their communities.

The study shows that more than two thirds of the child study centres have been established within the past ten years, confirmation of suggestions in the literature that child study has mushroomed in recent years. Most centres operate programs for preschool children, placing them in the tradition of laboratory preschools. Most are engaged in the preparation of teachers, whether they are under the auspices of a faculty

of education or some other faculty or department. All, however, place emphasis on at least two of the four main functional areas examined: research, teacher preparation, dissemination of child-related knowledge, and service. More than one-third of centres do not have sufficient financial support to carry out present goals. Respondents from most centres express a desire to communicate with other centres across Canada, naming topics of common concern.

Listed in the study is a catalogue of child study centres, many of which had been invisible in the literature. Such a list can enable communication to take place among them.

Further investigation will be required to examine the extensive involvement with child study and children's programs taking place on Canadian campuses and whether the effectiveness of new knowledge is being tested by its application to children in typical life situations. It is suggested that diverse sources of funding and communication and cooperation among centres will be required if the potential of child study centres as powerful resources for the translation of knowledge into practice is to be achieved.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION TO STUDY	1
Conceptual Barriers to the Study of Young Children	2
The Canadian Context	4
Definitions Used in This Investigation	5
Overview of This Investigation	7
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	9
Introduction	9
Laboratory Schools for Teacher Education	11
Laboratory Preschools for Child Study	16
Child Study in Canada	20
The Institute of Child Study: A Canadian Model	25
Summary of Related Literature and Implications for This Study . .	31
CHAPTER III: STUDY PROCEDURES	33
Questions Which Guided the Investigation	33
Sampling Procedures	34
Questionnaire Used in This Investigation	37

Construction and Format of the Questionnaire	46
Distribution of Questionnaire	49
Summary	50
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS	51
Description of the Centres	51
The Children's Programs	56
The Relationship of Faculty to Child Study Centres	60
Functions of Child Study Centres	63
Major Orientation of Child Study Centres	67
Policy Making for the Centres	69
Financial Support for Child Study Centres	70
Centres' Impact On Their Communities	71
Projects Desired	72
Common Concerns of Respondents	74
Summary	75
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	76
Child Study on Campus	76
Goals of Child Study Centres	79
Communication Among Canadian Child Study Centres	82
Limitations of Study	83
Recommendations for Further Study and Action	85
BIBLIOGRAPHY	87
APPENDIX A: LETTERS	95
APPENDIX B: RESPONSES TO OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS	99

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I Description of Canadian Child Study Centres	52
II Admission Criteria	56
III Relative Importance of Elements of Children's Environments and Program	59
IV Academic Level and Faculty Status of Workers in Child Study Centres	61
V Relative Importance of Functions Performed by Child Study Centre, Staff, and Faculty	64
VI Functions Described as Very Important or Important By Child Study Centres: A Comparison With Howd & Browne	65
VII Rank Order of Goals Which Guide the Activities of the Child Study Centres	66
VIII Bodies That Contribute to Policy Making	69
IX Child Study Centres' Major Sources of Funding	70

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deep appreciation to my advisor, Dr. Glenn Dixon, who generously shared his time and knowledge with me, and to my committee members, Dr. Hannah Polowy and Dr. David Bain, who were ready with suggestions and advice when they were most needed.

Special thanks go to my husband, Dr. Donald Coates, whose expertise and sense of urgency sped my task; and to Dr. Norma Law for her help and encouragement.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO STUDY

This is a time in Canada when young children are being deprived of opportunities to benefit from knowledge about child development which has accumulated over the past fifty years. Canadian parents, day care, preschool and primary teachers do not have ready access to information, adequate guidance to select that which relates to their situations, nor public policies which support them in putting the information to use to meet the needs of children in their day-to-day activities. The impetus for this study comes from a conviction that knowledge about young children must be translated into appropriate policies, programs and practices; that the development of knowledge, its application to Canadian situations, its transfer to Canadian practitioners and decision makers and its wide dissemination to all whose actions affect young children is essential to the development of the present and future populations of young Canadian children.

Programs for young children which are operated by universities could be in a unique position to provide leadership in the process of translating child development knowledge into practice. They could function as laboratories examining questions relating directly to the daily lives of young children. They could help to prepare professionals to work with young children on a daily basis in a variety of settings. They could be the vital source from which information about young children flows to many recipients.

There are barriers, however, to discovering whether Canadian university-operated children's programs in fact are having an impact on the daily lives of children beyond their doors. There are conceptual barriers between separate academic disciplines which study children, physical barriers between Canada's separate geographical regions and administrative barriers between Canada's separated constitutional jurisdictions. These barriers need to be examined and breached in order to understand the ways in which Canadian universities are transforming child development knowledge into practice.

Conceptual Barriers to the Study of Young Children

A vast amount of knowledge about the special nature of young children's development has accumulated over the past half century. However, while knowledge has been increasing, scholars and practitioners could not draw upon a "body" of knowledge nor a defined "field" of study. Literature readily accessible to one discipline provides neither a comprehensive nor complete picture of early childhood. Furthermore, the practices of one discipline with young children often offend the practitioners of others whose activities with young children occur in different settings; and accepted practices of some disciplines can offend parents of young children. Each discipline may see itself as acting in the best interests of the child while, like the blindfolded men touching the elephant, they are knowledgeable about only a portion of the young person.

Knowledge which is both valid in practice and widely generalizable points to the early years of life as a period of continuous integrated learning and growth. Piaget's careful analyses of naturalistic observa-

tions of young children and replication, discussion and dissemination of his insights have created a basis for understanding the special and universal nature of young children's thought and learning processes (Piaget, 1955; 1951). Language acquisition studies of the 1960's and 1970's have revealed the special and universal nature of the process of learning a first language (Bloom, 1970; Brown, Cazden & Bellugi, 1969; Ferguson, 1964; McNeill, 1970). Cross-cultural and psychoanalytic studies have emphasized the universal and special nature of the growth of trust and attachment in babies and young children (Ainsworth, 1967; 1969; Bowlby, 1953; Flint, 1959). The work of theorists and researchers such as the above points to the necessity to take into account the integrated nature of young children's development: for example, affective aspects of cognitive development, maturational factors in language development, cognitive values of social development.

It is difficult to operate an exemplary daily program for young children without drawing upon knowledge in the fields of education, sociology, medicine, nutrition, psychology and social work, to name a few. It is logical to assume that university-operated children's programs are in a position not only to benefit from recent knowledge in each of these fields but to provide a locus for communication between members of the academic community who are interested in applying their various disciplines to meeting children's needs. This study may demonstrate that university-operated children's programs do draw upon a variety of disciplines and provide a locus for communication between them. It may become evident that as a result these programs are helping to define the "field" of study of young children.

The Canadian Context

The necessity for a study that explores the present status of children's programs operated by Canadian universities arises not only from academic barriers, which undoubtedly exist beyond the boundaries of Canada, but from limitations on communication peculiar perhaps to the Canadian situation.

Canada's geography and demography often mitigate against the exchange of ideas and information within the country. As a 5000-kilometre wide country with 85% of the population living within 300 kilometres of the United States border, communication often flows more easily with adjacent states than with countrymen. The United States, with a population tenfold that of Canada, with large numbers of government and university research programs in operation, and with vast publishing and media empires overwhelms Canada with information and perceptions about young children which are derived from social, historical and economic contexts of a different country. Program models and policies thus are drawn more easily from American counterparts for which information is readily accessible, than from those in other parts of Canada.

In addition, the Canadian constitution places in the jurisdiction of the provincial governments almost all matters directly affecting children and families. Health, education, social services and child protection and family laws of each province reflect its public policies and social patterns, human and financial resources and its history, dominant language and geography. Education, especially, has been the jealously-guarded responsibility of provinces.

The universities can be insular in their impact upon Canadian

academia as a whole through opportunities and preferences for sharing knowledge in international or American publications and conferences with their large audiences.

This study may discover that university-operated children's programs exist in isolation from each other with few opportunities for mutual communication and little common knowledge about the collective impact of their programs upon the daily lives of young Canadian children.

Definitions Used in This Investigation

Child Study

Child study is a term which denotes a movement begun by G. Stanley Hall in the nineteenth century, concurrent with the emergence of psychology as a discipline (Deighton et al, 1971). It is also a term identified with the Child Study Association, founded in the 1920's to encourage parent study groups (Frank, 1962). Child study has also been used to refer to services designed for appraisal of children in the public schools (Good et al, 1973). Each of these uses of the term child study is too narrow for the purposes of this investigation.

Mary Northway, a Canadian involved with child study research for many years, offers the following definition of child study:

Child study is the study of children by any discipline or profession, carried out by any method from rigidly designed scientific investigation to first-hand experience in living situations, such as the playground and the clinic, which leads to increased knowledge of their experience, behaviour and development. Child study is therefore wider than child development, though it includes it. Contrariwise, child study does not include all studies merely because they use children as subjects. As few rat studies are designed primarily to study rats, but to gain knowledge of something else - effect of drugs or brain injury - in the same way, many studies using children as subjects are not directed to learning more about children but rather to such things as the adequacy of pedagogical methods or the effectiveness of TV commercials (Northway, 1973, p. 45).

Northway maintains that the "ultimate validity of knowledge attained in child study is . . . its effectiveness of application to children in life situations and . . . their increased human and social betterment" (Northway, 1973, p. 45).

This study will define child study as the study of children which leads to increased knowledge of their experience, behavior and development, following Northway's definition.

Early childhood

Not only is the field of child study open to a variety of interpretations, but there is no consensus in the literature as to what years constitute "young" or "early" childhood. Early Childhood Education has been defined as "organized educational experiences for children between two or three and eight years of age" (Deighton et al, 1971, p. 146). However, it is pointed out that this definition is not universal, as there is increasing emphasis on infants and toddlers. Hymes is cited. He considers early childhood to be "the period of high dependency," the period between birth and eight or nine years (Hymes, 1969, p. 1). The upper limit of eight or nine years old is supported by the work of the language and learning theorists who describe landmarks in children's thought processes, concept and language acquisition at about this age, and by the common usage of the term "preadolescent" to describe the years from approximately ten to twelve. The lower limit of early childhood as birth is supported not only by contemporary studies which reveal dimensions of baby behavior and learning not previously imagined, but by current social circumstances which require the development of policies and programs

for babies sometimes from the time of birth.

This study will refer, then, to young children as those in the period of high dependency, from birth to ~~nine years old~~.

Child study centre

Children's programs within institutions of higher learning are known by several names: "laboratory school," "campus-based laboratory school," "laboratory preschool," "child development laboratory." Good et al define "child study laboratory" as a place for studying the child under controlled conditions and for putting into practice experimental programs involving the child's behavior and learning" (Good et al, 1973, p. 326).

In this investigation, a child study centre is defined as a group program for young children operated by an institution of higher learning for the study of the experience, behavior and development of young children.

Overview of This Investigation

The purposes of this study are to explore and describe the present status of Canadian child study centres; to locate the centres and to determine their functions.

Do centres exist which are not visible in the literature? Are they laboratories in which universities address the questions in the child study field? Do centres offer students who are preparing to work with young children special opportunities for learning about child development through guided observation and practice? Do centres provide information about child development to a variety of audiences including

students, parents, decision makers, field workers and the academic community, by such means as publications, liaison work, workshops? Do centres provide services to special groups of children or families, to parents or to professionals?

If centres are performing research, teacher education, dissemination and service functions relating to young children and their programs, they may constitute a potentially powerful resource for validating knowledge by applying it to programs and practices, by testing its effectiveness in promoting children's development, and by providing guidance to a wide audience about that knowledge which has utility in life situations or that which may have only limited or specialized value.

Literature that relates to the history and function of child study centres is presented in Chapter II. Chapter III outlines the procedures of the present investigation. Results of the investigation are presented in Chapter IV. In Chapter V the results are discussed and implications are drawn. The study concludes with references and appendices.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In preparation for the investigation to be described in Chapters III and IV, the relevant literature is reviewed and abstracted. The literature was discovered to be in a variety of sources, little related to each other. It is presented in the following sections:

- Introduction
- Laboratory Schools for Teacher Education
- Laboratory Preschools for Child Study
- Child Study in Canada
- The Institute of Child Study: A Canadian Model
- Summary of Literature and Implications for This Study

Introduction

As suggested in Chapter I, there are barriers to examining child study, and child study centres, in Canada. Canadian universities have published relevant historical information in a variety of mimeographed reports, articles and monographs through psychology, education and home economics departments. Governments and private organizations have also compiled information. The circulation of this literature has typically been carried out on an informal, rather personal, basis in Canada, rather than being distributed, classified and catalogued in a public and readily accessible form.

Even beyond Canada's boundaries, literature about children's programs operated by universities exists in sources which are little related to each other. As a result, the writer has classified this literature from diverse sources into four categories which suit the purposes of this study: laboratory schools for teacher education, laboratory preschools for child study, child study in Canada, and the Institute of Child Study as a Canadian model. The historical and conceptual bases for these categories will be discussed with the review of each.

At the outset, however, a distinction must be made between laboratory schools and laboratory preschools. A considerable body of literature on laboratory schools is defined as a category for the purpose of educational research and is readily available. This literature relates almost exclusively to the United States, which has a long history of incorporating children's programs into teacher training institutions.

Laboratory preschools, on the other hand, belong to a newer tradition, exemplified by programs in both the United States and Canada. The growth of interest in child study during the early years of the 20th century culminated during the 1920's in the establishment of a number of laboratory preschools for the study of children. Literature about laboratory preschools is not catalogued as such, however. The sources of information are diverse, and sometimes conflictual.

Both laboratory schools, and laboratory preschools are programs for children operated by universities. However, their history and purposes are different and their literatures are entirely separate. Both are relevant to this investigation, but they will be discussed separately.

Laboratory Schools for Teacher Education

Programs for children operated by institutions of higher learning have traditions which go back 150 years, and are linked with changing perceptions of children and their place in North American society. During the 19th century social changes resulted in the introduction of compulsory education for short periods during each year. This provoked a need for training increasing numbers of teachers to handle children no longer in the labor force.

Early schools for the training of future teachers were termed "normal schools." A few children were admitted to the first normal schools in the United States and other countries for the purposes of demonstration and practice teaching as early as the 1820's (Barnard, 1851; Williams, 1942). This marked the beginning of a growing trend throughout the 19th century in the United States for the establishment of laboratory schools in teacher training institutions, a trend officially endorsed by the adoption of a resolution at the First Annual Convention of the American Normal School Association in 1859:

Resolved that this education of teachers should not only be theoretical, but also practical; and that to this end there should either be a school of observation and practice, in immediate connection with the normal school and under the same Board of Control, or there should be in other ways equivalent opportunities for observation and practice (McGeoch, 1971, p. 2).

During the first 25 years of the 20th century teacher training institutions in the United States were being transformed into four-year institutions and colleges and universities took an increasing part in teacher education. Laboratory schools kept pace. In 1926 the American Association of Teachers' Colleges adopted as one of its standards for accreditation of teacher education programs:

Each teachers' college shall maintain a training school under its own control as a part of its organization, as a laboratory school, for purposes of observation, demonstration and supervised teaching on the part of students (McGeoch, 1971, p. 3).

By the time Williams (1942) conducted his surveys of laboratory schools in the United States in 1934 and 1937, 131 schools comprised his sample.

As the need for greater numbers of teachers grew throughout the 1940's and 1950's, the laboratory schools could meet only a fraction of the needs of preservice teachers for practice teaching. Off-campus facilities assumed increasing responsibility for numbers of student teachers, "while circuit-riding college supervisors frantically tried to maintain some semblance of contact with students at ever-widening distances from the colleges" (McGeoch, 1971, p. 6).

In 1948, the American Association of Teachers' Colleges redefined professional laboratory experience for education students as:

All those contacts with children, youth, and adults (through observation, participation, and teaching) which make a direct contribution to understanding of individuals and their guidance in the teaching-learning process (American Association of Teachers, 1948, p. 4).

Practice teaching was becoming community based.

A 1964 survey revealed 212 laboratory schools in the United States, schools which were defined as "under the administrative control of a collegiate level institution and/or receives the major share of its financial support from such an institution" (Kelley, 1964, p. 2). Kelley also found that 22 laboratory schools had been terminated during the previous five years. When Howd and Browne updated Kelley's survey in 1969, they found 14 fewer laboratory schools in operation. It seems evident that the number of laboratory schools peaked and began to decline between the 1937 and 1964 surveys. Was the change of emphasis to

community-based practice teaching causing laboratory schools to become obsolete?

The early surveys of laboratory schools consistently found the cluster of functions relating to demonstration, observation and practice teaching to be the most important functions of the laboratory schools (Williams, 1942; Kelley, 1964). However, Howd and Browne found that more than half of the 194 laboratory schools surveyed in 1969 were unused or made only a limited contribution to student practice teaching. They reported that the demonstration and observation functions remained of major importance, but of particular interest was their finding that the cluster of functions relating to research, experimentation and inservice teacher education had emerged and become increasingly important.

While reporting that research had become an increasingly important function, however, the laboratory schools were far from being the focus for the ferment of experimentation and innovation of the 1960's. Educational research mushroomed during the 1960's. The launching of Sputnik in 1957 had resulted in widespread disenchantment with the American education system, and a renewed interest in separate subject disciplines. Sponsors of massive projects in these separate subject disciplines were funded by government. For the most part, the laboratory schools remained outside this curricular research activity, handicapped by old facilities, lack of funds for expansion and conflicting expectations. In addition,

Some educators stuck to their philosophical and curricular guns and refused to accept the assumption that progressive education was obsolete. The price paid for such integrity included lack of access to governmental and foundation funding (Van Til, 1969, p. 12).

When a shift in social priorities transferred educational concerns to the culturally disadvantaged in the mid-1960's only a minority of laboratory

schools found themselves fortunate enough to be located in a poverty area, and thus able to qualify for government and foundation funding.

Changing functions of laboratory schools have been documented by the surveys, analyzed and described in publications (Bixby & Mitzel, 1963; Blackmon et al, 1970; Blair et al, 1958; Perrodin, 1955), and new directions have been suggested (Aubertine, 1972; Hunter, 1970; McGeoch, 1971; Van Til, 1969). During the past decade a rash of state-sponsored evaluative studies has focused on the purposes of the laboratory schools and questioned what the proper public commitment to them should be (McGeoch, 1968; Quigley & Chaves, 1974; State of Florida, 1976; State University System of Florida, 1969).

Proponents of the laboratory school describe certain functions which a laboratory school may be in a unique position to perform. To bring "practice in line with present knowledge" (Ohm, 1960) is a theme repeated with variations: "to refine or field test theory in an environment uncontaminated by the very necessary restrictions imposed on public schools" (Hunter, 1970); to innovate (McGeoch, 1971). The laboratory school is seen as in the forefront of translating theory into practice, with the potential to institute innovative practices, and to monitor, assess and interpret them. While the value of this function is described as it relates to preservice teacher education, dissemination activities which affect field workers are seen as an equally important component of the translation of theory into practice (McGeoch, 1971).

Programs for children operated by institutions of higher learning can be subject to changes in emphases and supports as social changes bring pressure to bear on education systems. This is amply illustrated by the history of laboratory schools for teacher education in the United States.

Laboratory schools may be by-passed or discontinued as a result of these pressures. They may also have an opportunity to translate theory into promising programs and practices, unique in their freedom and support for innovation and for monitoring this innovation, and with the means and talent to disseminate information to the benefit of the populace of children.

Canada, a nation half as old as the United States, has universities which for the most part were in their infancy or not yet chartered at the time when children's programs were being established in a multitude of such institutions in the United States. Two exceptions were the University of Toronto and McGill University. It is not surprising, therefore, that the University of Toronto operated a laboratory school, the University of Toronto Schools, as early as 1911, and that two of the pioneering North American laboratory preschools were established by these universities in 1925. The preschools will be discussed in a later section. The University of Toronto Schools has now become a private school, and Canada has not had a tradition of incorporating laboratory schools into teacher training institutions. Laboratory schools for teacher education are not mentioned in standard references on the history of Canadian education (Phillips, 1957; Wilson, Stamp & Audet, 1970).

Because the literature on American laboratory schools brings to light the pressures which social changes can bring to bear on university-operated children's programs, and because it offers analyses of the functions such programs may serve, this literature constitutes a useful resource for those interested in child study centres.

Laboratory Preschools for Child Study

A second major tradition that has contributed to the establishment of programs for children in institutions of higher learning is that of child study. This is a younger tradition, with its interest in child growth and development growing alongside the new discipline of psychology late in the 19th century.

The first children's program to be established for the purpose of child study was the Iowa Child Welfare Research Station, at the State University of Iowa in 1917. This landmark was later described:

. . . here we find for the first time an emphasis laid on the scientific value of the study of children rather than upon its educational value. Its founding heralded the dawn of a new day in the study of childhood. Childhood had come into its own as a problem of major scientific interest to be studied not by the parent, the teacher, the philosopher, or the educator, but by the scientist (Bradbury, 1937, pp. 34-35).

This statement exemplifies the view of the growing discipline of psychology, but in fact whether laboratory preschools served the scientific study of children in direct contrast with the laboratory schools which served teacher education cannot be seen as an either/or question, but rather one of emphasis. For instance, neither "preschool" nor "child study" were domains exclusive to the new laboratory preschools.

Dewey included a "sub-primary" group of four to five year olds when he established his laboratory school at the University of Chicago in 1896, and his statement on laboratory schools marries the purposes of child study and educational research in the service of child development:

. . . a place for the study of mind as manifested and developed in the child and for the search after materials and agencies that seem most likely to fulfill and further the conditions of normal growth (Dewey, 1966, p. 96).

Dewey's view is paralleled by that of Harriet Johnson, founder of the second pioneering laboratory preschool, the City and County School, which was established in New York in 1919 for the Bureau of Educational Experiments (later the Bank Street College of Education):

. . . it is the idea of the director, [Miss Johnson] that the facts of growth and development are the best guide to the knowledge of what is significant in behavior . . . (Johnson, 1936).

With the establishment in 1922 of the Ruggles Street Nursery and Training School by Abigail Eliot, a social worker, and the Merrill-Palmer Institute in Detroit by Edna Noble White, a home economist, a further dimension was added to the study of young children. These women were familiar with working with parents and were interested in parent education and home and family life (Braun & Edwards, 1972; Osborn, 1975).

In 1923 the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial "decided to support the fields of child study and parent education, making five-year grants to universities which were later renewed and enlarged" (Frank, 1962, p. 214). The Memorial aided in the establishment of many pioneering child study centres, two of them in Canada. These Canadian centres will be discussed in following sections.

Nursery schools were established in home economics departments of ten American universities between 1924 and 1930: Iowa State, Ohio State, Cornell, Georgia, Purdue, Kansas, Nebraska, Oklahoma A & M, Cincinnati and Oregon State (Osborn, 1975). These programs emphasized the role of the family in the life of the child, while children's programs in colleges of education such as the Columbia University Nursery School established in 1921 by Patty Smith Hill, emphasized curriculum

methods and educational philosophy. "The public school wanted to improve society; the home economics nursery wanted to improve the family" (Osborn, 1975, p. 43).

These laboratory preschools were for young children aged three to five years old. From the beginning the North American child study centres drew inspiration for their program practices from the MacMillan sisters in England, and the teachings of Froebel, Montessori and the American progressive educators (Braun & Edwards, 1972; Northway, 1973; Omwake, 1971; Osborn, 1975). The aims of the early humanitarians, the MacMillans, Froebel, Montessori and the progressive educators such as Dewey, were to improve the whole lives of young children, their physical health and living conditions, as well as their moral and educational development. Froebel's more formal approach, as described in the use of his "gifts," was more influential in the early kindergarten movement than in the laboratory preschools, although an early report of the Ruggles Street Nursery School and Training Centre includes the "kindergarten gifts" in a description of the materials available to children (Braun & Edwards, 1972, p. 153). Dewey preferred to call his four to five year old group "pre-primary" rather than "kindergarten" perhaps to emphasize his differences with Froebel. Edna Noble White visited the MacMillan sisters in England, and Abigail Eliot worked with them, returning to the United States ready to incorporate an emphasis on healthy outdoor activities into their new programs in Detroit and Boston.

New influences were introduced into this humanitarian heritage during the 1920's. Freud's influence began to be felt in the criteria for nursery school discipline, but most of all in the increased significance with which the everyday experiences of early childhood for later life

problems were regarded (Forest, 1935; Omwake, 1971). Another influence was that of the behaviorist psychologists: "In the late 1920's . . . teachers who came under the influence of the behaviorist psychologists were mainly concerned about 'habits' and systematic training for eating, sleeping and elimination" (Omwake, 1971, p. 33). And the work of Gesell and the developmental psychologists was to modify this emphasis in the 1930's. The publication of Bertrand Russell's On Education in 1926 urged teachers to concentrate on personality development and expressed the opinion:

. . . that children should work at their own pace; that punishment should be minimized; that children often learn best when taught by other children and that the young children were highly motivated to work and discover. He felt that children should be provided a climate of learning which made discovery possible and allowed time to experience the joy of success (Osborn, 1975, pp. 45-46).

Early laboratory preschool programs may show the influence of such a wide range of humanitarians, philosophers, researchers and teachers because of the many disciplines to which their founders belonged. Bird Baldwin, first director of the Iowa Child Welfare Research Station, was a psychologist, although the establishment of the Station was the result of a campaign by a mother (Bradbury, 1937). Of the founders of other pioneering centres, Harriet Johnson was a nurse, Abigail Eliot a social worker, Edna Noble White a home economist, Patty Smith Hill an educator.

Early laboratory preschools, then, developed from many disciplines and they served a variety of functions. While many were involved in teacher education from their inception, and several such as Iowa, the Fels Institute at Ohio, and Minnesota were known mainly for research,

. . . most had three main functions: teaching, research and service. In some laboratory centers, Teaching was the major function; in others Research. The function of Service (to children, the family and community) varied depending on the center (Osborn, 1975, p. 44).

Some laboratory preschools have grown to include school-age children; in addition, some laboratory schools have extended their age range downward to preschool-age children. In 1969, 166 of 194 laboratory schools surveyed in the United States included preschool-age children, 15 were exclusively preschools, and one was a preschool-grade one (Howd & Browne, 1969). Although the survey included some laboratory preschools, it is not clear if those that were sponsored by disciplines other than education were included. The survey examined functions of laboratory schools in relation to educational research and teacher education, but not in relation to service or to child study as such.

The early laboratory preschools were multidisciplinary and multi-purpose, concerned with both theoretical questions of child development and with child and family oriented practices. More recent information suggests that the child study focus of laboratory preschools may have been submerged by the sheer numbers of laboratory schools operated solely in the service of teacher preparation programs.

Child Study in Canada

The beginnings of child study in four Canadian provinces can be traced to the influence of Dr. Clare Hincks, a physician, organizer and humanitarian entrepreneur, who founded the Canadian Committee for Mental Hygiene (later the Canadian Mental Health Association). Northway (1973) recounts the influence of Hincks in Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg and in Saskatoon, where Samuel Laycock "fell under Hincks' charisma" and through a Canadian Mental Hygiene Association grant to the University of Saskatchewan was able to operate a child guidance clinic in Saskatoon, the

beginning of his extensive work in parent and public education.

Hincks, believing that mental health begins in childhood, was instrumental in obtaining grants from the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial to open child study centres at the University of Toronto and McGill University in 1925. The St. George's School for Child Study in Toronto, now the Institute of Child Study, will be discussed in the next section.

The McGill University Nursery School closed in 1930 when the Rockefeller grant came to an end, and reopened in the same year as a private nursery school. K. M. Bantham Bridges, the research psychologist who had been Director of the McGill Nursery School, continued her studies of infants in hospitals and a crèche in Montreal.

A nursery school was begun in 1940 in the School of Home Economics at the University of Manitoba, when the home economics "practice house" was no longer able to have babies from the Children's Aid Society in residence in the house for student observation and practice. The nursery school for three to five year olds continues to the present time and now includes a program for babies as well (Jackson, 1979).

Home economics was also the base for the establishment of a new Preschool Education program in Ryerson Institute of Technology (now Ryerson Polytechnical Institute) in Toronto:

The Association [the Nursery Education Association of Ontario] made proposals which were accepted and incorporated into the 1951 Curriculum. Following the customary American practice the Preschool Education course was placed in the Home Economics Department as an option. Ten years later Ryerson opened its own Nursery School housed in the new unit (Esson, 1968, p. 8).

In the same year (1961) in which a laboratory preschool was established at Ryerson Polytechnical Institute in Toronto, the Child Study Centre came into being at the University of British Columbia in Vancouver.

It is noteworthy that the community of preschool teachers in the field played a prominent role in the establishment of both programs. The Nursery Education Association of Ontario submitted proposals to Ryerson, and the British Columbia Preschool Association submitted a comprehensive brief to the president of the University of British Columbia in 1956, "urging that a Child Development Centre should be established on campus" (Bredin, 1966, p. 39). Preschool teachers in both provinces were concerned about the lack of trained teachers for the many preschool programs which proliferated in their provinces following the second world war.

Neville Scarfe, Dean of the new Faculty and College of Education established at the University of British Columbia in 1956, chaired a committee:

. . . composed of selected faculty members representing the various faculties, departments and schools which offered courses and organized activities relating to the human sciences, to investigate the feasibility of the establishment of a Child Development Centre on campus. Representatives from sociology, psychology, economics, physical education and nursing were consulted by the committee, which then recommended that a Child Development Centre was needed and should be provided (Bredin, 1966, pp. 40, 41).

In 1961, the Child Study Centre was established, with the financial assistance of the Junior League, with the Faculty of Education having administrative responsibility for the Centre, and directed by a Management Committee recruited from a multidisciplinary Child Study Council. The main functions of the centre were:

(a) to provide facilities for observation and study of children by individual students enrolled in various courses related to human development; (b) to provide facilities for students and faculty who desired to undertake research in child development and (c) to provide laboratory facilities for students enrolled in teacher training programs leading to specialization in Preschool (Bredin, 1966, p. 42).

The Child Study Centre at the University of British Columbia, then,

developed from a multidisciplinary perspective, as did the early laboratory preschools described in the previous section.

A survey of the work of individuals engaged in child study all across Canada reveals that while over the years many of them have been internationally distinguished, it was not until 1960 when

Canada's somewhat scattered efforts in child study and concerns for her children were brought together for the first time. This was the culmination of years of planning and of three years' specific study of projects which dealt with existing programs for children in Canada (Northway, 1973, p. 43).

Murray Ross, the first president of York University, commented on that occasion, the first Canadian Conference on Children:

We need, in Canada, a very careful appraisal of what research in respect of children is being carried on, and which are the problems that need to be researched. In short, we need a comprehensive outline of the problems that exist and what should be done about them, the research resources and estimated costs. . . . (Northway, 1973, p. 43).

No such appraisal was carried out then or in the intervening years.

During the 1960's, "child study across Canada exploded" with preschool laboratory schools being established in universities, new community colleges providing courses in early childhood education and public pressure growing for the provision of increased day care services. In 1965, the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education "appeared like a meteor on the academic landscape" (Northway, 1973, p. 44). Head Start, which had begun in the United States in 1965, was producing repercussions in Canada, with researchers and practitioners becoming cautious only several years later about applying procedures and findings too specifically to Canadian populations and situations (Wright, 1973).

Although Northway refers to laboratory preschools which were established in universities during the 1960's, no catalogue or list of

these laboratory preschools exists. References to the programs are oblique, found for instance in literatures about play (Rubin, 1975) or playgrounds (Lueck, 1973) or compensatory preschool education (Wright, 1978), not in a literature about laboratory preschools as such.

There is some indication that Canadian child study centres are responding to the challenges of meeting the needs of several populations, and of interpreting these needs to others. Here again, the references are scattered, although they might be of central interest to other child study centres. A former student expresses her viewpoint to the investigators in a junior kindergarten study:

. . . an advantage of the Institute is the lab. school The student has the opportunity of spending a lot of time there with the children, even when he/she is not practice teaching We not only get the theory but actually see on a daily basis the interaction between children and their development our lectures are not isolated from reality because of the lab. school which serves as a continuous practicum (O'Bryan et al, 1975, pp. 128, 129).

A laboratory preschool supervisor sends brief research reports to parents, with an interpretive covering memo:

We have been asked by many of you about the 'feedback' from these research projects which had been promised to you by the researchers I should like to explain that although all researchers are ethically bound to send you this information, it often takes many months before the research is finally completed You will be able to review not only studies in which your own child has been involved, but also learn about other research that has been conducted here (Greenberg, 1977).

Twenty years after Ross' call for a comprehensive outline of the problems in the field of child study in Canada, and of the research resources and estimated costs, problems have proliferated, research centres have increased in number although with no widespread knowledge of where they are, and costs have escalated. While the United States established a Children's bureau in 1912 and has continued to address the problems of

child study at the national level, Canada has never had an equivalent office, and her efforts in child study remain "somewhat scattered." In spite of the growth which has occurred in programs and studies of young children in the past two decades, these programs and studies take place in isolation from each other, strung across the ten provinces, with scant opportunity for mutual exchanges and no national policies to support communication and cooperation.

The Institute of Child Study: A Canadian Model

The St. George's School for Child Study, named for the Toronto street on which it was located in 1925, was Canada's only centre for child study for many years. Because its lengthy history links it with the earliest North American laboratory preschools, because it has exemplified a wide range of functions which both laboratory schools and laboratory preschools have undertaken, and because its changing auspices provoke questions about the role of a child study centre, this section will describe the Institute of Child Study in some detail.

In Toronto, Clare Hincks worked closely with Professor E. A. Bott, head of the Department of Psychology at the University of Toronto, to establish St. George's School for Child Study, linking the concern for improving mental health and the human good with child study for several decades. Hincks persuaded William Blatz, a Canadian physician studying psychology in Chicago, to take charge of the new child study centre and he persuaded the Rockefellers, who were providing much of the initial funding, to accept the young man's appointment (Northway, 1973). Professor Bott not only piloted the project successfully through University

negotiations but designed the children's playground and helped to construct the equipment.

Blatz described the new school in 1926:

Today the pre-school child is assuming a unique importance for science. The problems of development as focused in the young normal child are of interest not merely for parents and educators, but also for those whose business it is to study the laws of health, habit formation, and the influence of the group upon the behaviour of the individual. In the average home these problems exist, but not the opportunity for their study and solution. The Nursery School as developed during the past decade in Great Britain and the United States offers a means of advancing our knowledge in these various fields and at the same time affords the best care and attention for the children who attend. To give services as well as being a useful observation centre, a nursery school must necessarily combine the interests of many University departments co-operating to study the child as a developing organism.

In the St. George's School for Child Study these problems are being approached from two sides. In the Nursery School division a controlled environment is possible and the behaviour of the child in such an environment, particularly under the influence of the other members of the group, can be observed and recorded. The child is not "experimented with" in the sense that some critics dread. He is furnished with abundant material to stimulate his varied interests and his activities are noted.

To this part of the child's life the parents, and particularly the mother, hold the key. Mothers have therefore been organized into groups in the Parent Education division to discuss the problems which they meet in handling children at home. Several inquiries are being carried out with the co-operation of these mothers, and it is hoped that in this way information can be collected which will be of use, not only for themselves, but for others The Nursery School division and the Parent Education division are thus complementary in their aim to arrive at as complete an understanding as possible of the life of the pre-school child, and the work of the two staffs is being correlated to this end (Northway, 1973, pp. 11, 12).

From its beginnings, the Institute staff was committed to disseminating as well as developing knowledge about young children. One staff member is quoted as saying "there were few books to consult, so we had to write our own" (Northway, 1973, p. 17). Bott and Blatz wrote the first book published by the Institute staff, The Management of Young Children, designed as a text for parent study groups. Millichamp records that as a student of the St. George's School in 1931 the only text book

available to her was Harriet Johnson's Children in the Nursery School. (Millichamp & Northway, 1977), and in turn, the first and for many years the only Canadian text available to preschool students was Nursery Education Theory and Practice by Blatz, Millichamp and Fletcher.

Research began to be published soon after the St. George's School for Child Study opened. Bott's study of play activities in the nursery school is much cited as a classic not only in play research, but in observational research method (Bott, 1928). Bott and a group of graduate students published a comparative analysis of current methods of observational studies of children which became the first of 18 monographs in the Child Development Series published during the 1930's by the staff of the Institute of Child Study (Bott, 1933). This series included research reports (Bott, 1937; Blatz, Allin & Millichamp, 1936; Blatz & Millichamp, 1935), case studies of children (Blatz & Griffin, 1936) and study outlines for parent groups (Staff of the Institute of Child Study, ND). New methods of observational research were employed, such as analyzing the social contacts of preschool children with the aid of "motion pictures" (Bernhardt et al, 1937).

The Institute of Child Study used its nursery school, parent education and clinic programs as research populations. For one study, monthly records of babies from one month to two years of age were kept by parents under the supervision of the Parent Education Division (Blatz & Millichamp, 1935). Ninety children were observed in a study of laughter in the nursery school child (Blatz, Allin & Millichamp, 1936). Sixty children referred to the clinic of St. George's School provided data on developmental difficulties (Blatz & Griffin, 1936). Two hundred parents in attendance at parent education classes, 150 public health nurses,

50 social workers and 50 mental hygienists comprised the sample for a study of adult attitudes to children's misdemeanors (Bott, 1937).

The programs for parent education and for preschool teachers' education, as well as the children's programs, were resources for testing innovative practices. The discussion outlines for parent educators were

used, revised reported stenographically and the discussion revived in seminars and conferences . . . the references read and reread Each item of the outline was discussed by the whole staff and included or rejected on the basis of this ten years' experience (Staff of St. George's School for Child Study, ND, Preface).

Songs and games were invented, and revised to incorporate children's ideas and responses, many variations becoming familiar to successive groups of children before they were published in song books (Fletcher & Dennison, 1960; 1955).

A continuing thrust of the Institute of Child Study has been the interest in longitudinal studies. For example, information was obtained yearly over a 30-year period from children and families attending the Institute from 1926 to 1945, growing into an analysis of trust and emancipation in families (Davis, 1966). Studies of the famous Dionne quintuplets continued for five years (Blatz, 1938). Another major longitudinal study followed a cohort of young children from 1957 when they were in custodial care in an orphanage, through their adoption or placement in foster homes, and in a sixteen-year followup study (Flint, 1966; 1978).

The Institute was frequently called upon to assume a public role, in its own and other communities. This was particularly important during the years of the second world war. A team from the Institute travelled to England to develop the Wartime Day Nurseries in Birmingham (Northway, 1973). Institute staff were seconded to the Ontario government to help develop wartime day nurseries in that province and were called upon to

draft day nursery legislation to safeguard standards when public pressure prevented the closure of the "wartime" day nurseries in 1946 (Stapleford, 1976).

The Institute of Child Study has had many audiences. As well as the families of the children, and post-graduate Diploma programs for nursery educators, parent educators and guidance personnel, other audiences included students in kindergarten-primary specialist education, occupational therapy and nursing, graduate students in psychology, lay leaders preparing to work with parents, and assistants in the nursery school and day nursery field (Millichamp, 1951, p. 23). Dr. William Blatz, the controversial Director, became a permanent guest on a weekly television show during the 1950's, provoking responses from an interested mass audience which often raised questions about child development and child rearing requiring clarification and interpretation of issues by the Institute staff (Millichamp & Northway, 1977).

The Bulletin of the Institute of Child Study was published four times a year for thirty years, from 1938 when, as The Parent Education Bulletin, it was mimeographed and stapled by hand, to 1968 when, as Child Study, it had a world-wide readership for its diverse range of topics (M.L.N. & N.F., 1965). This house organ published articles describing the research taking place at the Institute (Flint, 1966; Grapko, 1965; Northway et al, 1964) and in other places in Canada (Clark, 1967), descriptions of the curriculum of the Institute's own nursery school and elementary school (Child Study, 28, 29), and descriptions of other types of children's programs which proliferated particularly in the 1960's in Toronto (Child Study, 30), descriptions of teacher preparation programs

(Child Study, 30), addresses presented at professional gatherings (Almy, 1966), issues affecting young children (Millichamp, 1968; Stapleford, 1967). Many articles were widely reprinted. A collection of impressionistic essays describing the Institute of Child Study as an environment which first appeared over a number of years in The Bulletin of the Institute of Child Study were republished as Laughter in the Front Hall (Northway, 1966).

The changing auspices, administrative arrangements and sources of financial support for the Institute of Child Study illustrate how the definition of a child study centre can affect its function and productivity, as well as be investigated in this study. The St. George's School for Child Study began with the assistance of a five-year grant from the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial and a grant to the Canadian National Committee for Mental Hygiene from the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company (Northway, 1973). For twelve years it was under the general sponsorship of the University of Toronto Department of Psychology with a management committee representing several University departments (Bott, 1951). In 1937 it became the autonomous Institute of Child Study, administered by a committee of the University Senate, but graduate students continued to submit theses to the Department of Psychology. During the 1950's a "divergence of scientific viewpoints" became apparent between the "scientific-statistic" orientation of the Department of Psychology and the "mental health-community minded" perspective of the Institute, when some question arose about whether the Department would accept the Master of Arts theses of two Institute graduate students (Millichamp & Northway, 1977, p. 24). Through the years National Health Grants and Ontario Mental Health Grants provided considerable support for the Institute, for conducting and

publishing research. Changes in personnel and academic priorities resulted in the Institute becoming a constituent of the University of Toronto Faculty of Education in 1971 (Institute of Child Study, 1978; Millichamp & Northway, 1977).

Throughout its more than 50-year history the Institute of Child Study has affected the lives of children spanning more than two generations. Graduates of its various programs for graduate and undergraduate students and associates of the Institute, have travelled to many parts of Canada and to countries as near as the United States and as far away as Thailand taking a child study perspective with them. However, the standards and the diversity of the Institute of Child Study are difficult to replicate, and sufficient public support for such institutes with a wide range of research and dissemination activities may come about only when there is general public acknowledgement of the importance to young children of the decisions taken by their families, communities and the institutions of their society on their behalf.

Summary of Related Literature and Implications for This Study

Children's programs operated by institutions of higher learning began in the United States with a mission to provide demonstration and practice teaching opportunities for teachers in training. Laboratory preschools, on the other hand, were established to study the development of young children, and the founders belonged to a number of disciplines. Both laboratory schools and laboratory preschools, however, have been engaged in three main functions: research, teacher preparation and

dissemination activities, with the laboratory preschools also fulfilling a service function.

Canada's first model, the Institute of Child Study, one of the pioneering laboratory preschools established in the 1920's in North America, has embodied all of these functions within a changing administrative pattern.

There is some indication that laboratory preschools have proliferated in Canada, but information about these programs is not readily accessible.

The present investigation seeks to create a catalogue of present child study centres in Canada, and a description of the centres, and to explore the extent to which they are engaged in research, teacher education, dissemination and service activities. The number of universities operating such programs, the functions the centres fulfill, their supports and community image may provide some indication of the collective impact the centres are having on the study, care and education of young children in Canada.

CHAPTER III

STUDY PROCEDURES

This chapter describes the procedures for the investigation as they evolved out of the summary with which Chapter II concluded. The chapter sections are the following:

Questions That Guided the Investigation

Sampling Procedures

Questionnaire Used in This Investigation

Construction and Format of the Questionnaire

Distribution of the Questionnaire

Summary

Questions That Guided the Investigation

This exploratory study was undertaken to investigate the status of child study centres in Canada, for three purposes:

- 1) to establish a catalogue of Canadian child study centres;
- 2) to determine the functions which the Canadian child study centres fulfill;
- 3) to explore the possible impact of Canadian child study centres upon Canadian child care and education policies and practices.

In keeping with the purposes of the study, a child study centre was defined as a group program for children between birth and nine years

old which develops or disseminates information about young children or programs for young children, and is operated by a degree-granting institution.

A review of related literature suggested that child study centres would be multidisciplinary and multipurpose, engaging in research, teacher education, service and dissemination activities, although the centres would differ in their balance of activities. The literature review resulted in the following revised list of questions which guided this investigation:

- 1) What is the balance of functions which the child study centres perform, and where do they place their priorities and emphases?
- 2) What disciplines assume major responsibility for Canadian centres?
- 3) What bodies help to support and form policies for the centres?
- 4) Do centres identify common concerns which could serve as a focus for joint planning or study?
- 5) How isolated are the centres from the mainstream of Canadian practices with young children, and from each other?

Sampling Procedures

In the literature review reference was made to the rapid expansion of laboratory preschools in Canada during the 1960's (Northway, 1973). However, no catalogue or listing exists of these laboratory preschools. It was necessary to sample in two stages, therefore: first, to contact institutions to determine if they operated a children's program within the study definition; second, to contact the centres identified to obtain the information on which the findings are based.

In order to identify centres, a letter of enquiry (Appendix A)

was sent, in March 1978, to each of the 50 degree-granting institutions in Canada (Canadian Education Association, 1977). The letter was addressed to the Dean of Education, by name, in institutions with faculties of education. Otherwise, the letter was addressed to the head of the Department of Psychology, Community Services, Family Studies, or to the Principal of the institution. The letter included a stamped, addressed reply post card, requesting a yes or no answer about the presence of a children's program as defined above in their institution, and the name, address and telephone number of the most knowledgeable person to contact for information about the centre.

By May 1978, replies had been received from 100% of the fifty administrators contacted, identifying twenty institutions that operate children's programs, and the person most knowledgeable about each of them.

Prior to identifying the centres, the investigator planned to visit each of the child study centres, in the belief that they were few and clustered mostly in one province. Observations and structured interviews would have provided a much more complete picture than is possible with a questionnaire. However, the importance for an exploratory study on child study centres in Canada to include every Canadian centre identified will be appreciated. Thus, when twenty centres were named, from Vancouver to Halifax, site visits were precluded.

Accordingly, a survey, in the form of a mailed questionnaire, was conducted of each of the child study centres identified in the manner described above.

The twenty persons named by the administrators of degree-granting institutions as most knowledgeable about the centres were invited

to complete one, or more than one questionnaire if several programs were operated by their institution. Respondents from Ryerson Polytechnical Institute and the University of Guelph completed two questionnaires each. As shown in Table I, and discussed in Chapter IV, these are the only institutions named with programs for children under two years old and they take place in different physical settings from the programs for older children offered by these institutions. Thus, the sample consists of twenty-two Canadian child study centres.

The covering letter (Appendix A) accompanying the questionnaire outlined the purpose of the study, made specific requests and included a commitment to share a summary of the results with the respondents, as an incentive to completion.

Seven administrators who replied negatively to the initial enquiry briefly described programs for children which did not fall within the definition of the study. One university psychology department operates a home for retarded children which is used for internships for psychology students. Another university psychology department operates a behavior management program for developmentally handicapped children through visits to home, nursery schools, etc. Two universities house kindergartens, and three house day care services, all of which are used for observation and practica. One university operates a centre for educational disabilities in addition to its child study centre program. These programs will be discussed in Chapter V.

In summary, a two-stage sampling procedure resulted in a catalogue of twenty-two Canadian child study centres as defined in this investigation. At each of the two stages in the sampling procedure 100% of replies were received; that is, the entire census of fifty institutions

responded to the initial enquiry identifying the child study centres, and the entire census of twenty identified persons responded to the survey, completing a total of twenty-two questionnaires.

Questionnaire Used in This Investigation

Although the questionnaire has been called "a wayward child of science" it provides a means not only of uncovering information, but of interpreting and synthesizing it and of drawing implications that may lead to more rigorous research. (Mouly, 1970, p. 262).

A questionnaire was the favored method for this study, for reasons of accessibility and distance, discussed in the previous section. A mailed questionnaire, rather than a telephone interview, for instance, was used partly for reasons of distance and differing time zones, but mainly because it was anticipated that respondents would require time to compose complete answers to questions, and in some instances to consult records.

The questionnaire used in this investigation is presented in its entirety on the following pages. It has been reduced from the original 8½ X 14 inch size.

The construction and format of the questionnaire is discussed in the section following the questionnaire itself.

CHILD STUDY CENTRES IN CANADA

What is the name of your child study centre?

What is the name of the degree-granting institution which sponsors your child study centre?

Who is completing this questionnaire?

NAME

POSITION

Does your centre conduct a group program for children of any age between birth and nine years old which has as part of its mission the development and/or dissemination of knowledge about children and/or children's programs?

YES NO

Does your sponsoring institution assume at least half the capital and/or operating costs of the centre, or administer funds which do so?

YES NO

If the answer to either of the two foregoing questions is NO, disregard the questionnaire and return it to the address on the final page.

If you have several programs with differences in purpose, content, administration, etc., please read the questionnaire before beginning to complete it, as you may find it appropriate to complete a copy for each program.

* * * * *

1. Is the child study centre located on the campus of your institution? YES NO

2. How many children attend the centre?

3. What ages are the children who attend?

_____ to _____ years

4. During which months does the centre operate?

5. Does the centre conduct an additional summer program?

YES NO

Comment

6. What are the centre's daily hours?

_____ to _____

7. In what type of physical facility is the centre housed?

8. Which of the following criteria apply to the admission of children to your centre?

- | | |
|---|--------|
| a) first come, first served | YES NO |
| b) parents are faculty, staff or students of this institution | YES NO |
| c) children have special physical, emotional or social needs | YES NO |
| d) families have need for centre's services | YES NO |
| e) families must be members of a specified geographical community | YES NO |
| f) families agree to cooperate with research requests | YES NO |
| g) families agree to participate in some aspect of the program | YES NO |
| h) according to balance of age, sex, socio-economic status | YES NO |
| i) other (please specify) _____ | |
- _____

9. How would you describe the records kept for each child?

- | | |
|--|--------|
| a) basic information and anecdotal summaries | YES NO |
| b) detailed history and precise records | YES NO |
| c) joint home/school cumulative files | YES NO |
| d) other (please specify) _____ | |
- _____

10. What activities are included in a sample daily program for the children?
(or attach a sample daily schedule)

11. What was the relative importance given to each of the following elements when the present children's environment and program in the child study centre were being planned?

	VERY IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	LIMITED CONSIDERATION	NOT CONSIDERED
a) provision of sensory, manipulative constructive and symbolic material, such as sand, blocks				
b) provision of cognitive material such as attribute blocks, seriation cylinders				
c) provision of opportunity for free choice and use of materials during unstructured time				
d) provision for children to move individually from one activity to another				
e) provision for whole-group activities				
f) provision for outdoor activities				
g) provision for teacher directed activities				
h) provision for learning and practice of self-care skills				
i) attention to basic daily needs such as eating, drinking, rest				
j) planning for and reinforcement of pro-social behaviors				
k) development of procedures for evaluating and discussing children's progress with parents				
l) provision for parent participation in the program				
m) other (please specify) _____				

12. Does one faculty or department have major professional responsibility for the centre?

If so, which one? _____

If not, please elaborate _____

13. Other than the children's program, who does the centre house?

- | | |
|---|--------|
| a) no one else | YES NO |
| b) instructional faculty | YES NO |
| c) research facilities | YES NO |
| d) faculty other than that of the sponsoring department | YES NO |
| e) parents' activities | YES NO |
| f) other (please specify) _____ | |

14. What are the academic qualifications of those who work at the child study centre? Please indicate if personnel are also members of the faculty.

	NUMBER	DOCTORATE	MASTERS	BACHELOR	DIPLOMA	CERTIFICATE	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	FACULTY MEMBER
Director (head)								YES NO
Teachers of children								YES NO
Researchers								YES NO
Others (please specify)								YES NO
_____								YES NO
_____								YES NO
_____								YES NO

15. Other than staff members, who are regular participants in the children's program?

- | | YES NO | NUMBER DURING 77/78 () |
|----------------------------------|--------|-------------------------|
| a) undergraduate students | YES NO | () |
| b) graduate students | YES NO | () |
| c) parents | YES NO | () |
| d) researchers | YES NO | () |
| e) others (please specify) _____ | | () |

16. What is the relative importance of the functions performed at the present time by the child study centre, its staff and faculty?

	VERY IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	LIMITED VALUE	NOT USED FOR THIS PURPOSE
a) conducts child development research				
b) conducts research relating to children's programs				
c) conducts family research				
d) provides a data and population pool for graduate students' research				
e) provides a child care service for parents				
f) demonstrates an exemplary program				
g) provides a setting to field-test research findings				
h) provides an observation setting for preservice teachers				
i) provides a setting for preservice teachers' participation and practice				
j) provides an observation setting for students from other faculties or departments				
k) provides leadership in in-service teacher education programs such as workshops, study groups, professional organizations				
l) produces and/or catalogues films, tapes, slides				
m) provides a consultation service for the professional community				
n) produces a regular publication				
o) provides a consultation service for parents whose children are not in the centre program				
p) disseminates knowledge about children to the general public				
q) other (please specify) _____				

17. What technological resources are available for use at the centre?

- | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| a) one-way vision glass | YES NO |
| b) audio tape | YES NO |
| c) video tape | YES NO |
| d) other (please specify) _____ | |

18. Please rank order from (1) for most important to (9) for least important the following goals which guide the activities of your centre. Please disregard those which do not apply.

- () to produce new theory
- () to translate theory into practice
- () to disseminate knowledge and practice into the mainstream of child care/education
- () to develop promising programs and processes
- () to disseminate successful practices and programs
- () preservice and inservice education of teachers to implement successful practices and programs
- () to develop vigorous leaders
- () other (please specify) _____

19. How many publications have been produced by the child study centre faculty and staff during the past 5 years?

- | | NUMBER |
|--|--------|
| a) published research studies | () |
| b) published articles in professional journals | () |
| c) books | () |
| d) issues of an in-house publication | () |
| e) other (please specify) _____ | () |
| _____ | () |

20. Are program practices, observation and research schedules and demonstrations planned jointly by centre staff and faculty instructors?

YES NO

Please comment _____

21. Which of the following bodies contribute to the development of policies for the child study centre through representation on a centre committee or council?
- | | |
|--|--------|
| a) the centre staff | YES NO |
| b) the faculty and administration of the sponsoring department | YES NO |
| c) interested members of the university community | YES NO |
| d) parents | YES NO |
| e) informed citizens of the community | YES NO |
| f) government staff | YES NO |
| g) no established group | YES NO |
| h) other (please specify) _____ | |
| _____ | |
22. What are the centre's major sources of funds?
- _____
- _____
23. Do parents of children attending pay fees? YES NO
24. Does the centre have enough funds to operate and achieve its goals? YES NO
- Please comment _____
- _____
25. Do you have community supports to whom you can turn for assistance? YES NO
- Please comment _____
- _____
26. In what year was the child study centre established?
27. What have been the main landmarks in the development of the child study centre? (or attach a relevant publication)
28. What special qualities contribute to your centre's impact on the community and its image in the eyes of faculty, students and parents?

29. What ideas or projects would you most like to put into action if your child study centre had access to more resources?
30. What insights, concerns or questions would you particularly like to discuss with those from other Canadian child study centres, if you had the opportunity?
31. Is there anything else you would like to say about your child study centre, this study, or your ideas about the relationship of child study centres to early childhood education and child development?

* * * * *

Address to which a summary of the study findings should be sent:

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

Thank you for the time and effort required to complete this questionnaire.
Please mail it in the enclosed stamped addressed envelope.

Dona Coates,
505 - 2055 Pendrell St.,
Vancouver, B.C. V6G 1T9

September
1978

Construction and Format
of the Questionnaire

The questionnaire for this study was constructed by the investigator, as prior surveys investigated laboratory schools, rather than child study centres, as discussed in Chapter II (Williams, 1942; Kelley, 1965; Howd & Browne, 1969). A broader perspective was required for this investigation, to elicit information about the number of faculties and disciplines which might be involved with the centres and to explore the range of goals and functions of the centres. Much of the question content, therefore, was drawn from literature reviews and analyses of possible functions of centres, together with functions which may be inferred from Canadian centre publications. Literature on educational research (Borg & Gall, 1971; Gay, 1976) and on survey research (Parten, 1950) provided guidance for questionnaire construction and format.

An exploratory study of centres which were expected to vary from each other in many respects posed problems in constructing a questionnaire which would accommodate all interests. Closed questions of the yes/no or checklist category were preferable, because of their objectivity, and efficiency in completion and scoring. Appropriate use of closed questions requires that,

- 1) respondents have adequate information and well-structured opinions (Good, 1963, p. 277);
- 2) the lists of alternatives are complete and each alternative is distinct from the others (Gay, 1976, p. 129);
- 3) the investigator is well informed about the respondent (Good, 1963, p. 277).

Each respondent was referred to the investigator as being the person most knowledgeable about the child study centre by a person in authority (Appendix A), hence the respondents were assumed to have adequate information. The exploratory nature of the study precluded the investigator from being well informed about the respondents. Therefore, several open-ended questions were included to enable respondents to comment freely about their centres, to amplify information or to raise aspects which had not been explored by means of the closed questions. Because it could not be assumed that lists of alternatives were complete in the check-list questions, an "other" category was added to most questions.

Questions used by Howd and Browne (1969) provided some of the questions on centre functions, and are the basis for a limited comparison with their findings, in Chapter IV.

The questionnaire is composed of 31 questions in seven clusters.

The first cluster of questions, Q1 - Q7,* is designed to provide a basic description of the centres and to lead respondents into the questionnaire with some ease.

The second cluster of questions, Q8 - Q11, refer to the children's programs. While it was recognized that only limited information about children's programs could be obtained as part of a general questionnaire, it was anticipated that admissions criteria, children's records and emphasis on some program elements might be related to the overall functions of the child study centres.

* Throughout this section and Chapters IV and V, questions from the questionnaire will be identified by "Q" followed by the number of the question.

The third cluster of questions, Q12 - Q15, focus on faculty responsibility for and involvement with the child study centre, including physical proximity of faculty with centre, and centre workers who are faculty members.

The fourth cluster of questions, Q16 - Q19, relates to the functions of the child study centres and the relative importance the respondents assign to these functions. The scaling of Q16, from "Very important," to "Not used for this purpose," is adopted from Howd and Browne. Sections Q16 h), l), and k), which relate to preservice and inservice education of teachers, are also derived from Howd and Browne. The remainder of functions listed in Q16 are those that are described and suggested in the literature, as discussed in Chapter II. Q18 is developed from a list of possible centre goals which has been cited widely (Hunter, 1970). Howd and Browne's questions about centre publications formed the basis of Q19, augmented by the item "in-house publication," as the publication of Viewpoint by the University of British Columbia's Child Study Centre, and of the Institute of Child Study's former publication Child Study, indicated the possible importance of this activity.

The fifth cluster of questions, Q20 - Q21, deal with policy making for the child study centres. Howd and Browne ask questions about policy making that assume a large-system, education-oriented context. Van Til (1969) describes how policy making can be perceived differently in relation to children, parents, professors, teachers and funding sources. Anderson (1973) describes a large policy-making body composed equally of parents and members of the professional and academic community. This investigation merely asks for identification of those bodies which are represented on policy-making committees or councils for the child study centres.

The sixth cluster of questions, Q22 - Q25, identify the centres' sources of support and the adequacy of these supports.

The final cluster of questions, Q26 - Q31, invite the respondents to express personal perceptions of their centres, desires for future directions and opinions about child study and early childhood education. "A survey is a cold affair and ends in an abstraction removed from events" (Northway, 1973, p.38). This cluster of questions was designed to provoke expressions of respondents' own points of view.

Instructions for completion were printed on the questionnaire itself. The questionnaire was printed on one side of the paper only, with ample space provided for comments. It is as attractive and as brief as possible. Placement of the "YES NO" response in a consistent place on the page and the boxing of faculty and staff qualifications followed the style of a previous unpublished Canadian survey (O'Connell, 1968).

Distribution of Questionnaire

A draft of the questionnaire was pretested by a former Director of the Child Study Centre at the University of British Columbia, and the form and content of the final questionnaire reflect the suggestions and additions resulting from her review.

Two copies of the questionnaire, together with covering letter (Appendix A) and a stamped, addressed return envelope, were distributed to the twenty respondents designated by their administrators. Two questionnaires were included to allow for more than one program operated by an institution.

The questionnaires were distributed by mail during the second

week of September, 1978. The first mailing produced a return of 12/20.

A reminder letter (Appendix A) was sent to subjects who had not returned the questionnaire by November, 1978. Telephone calls were made in January and March, 1979, and additional questionnaires sent out in cases of postal errors, change of personnel or loss of the first questionnaire.

By March, 1979, every one of the twenty persons who had been contacted had provided the relevant information.

Responses from the questionnaire were then tabulated and summarized.

Summary

The preceding chapter outlined the specific procedures of the investigation.

The first step in the investigation resulted in the establishment of a catalogue of the present Canadian child study centres. This will be presented in Chapter IV.

Further aims of the investigation were translated into a questionnaire that focused on:

- 1) a basic description of the child study centres;
- 2) aspects of the children's programs;
- 3) faculty responsibility for and involvement with the centres;
- 4) functions of the centres and the relative importance assigned to them;
- 5) policy making for the centres;
- 6) the centres sources of support and adequacy of support;
- 7) hoped-for plans and personal perceptions of centre respondents.

Results of the questionnaire survey are presented in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of analyses of the questionnaire survey carried out in this study. Sections are as follows:

Description of the Centres

The Children's Program

The Relationship of Faculty to Child Study Centres

Functions of Child Study Centres

Major Orientation of Child Study Centres

Policy Making for the Centres

Financial support for Child Study Centres

Centres' Impact on Their Communities

Projects Desired

Common Concerns of Respondents

Summary

In some instances the clusters of questions described in Chapter III have been regrouped if responses to an individual question indicated that its results would be more appropriately presented within another cluster.

Description of the Centres

Table I provides a composite picture of the twenty-two child study centres in Canada, as defined for this investigation.

TABLE I
DESCRIPTION OF CANADIAN CHILD STUDY CENTRES

Name and Location of Centre	Faculty or Department Responsible for Centre	Type of Facility
Child Study Centre, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C.	Faculty of Education Dept. of Early Childhood	Army huts
Children's Centre, University of Regina, Regina, Saskatchewan	Faculty of Education (Early Childhood Subject Area)	Fourth floor classroom
Early Childhood Centre, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan	Institute of Child Guidance and Development	Two indoor rooms + playground
Prekindergarten, Brandon University, Brandon, Manitoba	Faculty of Education Dept. of Adm. and Educ. Services	Faculty of Ed. building
Child Studies Centre, University of Winnipeg, Winnipeg, Manitoba	Dept. of Psychology	Fourth floor with courtyard
Child Study Centre, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba	Faculty of Education Dept. of Ed. Psych, Early Childhood	Classroom in Ed. building
Child Study Centre, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ontario	Faculty of Social Sciences Dept. of Psychology	6-storey building designed for children
Laboratory Preschool, Carlton University, Ottawa, Ontario	Dept. of Psychology	Third floor, indoors and outdoors
Institute of Child Study, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario	Institute of Child Study	Converted home with addition
Ryerson Infant-Toddler Centre, Ryerson Polytechnical Institute, Toronto, Ontario	Early Childhood Education	Renovated house
Ryerson Early Learning Centre, Ryerson Polytechnical Institute, Toronto, Ontario	Early Childhood Education	Main floor of campus building in- and out
Family Studies Laboratory School Toddler Program, University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario	Department of Family Studies	First floor of house
Family Studies Laboratory School Preschool, University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario	Department of Family Studies	Basement of university building
Early Childhood Education Centre, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario	Dept. of Psychology	First floor of university building
Laboratory Preschool, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario	Dept. of Psychology	Fifth floor of new U. bldg. designed for ch.
Activity Learning Centre, Laurentian University, Sudbury, Ontario	Under negotiation	Main floor of Teachers' College
Child Care Centre, Concordia University, Montreal, Quebec	Department of Education	Masonic Temple
Early Childhood Centre, University of New Brunswick, Fredericton, New Brunswick	Faculty of Education	Redesigned classroom in Ed. bldg. with playground
Maternelle La Colombe, Université de Moncton, Moncton, Nouveau-Brunswick	Département d'apprentissage et d'enseignement	Dans Faculté bldg.
Centre for Child Studies, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia	Interdisciplinary	Several rooms with outside area
Child Study Centre, Mount St. Vincent University, Halifax, Nova Scotia	Child Studies (Education)	Purpose-built extension to maintenance bldg.
Child Development Centre, Acadia University, Wolfville, Nova Scotia	School of Education	Large room in School of Education

Located on Campus.	Ages of Children	Number of Children	Daily Hours	Months of Operation	Year Established
+	3-5	38	9-2:30	Sept.-May	1961
+	3-5	90-95	9-11:30 1-3:30	Sept.-June	1969
+	3-5	65-70	9:15-11:45 1:30-3:30	Sept.-May	1970
+	4.6-5	16	9-11:30	Sept.-Apr.	1968
+	2.6-5	40	9-3:30	Sept.-May	1970
+	2.6-5	37	9-11:30 1-3:30	Oct.-Apr.	1972
+	5-12	91	9-3:30*	Sept.-June	1967
+	2.9-5	60	9-11:30 1-3:30	Sept.-June	1967
-	2.9-11	153	8:45-3	Sept.-June	1925
+	.4-2	24	8-5:30	Sept.-July	1975
+	2-5	40	8-5:30	Sept.-June	1963
+	1.3-3	28	9:15-11:15	Sept.-July	1974
+	2.6-5	40	9-3:30	Sept.-July	1959
+	3-5	30	9-11:30	Sept.-June	1974
+	2.8-5	56	9-11:30 1-3:30	Sept.-June	1973
+	6-15	85	8:30-4:30**	Sept.-June	1978
-	2.6-5	43	8:30-6	Sept.-Apr.	1973
+	3-6	40	8:45-11:45 12:30-3:30	Sept.-June	1975
+	3.5-6	80	9-3:30	Sept.-Apr.	1976
+	3-5	41	9-12 1:30-4	Sept.-June	1975
+	2-6	52	8-5:30	Sept.-Apr.	1977
+	3-5	27	9-11:30 1-3:30	Sept.-Apr.	1974

* Also a residential program

** Two-hour sessions all day

Dramatic confirmation of Northway's (1973) statement about the explosion of child study in Canada is demonstrated by the dates when the child study centres were established (Q26). One centre, established in 1925, is three and a half decades older than any of the other centres. Six centres were established in the decade between 1959 and 1968. Fifteen centres (68%) were established between 1969 and 1978, eight of these in the past five years.

A very large majority of the centres conduct programs for pre-school children (Q3). Seventeen centres include children between the ages of 2 - 3 years old to 5 - 6 years old; two more centres include younger children, nineteen in all (86%) that conduct programs for children only under six. Three centres include children older than six years old, and two of these, the Child Study Centre at the University of Ottawa, and the Activity Learning Centre at Laurentian University, are treatment programs.

Eight centres operate both morning and afternoon programs, and an additional three, a morning program only (Q6). Thus, 50% of the centres are involved with half-day children's programs of two to three hours duration, making this the most typical. Six centres, including two of the three centres for children over six years old, have a daily program of 5½ to 6½ hours in length. Four centres operate a full-day program from 8:00 AM to 5:30 or 6:00 PM. One centre schedules two-hour sessions all day from 8:30 AM to 4:30 PM, although this atypical pattern is clearly a result of their role as a treatment centre. One centre, again a treatment centre, operates a residential, as well as a daytime program.

The number of children served by the individual programs varies between 16 and 153 (Q2). However, assuming that centres with two half-day programs serve two different groups of children, and that centres with a

wide age range have several classes, the picture which emerges is that of relatively small, intimate groups of children.

The centres are housed in a variety of physical settings (Q7).

The contrast in these facilities is notable; for example, one centre consists of a six-storey building designed for children, another is a converted home with a large addition designed for children, two are in renovated houses, while one exists in Army huts and another in a Masonic Temple. Sixteen (73%) occupy part of a university building. Six of these are specified as having outdoor space, and three are described as being designed, or redesigned for children, or built specifically for this use.

All but two of the centres are campus-based, and one of the two, the Institute of Child Study, is less than a half mile from the university campus (Q1).

Centres are open following either the academic or the public school year, generally (Q4). Half are open from September to June or July, and four of these offer an additional summer program. Six are open from September or October to April, with an additional three open until May. These nine, together with the University of Guelph centres which conform to the trimesters of that university, constitute 50% of the centres that follow the academic year of their parent institutions rather than the public school year. This busy picture is augmented by the centres, ten in all, that operate summer programs (Q5). The summer trimester at the University of Guelph and the September-July schedule of the Ryerson Infant-Toddler centre bring to 13 (59%) the number of centres open for part of the summer.

The Children's Programs

It was anticipated that the cluster of questions relating to the children's programs, namely, those about admissions, records, activities and the relative importance of program elements, would reveal different program emphases amongst the centres. In fact, the responses do not differentiate well among the centres, or reveal any definable patterns.

A multitude of admission criteria are applied by centres (Q8), as shown in Table II.

TABLE II
ADMISSION CRITERIA

Admission Criterion	Number of Centres
first come, first served	14
children have special physical, emotional or social needs	13
families agree to cooperate with research requests	13
families have need for centre's services	12
according to balance of age, sex, socio- economic status	11
families agree to participate in some aspect of the program	10
parents are faculty, staff or students of the institution	8
families must be members of a specified geographical community	4

An average of four of the eight listed admission criteria were named by the centres; and an average of one out of the four named was qualified in some way. An additional eight criteria were specified, as follows:

- families outside the university setting
- parents must bring children to and from, to ensure daily contact
- groups balanced to maintain normalizing effect (a treatment centre)
- sibling priority
- priority given to community in institution
- ability to pay or be sponsored
- seek out "scholarship" children
- some children under 2½ attend with siblings and mothers

It will be noted that criteria of some centres are completely opposite to those named by others: families outside the institution contrasted with families within the institution, and the ability to pay contrasted with seeking out "scholarship" children.

Basic information and anecdotal records are kept by 19 centres (86%), detailed histories and precise records by 10 centres (45%), joint home/school cumulative files by four (18%) and other types of records by five centres (9%). Other types of records specified were:

- psychological test files
- research data, if requested by Director
- entrance and cognitive assessments
- records in relevant areas (a treatment centre)
- student observations
- test results from replicating studies
- check list of interactions

The open question, "What activities are included in a sample daily program for the children?" (Q10) elicited responses which exhibited common themes, although they were worded differently. Free play in activity centres, indoors and out, and stories, music, snacks, discussion and field trips were listed repeatedly. Academic study was mentioned as an activity only by the three centres with children over six years old. Some daily schedules were specified, but all showed large blocks of free choice time, and stressed flexibility.

The relative importance assigned to elements of the children's environment and program (Q11) shows near consensus on the items noted first as very important, as shown in Table III. Indeed, eight of the twelve items seem to be "motherhood" questions, with 90 - 100% of the centres rating them as very important or important. Comments offered by respondents to specify additional elements which they consider important provide more interesting clues to program emphases. These include comment on children's free choices:

- supporting children in making choices
- a careful choice of materials by the teacher effectively "structures" the program, even if the children have free reign to choose their activities.
- self direction and decision making.

Problem-solving was also added to the list by several centres:

- provisions for learning social problem-solving
- encouraging creativity and problem-solving
- problem defining and solving, both social and physical.

Other program elements added to the list were:

- stimulation of representational skills, e.g. dramatic play
- perspective-taking and communication skills.

TABLE III

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF ELEMENTS OF CHILDREN'S
ENVIRONMENTS AND PROGRAM (N = 22)

Element of environment or program	Index of Importance*	Number of centres assigning importance			
		Very Important	Important	Limited Consideration	Not Considered
provision of sensory, manipulative, constructive and symbolic material, such as sand, blocks	3.0	22	0	0	0
provision for children to move individually from one activity to another	2.9	21	0	1	0
provision of opportunity for free choice and use of materials during unstructured time	2.8	19	2	1	0
planning for and reinforcement of pro-social behaviors	2.7	15	7	0	0
provision for outdoor activities	2.6	14	7	1	0
provision of cognitive material such as attribute blocks, seriation cylinders	2.5	14	6	2	0
development of procedures for evaluating and discussing children's progress with parents	2.5	14	6	1	1
provision for learning and practice of self-care skills	2.4	8	14	0	0
provision for whole-group activities	2.2	9	9	4	0
attention to basic daily needs such as eating, drinking, rest	2.0	6	11	4	0
provision for parent participation in the program	1.8	4	11	6	1
provision for teacher directed activities	1.6	7	11	4	0
other		7	1	0	0

* To obtain an index of importance for each item, scores were assigned to each scale level as follows: Very Important (3), Important (2), Limited Consideration (1), Not Considered (0). An average score was then computed for each item.

The Relationship of Faculty to
Child Study Centres

The relationship of the child study centres to the academic life of their institutions is explored in the cluster of questions relating to physical proximity of centres to faculties, to the academic status of staff, and to the involvement of members of the university community in the children's program.

A variety of faculties and departments have major professional responsibility for the centres (Q12). As shown in Table I, half are within faculties or departments of education and two are institutes related to faculties of education, bringing to thirteen (59%) the centres that relate mainly to education as a discipline. Five centres (23%) are within psychology departments. Two, at the University of Guelph, are operated by the Department of Family Studies. In one institution a number of disciplines are responsible for the centre, and responsibility for the most recently opened centre, at Laurentian University in January 1978, was still being negotiated, but "will probably include social sciences, physical education and community groups."

Table IV shows the academic level of those who work in the child study centres and the numbers who have faculty status (Q14). The typical pattern, that of half the centres, is that the Director is a faculty member, while the teachers are not; however, in four centres all are faculty members, and in another four centres none have this status. Others who work in the child study centres include a program coordinator, aides, an administrator, support staff, a community coordinator, academic staff and faculty consultants, as well as a grandmother.

TABLE IV
ACADEMIC LEVEL AND FACULTY STATUS OF
WORKERS IN CHILD STUDY CENTRES

Academic Level	Number of Directors	Faculty	Number of Teachers	Faculty	Number of Other Workers	Faculty
Doctorate	11	11	0	0	8	6
Masters	8	6	10	5	6	2
Bachelor	2	1	45	4	4	0
Diploma	1	0	7½*	1	1	0
Certificate	0	0	16	1	0	0
Other	0	0	2	0	10	0
Total	22	18	69½	10	29	8

* ½ = a half-time teacher

Many members of the university community participate in the children's programs (Q15). In nineteen centres, undergraduate students regularly participate, numbers ranging from three to 120; and in ten centres graduate students participate, the numbers ranging from three to 75. Others participating in centre programs include faculty members, parents, community volunteers, high school students and one grandfather.

Informal exchanges between faculty and staff occur in eighteen centres where program practices, observation and research schedules and

demonstrations are planned jointly by centre staff and faculty instructors (Q20).

Generally, the technical facilities available in the centres are extensive (Q17). Eighteen centres are equipped with one-way vision glass. Nineteen centres have audio-taping resources, and an equal number have video-taping resources. Fifteen centres are equipped with all three. Four of the latter specified additional resources:

- a sound system
- the resources of the university media department
- "research rooms" equipped with one-way mirrors and audio- and video-taping facilities
- opportunity to supplement centre resources from the department of psychology equipment centre for research needs.

There is close physical proximity between the centres and the academic community (Q13). Twelve centres (55%) share housing with instructional faculty, and ten of these also house research facilities. Three centres house faculty other than that of the sponsoring department. One centre houses, in addition to children's programs, 115 graduate students in two Diploma programs, Early Childhood Education teacher preparation and Child Assessment and Counselling. Seven centres house only the children's program, but only one of these seven is not itself located in part of a university building.

Publications are another indicator of the involvement of the academic community with centres (Q19). Information about publications produced by the child study centre faculty and staff was far from complete, half the centres failing to respond to this question; others commenting that it was too difficult to say, that the information was just being compiled or that only a "ball park" figure could be given. Nonetheless, centre

personnel have published a substantial amount in the past five years. Faculty or staff of each of four centres have produced a book; two centres have each produced 15 issues of in-house publications; each of six other centres specified that faculty or staff have produced ten or more publications in professional journals; and many centres produced research studies in the form of graduate students' theses.

Functions of Child Study Centres

The relative importance of functions performed by the child study centres, staff and faculties is presented in Table V (Q16).

The composite picture provided by Table V illustrates the great emphasis given to the observation, practice-teaching and demonstration functions in Canadian child study centres, with almost all centres rating these as very important or important functions.

Table VI compares the ratings in this study with those of Howd and Browne (1969), for the observation, practice teaching and demonstration functions of centres. It is interesting to note that while the pattern is very similar, the Canadian centres consistently rate these education-oriented functions higher than do the American laboratory schools of 1969, even though only 59% of Canadian centres are under the auspices of education as a discipline.

Respondents were asked to rank order the goals that guide the activities of their centres (Q18). Despite clear instructions, some respondents failed to rank the goals. In Table VII, four cases were dropped because they used the first rank and no other; thus Table VII represents partial findings (18/22 centres). When any of the remaining

TABLE V

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF FUNCTIONS PERFORMED BY
CHILD STUDY CENTRE, STAFF, AND FACULTY (N = 22)

Function	Number of centres assigning importance				% of Centres Assigning Very Important or Important
	Very Important	Important	Limited Value	Not Used For This Purpose	
provides an observation setting for preservice teachers	17	5	0	0	100%
provides a setting for preservice teachers' participation and practice	18	3	0	1	95.5%
demonstrates an exemplary program	17	4	0	1	95.5%
provides an observation setting for students from other faculties or departments	8	14	0	0	100%
provides leadership in in-service teacher education programs such as workshops, study groups, professional organizations	8	8	1	5	72.7%
disseminates knowledge about children to the general public	5	5	4	8	45.5%
provides a child care service for parents	8	5	1	8	59.0%
conducts child development research	7	3	5	7	45.5%
provides a setting to field-test research findings	6	4	4	8	45.5%
conducts research relating to children's programs	4	6	4	8	45.5%
provides a data and population pool for graduate students' research	6	3	4	9	41.0%
provides a consultation service for the professional community	5	6	2	9	50.0%
provides a consultation service for parents whose children are not in the centre program	2	5	4	11	31.8%
conducts family research	2	2	7	11	18.2%
produces and/or catalogues films, tapes, slides	1	3	8	10	18.2%
produces a regular publication	2	1	2	17	13.6%

TABLE VI

FUNCTIONS DESCRIBED AS VERY IMPORTANT OR IMPORTANT BY CHILD STUDY CENTRES:

A COMPARISON WITH HOWD & BROWNE (1969)

Function	Howd & Browne (N = 194)				Coates (N = 22)			
	Number of Centres			%	Number of Centres			%
	Very Impt.	Impt.	Total		Very Impt.	Impt.	Total	
provides an observation setting for preservice teachers	117	62	179	92.3	17	5	22	100
provides a setting for preservice teachers' participation and practice	89	72	161	83.0	18	3	21	95.5
provides leadership in in-service teacher education programs such as workshops, study groups, professional organizations.	41	65	106	54.6	8	8	16	72.7

TABLE VII

RANK ORDER OF GOALS WHICH GUIDE THE ACTIVITIES OF
THE CHILD STUDY CENTRES (N = 18)

Goal	Rank Index*	Number of Centres Assigning Rank			
		First	Second	Third	Fourth or Lower
to translate theory into practice	2.5	6	2	3	7
preservice and inservice education of teachers to implement successful practices and programs	2.2	5	2	3	8
to develop promising programs and processes	2.1	3	4	4	7
to disseminate knowledge and practice into the mainstream of child care/education	1.8	2	4	4	8
to disseminate successful practices and programs	1.5	1	3	6	8
to develop vigorous leaders	.8	2	0	2	14
to produce new theory	.6	0	2	2	14

* To obtain a rank index for each item, scores were assigned to each rank as follows: First Rank (3), Second Rank (2), Third Rank (1), Fourth Rank or lower (0). An average score was then computed for each item.

eighteen centres designated two items to be of first rank, the ranking was reordered, with each goal taking priority in turn during tallying. The result of this procedure was to reduce, rather than to enhance, the importance of goals endorsed. Even so, translating theory into practice clearly shows as the most highly ranked goal overall.

Major Orientation of Child Study Centres

The ratings which centres assigned to functions and the order in which they ranked their goals made it possible to examine centres' orientations to the four major clusters of activities with which centres are involved: research, teacher preparation, dissemination and service.

Seven centres identify child development research as a very important function and "to produce new theory" ranks first, second or third as a goal of five of these seven. All of the seven rate research about children's programs or family research as very important or important, as well as the provision of a population pool for graduate students' research. Six of the seven also rate the provision of a setting to field-test research findings as very important or important. No centre other than these seven assigns a very important rating to more than one research function, nor ranks the goal "to produce new theory" first, second or third.

One should not conclude, however, that these seven centres have an exclusively research orientation. Five of them rate the provision of a setting for preservice teachers' participation and practice as very important; and of these, four rank the preservice and inservice education of teachers to implement successful practices and programs as being the first goal of the centre. In addition, four of the research-oriented programs consider the function of "disseminating knowledge about children to the general public"

as being an important or a very important function of their centre; five of the seven rank disseminating knowledge and practices as first, second or third most important goals; and one describes service functions as important or very important.

While fewer than one-third of the twenty-two Canadian child study centres may be called "research oriented," this study shows that a majority are oriented to teacher preparation. Eighteen designate the provision of "a setting for preservice teachers' participation and practice" as a very important function and thirteen of these rank the "preservice and inservice education of teachers" as a first, second or third goal of the centre. Here again, the orientation is not exclusively to teacher preparation, however. Five of the eighteen are also research oriented, as described above; seven consider "dissemination of knowledge about children to the general public" as an important or very important function; fifteen rank dissemination activities as first, second or third goals of the centre; and seven describe service functions as important or very important.

One centre, a treatment program, might be said to have a major orientation to dissemination activities. This is shown in the pattern of functions rated by that centre as very important: to demonstrate an exemplary program, to provide a consultation service to the professional community and to parents whose children are not in the centre program, to produce and/or catalogue films, tapes and slides (the only centre to designate this as a very important function), to provide leadership in inservice teacher education programs, and to disseminate knowledge about children to the general public. This centre also highly rates all the service functions. It ranks neither research nor teacher preparation functions as very important; however, its highest ranking goal, to translate theory into

practice, and its involvement with inservice teacher education, show again that centres cannot be said to have an orientation to one cluster of activities to the exclusion of the others.

No centre is mainly oriented to service. However, half the centres rate their services to families and the community as important or very important functions.

Policy Making for the Centres

Table VIII lists the bodies that contribute to the development of policies for the child study centres through representation on a centre council or committee (Q21).

TABLE VIII

BODIES THAT CONTRIBUTE TO POLICY MAKING

Body of People Represented	Number of Centres
faculty and administration of the sponsoring department	22
centre staff	20
parents	9
interested members of the university community	6
informed citizens of the community	5
government staff	5
no established group	1
school boards	1

Faculty and administration are involved with policy making for all the centres, and are the only policy makers for two centres. Staff are involved in policy making for all other centres. Parents are the third body represented in two centres, and in two others interested members of the university community is the third body represented. The complexity of university organizations is illustrated by the fact that seven centres involve four or more bodies in policy making.

Financial Support for Child Study Centres

Table IX shows the centres' major sources of funding (Q22).

TABLE IX

CHILD STUDY CENTRES' MAJOR SOURCES OF FUNDING

Source of Funding	Number of Centres	
	A Major Source	Only Source
university budget	20	9
parent fees	11	1
provincial government	3	1
research grants	2	0
fund raising projects	1	0

The university budget is a major source of funds for 20 centres, and the only major source for nine centres. Six centres list university budget and parents' fees as their two major sources of funds.

Although parents' fees are listed as a major source of funds for only half the centres, some parents pay fees in 20 centres, and in 17 of these 20 all parents pay (Q23).

Fourteen centres (64%) report adequate funds to operate and achieve their goals, though these include one centre which commented only "we get by." Eight centres do not have enough funds and their comments on this include:

- needs for children's program as well as for administration
- need for faculty time for research
- need for development money for outdoor play space
- recent cutbacks in funds
- need for funds to cover expenses for "disadvantaged" children
- after the initial capital grants it is difficult to budget for operating and expansion.

Twelve centres do not have community supports to turn to for assistance, including one centre which said it would not be appropriate (Q25). Three centres did not respond to this question. Of the seven who do have community supports some commented:

- for moral support only
- a campaign to raise money - parents, etc.
- able to call upon various professional services as required
- some support for low income families from foundation, city subsidy for individual children, private sources such as gifts.

Centres' Impact on Their Communities

Twenty centres responded to the question, "What special qualities contribute to your centre's impact on the community and its image in the eyes of faculty, students and parents?" (Q28) The comments range from

enthusiastic descriptions of quality programs to a terse "none."

Most centres comment on their impact as quality demonstration programs, although program descriptions range from general - "based upon developmental knowledge" - to more specific - "open education program," "integrated group of children, normal and handicapped," "infant program." Several centres mention the innovative character of their programs in their respective communities, with some community programs beginning to replicate their models.

Four centres specifically mention the impact of their teacher education programs, one emphasizing inservice as well as preservice education. Several of these teacher education programs have been established in recent years: one graduated its first students in 1974, and three others established teacher preparation programs in early childhood education in the 1970's.

Two centres comment on the services they provide to the community, and three; specific liaisons with community agencies such as schools and Child Guidance Clinic. One centre describes its community liason person who tours and lectures.

One centre comments specifically that "in the eyes of faculty it is important that research studies have been viewed as enlightening and have been the source which provided data that brought about program change."

Projects Desired

Eighteen centres described projects they would like to put into action if resources allowed (Q29). These are presented in Appendix B and summarized here.

Eleven projects concern the children's programs. Four centres

describe an interest in disadvantaged or low income families. Two centres would like to extend their age groups from infants or toddlers through to five year olds. Two would like to extend their programs to day care for reasons of community service and the potential for longitudinal research studies. One describes plans to institute a program for gifted four year olds, while another has an interest in the integration of special needs children.

Six centres wish to extend their work with parents, one specifying "both in the laboratory setting and in home environments," and two, parent education in the community.

Seven centres would increase their research commitments. Two mention the need for longitudinal studies of children "from three to eleven" or "longitudinal study of children attending the centre from two to five." One centre needs staff time designated for research. Others mention research interests in areas such as children's play or curriculum development.

Eleven projects named concern service to the community. These services would include the provision of counselling, a resource centre for students and the community, workshops for day care and nursery school personnel, an early infant identification and stimulation program. Some reflect specific community needs:

- centralization of services for learning disabled children
- supervise infant group homes or have well developed infant unit
- Il nous faut un Centre de coordination pour les services a l'enfant pour le secteur français de la province du Nouveau-Brunswick.

Two centres mention housing, one needing a new facility and another a larger space.

Four centres would like staff time to develop audio-visual materials, in the service of research, parent education, and teacher education.

Common Concerns of Respondents

Respondents from fifteen centres had insights, questions or concerns that they would share with personnel from other centres, given the opportunity (Q30). These are grouped and listed in Appendix B, and common concerns are summarized here.

Seven centres are interested in discussing the uses and purposes of child study centres, for example "the availability of centres for community use," "the development of novel programs," the balance of "research, teacher training and community involvement."

Nine centres would like to discuss the internal problems of centres. These problems include the selection of suitable staff, staff time constraints and salaries; funding; program planning for children and parents; record keeping methods; the role of a parents' association.

Eight centres would like to share current research interests, one specifying the possibility of cooperative research ventures.

Six centres have concerns about teacher education, expressing a desire to discuss "approaches to teacher training" or the effectiveness of a variety of teacher education programs preparing early childhood educators.

Summary

Results of the analyses of the questionnaire used in this investigation have been presented in this chapter.

A catalogue of present Canadian child study centres was presented, together with descriptive information about their programs for children, facilities, sponsorship and year of establishment, revealing a notably high number of centres less than ten years old, and of centres for preschool age children.

Centres are able to identify and scale the relative importance of their functions, as listed in the questionnaire. The results indicate that the research, teacher education, dissemination and service functions are all performed by Canadian child study centres. Every centre is multipurpose, emphasizing two or more functions. Most centres are under the sponsorship of only one discipline or department, and these vary from institution to institution.

Most centres are able to express an opinion about the impact of their centre on their community, and many express common concerns and an eagerness to share these with other child study centre personnel.

While many projects concerning the study of children and their care and education are described as needed, most centres lack sufficient support to make these a reality, and one third have not enough support to meet present goals.

The results of this investigation are discussed in Chapter V, conclusions are drawn and recommendations are made for future study and action.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This investigation established a catalogue of Canadian child study centres operating in 1978, as defined in Chapter I and investigated by the procedures described in Chapter III. It was possible to explore the variety and balance of the functions which the centres perform, and the sponsorship, supports and policy making which transform centre goals into reality. Some indications were given as to the centres' impact on their communities.

The investigation answered, completely or in part, the questions posed by this study which were introduced in Chapter I and revised in Chapter III. New questions which require both investigation and communication also came to light as a result of the study. These are discussed in the following sections:

Child Study on Campus

Goals of Child Study Centres

Communication among Canadian Child Study Centres

Limitations of Study

Recommendations for Further Study and Action

Child Study on Campus

It is clear from this investigation that there is extensive involvement with child study on Canadian campuses, and that this involvement has been increasing rapidly over the past ten to fifteen years. Three-quarters of the

present child study centres have been established during the last ten years, centres now existing in twenty of fifty Canadian degree-granting institutions.

The definition of child study centre used in this investigation was designed to identify programs for which there was an institutional commitment to the goals and functions that a program for young children can fulfill. A child study centre was defined as a group program for children of any age between birth and nine years old which develops and/or disseminates knowledge about children and/or children's programs. "Operated by the institution" meant that the institution assumes at least half the capital or operating costs of the centre, or administers funds which do so. Institutional commitment to programs is much more complex than simply contributing or administering a large proportion of the centres' operating expenses, as the literature review in Chapter II implies, and the results of this study indicate.

The proportion of a centre's budget provided by the sponsoring institution may not be a guide to the adequacy of financial support, as shown by this investigation. One-third of centres felt support was inadequate to fulfill present goals, and more than three-quarters would like to institute further ideas or projects if resources allowed (Q 24, 29). Budgetary support was lacking for: administration, academic and research commitments of faculty, available time for faculty and staff to develop programs, and for such dissemination activities as writing, video-taping, and communication with parents, professionals in the field and the public.

At the same time, most centres have few major sources of funding, half having only a single major source (see Table IX). The first Canadian centres relied on foundations, organizations, business and government to provide considerable parts of their budgets. Social and economic pressures

can bring about changes in public commitment to centres, as shown by the history of laboratory schools in the United States. These factors, discussed in Chapter II, might suggest that diverse funding sources, supporting certain functions or projects of centres, might help centres fulfill present goals and develop further plans.

Institutional commitment to child study centres involves not only budgetary support, but relates to the nature of administrative and academic supports, as well. In the introduction to this study it was postulated that child study centres might be the locus for interdisciplinary involvement in child study, and that this cooperation might help to define a field of study of young children. The literature provides some support for this expectation, in that early laboratory preschools were multidisciplinary, and in that two of the earliest child study centres established in Canada, at the University of Toronto in 1926 and at the University of British Columbia in 1961, evolved from multidisciplinary cooperation. The importance of the nature of administrative and academic supports, and the academic quandries posed by the study of young children is illustrated by the evolution of the Institute of Child Study from its initial sponsorship by a psychology department, to an autonomous institute, to its current incorporation as a constituent of a faculty of education.

The results of this study show that present Canadian child study centres are sponsored by different disciplines (see Table I) but seem to indicate that fewer than one-third include disciplines other than that of the sponsoring department in policy making (see Table VIII). All the centres except the two treatment programs belong to the tradition of laboratory preschools. The multidisciplinary focus of early laboratory preschools seems to be supported by contemporary theory and research in the

child development field, as suggested in Chapter I. Thus the results of this study suggest that either the information as gathered is incomplete, or there is a puzzling lack of multidisciplinary focus in the present Canadian child study centres.

This study reveals that centres' supports may depend upon personal rather than institutional commitment, endangering or limiting functions in a variety of ways when personnel change. In order for centres to contribute to the field of the study, care and education of young children, the results indicate that it is essential for institutions to spell out the values and roles of the centres and to recruit and commit adequate resources to fulfill these roles.

Goals of Child Study Centres

The questionnaire used in this investigation listed seven possible goals which child study centres might support (Q18). Ten or more centres ranked the following as first, second or third goals of their centres (see Table VII):

- to translate theory into practice
- preservice and inservice education of teachers to implement successful practices and programs
- to develop promising programs and processes
- to disseminate knowledge and practice into the mainstream of child care/education
- to disseminate successful practices and programs.

As presented in Chapter IV, the goal emerging with the highest rank was that of translating theory into practice. This is not surprising in the light of authors cited in Chapter II who describe centres as being

uniquely suited for this function. However, translating theory into practice has been described as an activity which requires staff members who are "bilingual in their fluency with an understanding of the fields of theory and practice" (Hunter, 1970, p. 15). The implication is that achieving the translation of theory into practice requires high academic qualifications of staff members. This study shows that in all but one of the Canadian centres rating highly the translation of theory into practice the director has a doctorate or masters degree, and three of these centres employ teachers with masters degrees, an indication that these staff members may indeed be "bilingual" with theory and practice.

This study clearly demonstrates that all Canadian child study centres, whether sponsored by a faculty of education or not, are operating in the service of teacher education. All centres provide an observation setting for preservice teachers, and all but one centre rate highly the functions of providing a setting for preservice teachers' participation and practice and the demonstration of an exemplary program, as reported in Chapter IV. The ages of children and descriptions of daily programs (see Table I) seem to indicate that prospective teachers are being prepared for a variety of programs in different centres, including infant and preschool day care, family programs, part-day nursery schools, kindergarten or primary school programs and for work with disabled children.

This raises the question of the ages of children served by the programs. The typical choice of children's program is a small, half-day program for three-to-five year olds. Twelve of the fifteen programs established during the past ten years are for the three-to-five age group. This choice may indicate that the centres are involved in programs for the preparation primarily of preschool teachers; it may mean that a group of

preschool children lends itself particularly well to observational research in child development; it may also mean that a university preschool may be an innovation, demonstrating the values of such a program to an area of Canada not familiar with these programs; it may indicate simply that while older children are available in public schools for observation, study and practice, groups of preschool children are not available for such purposes in the community.

It is noteworthy that while three-quarters of the centres are equipped with observation screens, as well as with video and audio recorders, only one-third are research oriented. This raises the interesting question of whether these technical resources are being used in innovative ways in the service of teacher education or of a variety of dissemination activities. Comments by respondents indicate that some resources are perhaps unused for lack of staff and faculty time to exploit their potential.

Several centres claim that many goals are of the first rank, as discussed in Chapter IV. It is possible that some centres have not set priorities. One respondent commented that the questionnaire itself provided her, as a new director, with "the opportunity for interfaculty communication and goal setting." Some centres, on the other hand, may have generous resources which allow several goals to be high priority.

This raises a question addressed by many of the evaluative studies of laboratory schools cited in Chapter II; that is, the multi-faceted role of teachers in the programs and the demands which the needs of children and their parents, research projects, students, visitors and field workers all make upon their time. Among the projects desired by centres if resources allowed, were some extensive ones such as coordination or centralization of services. Yet the strains on centres which try to be all things to all

people is well documented in the literature, and is expressed by one respondent in this study as a concern for the "burn-out effects" on staff.

It seems clear both from the literature and from responses to the questionnaire used in this investigation that the ability to select, give appropriate status, and achieve commitment of centre personnel may depend upon careful setting of goals and priorities by centre policy makers, and stringent allotment of time to achieve these goals.

Communication Among Canadian

Child Study Centres

It appears from the results of this investigation that child study centre personnel wish to communicate with each other, and that they have many common concerns. Such a communication model may be found in the three-year old Ontario Association of Laboratory Preschools, as commented upon by the present members who share internal problems, research findings and scholarly papers in their twice-yearly meetings.

Two respondents expressed the wish for a national group similar to that of Ontario and the hope that this study might pave the way for its formation by leading to improved communications and identification of common concerns.

Much information about the centres can be exchanged only by face-to-face communication and mutual visits. The limitation of the mailed questionnaire is particularly evident with regard to the children's programs. Descriptions of the children's activities and scaling of the elements of the children's programs showed so much consensus that one might infer that a visit to any one centre would be much like that to any other. Although

this seems highly unlikely, if there is indeed such consensus across Canada about program elements which are essential, a collective statement to that effect might have a powerful effect on practices with the wider population of Canadian children.

If the body of knowledge which collectively the centres represent were consolidated and made available, would it articulate the state of knowledge and practice in Canada? Would it define a field of theory and practice in early childhood? Would it catalogue the problems that are being addressed? Would it then be possible to identify and define questions that are of common and perhaps unique significance to the study of the populace of young Canadian children?

Limitations of Study

Decisions made at the outset of this investigation placed two major limitations on the study.

First, the definition of child study centre used by this study may exclude programs for children operated by universities that do not fall within the study definition, but that contribute significantly to child study in Canada. This study is exploratory, surveying programs in different institutions and geographic areas in Canada, many that are invisible in the literature. It was important to define a child study centre precisely in order to gather information about programs with some common characteristics.

A second major limitation relates to sampling. Many programs for young children are operated by Canadian community colleges in conjunction with their early childhood education departments, children's programs which would be expected to show some characteristics in common with those operated

by degree-granting institutions. A decision to exclude these programs from this investigation was made because of the expectation that research might be a function of some child study centres in degree-granting institutions, but not in community colleges, and a full range of functions was to be explored.

The 100% response to the survey, and the completion by all respondents of all closed questions and the majority of open questions are satisfactory results of the investigative procedures outlined in Chapter III. However, the survey responses brought to light some deficiencies in the questionnaire format and content, as follows:

1. Few centres enclosed lists of publications, reports or brochures, as requested in the letter accompanying the questionnaire (Appendix A). This may have been an oversight rather than a lack of material, suggesting that such a request should appear in the body of the questionnaire itself.
2. Responses to questions about children's programs and activities (Q10, 11) showed such slight differences amongst the centres that it seems highly questionable whether it is possible to determine the flavor and quality of children's experiences by means of a mailed questionnaire.
3. A question about landmarks in the development of centres (Q27) elicited few responses and these provided little additional information to that provided in the open questions which followed. Such a question might better appear in a historical study where it could be expanded and clarified, rather than in a study of the present status of centres.

4. Rank ordering was not a completely effective way of learning the centres' priorities, as described in Chapter IV (Q18). The respondents were clearly asked to rank the goals, although a mis-print read "from one to nine" instead of "from one to seven" and this may have proved confusing.

While for the most part the survey brought full and satisfactory results, the necessity to use a mailed questionnaire was a regrettable limitation of this study. Child study centres bring together people who must work closely: parents and children who belong to families and neighborhoods, staff members with varied backgrounds and philosophies, students with many motivations and interests, faculty members with multitudes of responsibilities and differing academic convictions. These people merge their interests for the betterment of children not only in the centre but beyond its doors. A mailed questionnaire cannot result in a description of the human interactions required to achieve such a complex task.

Recommendations for Further Study and Action

The comprehensive appraisal recommended twenty years ago by Ross and quoted in Chapter II, of the problems which are being addressed and which need to be addressed in the study of young Canadian children has never been carried out. Yet all but two of the present twenty-two child study centres in Canada have been established since that time. Until the present study was carried out, no catalogue existed to make these centres visible to each other and to others interested in their work.

The present study points to several gaps in present knowledge and suggests that child study centres are in a unique position to help fill the following needs:

1. to identify pivotal programs for children operated by institutions of higher learning, including the community colleges, which are having an impact on programs and practices with the general populace of young Canadian children;
2. to survey vital questions being asked about young Canadian children;
3. to assign priority to those questions which have the most effective application to children in life situations;
4. to use Canadian journals and publications of Canadian professional and advocacy organizations to describe the work now being done in the three categories above;
5. to create a direct communication link among child study centres in Canada in order to facilitate the accomplishment of common goals.

The high dependency of young children, and the widespread lack of supports for their families demand that Canada makes the most effective use of the sources of scholarship and leadership which are available for guidance. Child study centres may be uniquely suited to fulfill this urgent need. They face difficult questions of academic and professional boundaries, of choosing and balancing a variety of functions, and of defining and diversifying their supports. This study points to the need for communication and collective action on the part of the centres to begin to solve these difficult questions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ainsworth, Mary D. Infancy in Uganda. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1967.

Object relations, dependency, and attachment: a theoretical review of the infant-mother relationship. Child Development, 1969, 40, 969-1025.

Almy, Millie. Spontaneous play: an avenue for intellectual development. Child Study, 1966, 28, 2-14.

American Association of Teachers' Colleges, Committee On Standards and Surveys. School and Community Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education, 1948.

Anderson, Roberta, et al. Interdisciplinary Teacher Education in Early Childhood. Minnesota: Mankato State College, School of Education, 1973.

Aubertine, Horace E. The renaissance of the laboratory schools. A Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association of Laboratory Schools. Chicago, 1972.

Barnard, Henry. On Normal Schools. Hartford: Case, Tiffany and Co., 1851. (Reprint by Colorado State Teachers College, 1929)

Bernhardt, Karl S., Millichamp, Dorothy A., Charles, Marion W., & McFarland, Mary P. An Analysis of the Social Contacts of Preschool Children With the Aid of Motion Pictures. University of Toronto Studies: Child Development Series #10. University of Toronto Press, 1937.

Bixby, Paul W. & Mitzel, Harold E. (eds.) Campus School to a Research and Dissemination Center. University Park: Pennsylvania State University, 1963.

Blackmon, C. Robert (ed.) Laboratory Schools, U. S. A. - Studies and Readings. Southwestern Studies: Humanities Series, #3. Lafayette: University of Southwestern Louisiana, 1970.

Blair, Lois C., Curtis, Dwight K. & Moon, A. C. The Purposes, Functions and Uniqueness of the College-Controlled Laboratory School. Lock Haven, Pa.: Association for Student Teaching, 1958.

Blatz, W. E. The theory of human security. In Lois M. Brockman, John H. Whiteley & John P. Zubek (eds.) Child Development: Selected Readings. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1973, 150-166.

Human Security. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1966.

Understanding the Young Child. London: University of London Press Ltd., 1951.

- _____. The Five Sisters, a Study of Child Psychology. Toronto: McLelland and Stewart, 1938.
- _____, Allin, Kathleen Drew, Millichamp, Dorothy A. A Study of Laughter in the Nursery School Child. University of Toronto Studies: Child Development Series #7. University of Toronto Press, 1936.
- _____. & Bott, Helen. The Management of Young Children. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1930.
- _____. & Griffin, J. D. M. An Evaluation of the Case Histories of a Group of Preschool Children. University of Toronto Studies: Child Development Series #6. University of Toronto Press, 1936.
- _____. & Millichamp, Dorothy A. The Development of Emotion in the Infant. University of Toronto Studies: Child Development Series #4. University of Toronto Press, 1935.
- _____. Millichamp, Dorothy A. & Fletcher, Margaret. Nursery Education Theory and Practice. New York: William Morrow and Company, 1935.
- Bloom, L. Language Development: Form and Function in Emerging Grammars. Cambridge, Mass.: M. I. T. Press, 1970.
- Bott, E. A. Founding of the Institute of Child Study. In Institute of Child Study Staff. Twenty-Five Years of Child Study. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1951, 13-17.
- Bott, Helen. Observation of play activities in a nursery school. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1928, 4 (1), 44-88.
- _____. Method in Social Studies of Young Children. University of Toronto Studies: Child Development Series #1. University of Toronto Press, 1933.
- _____. Adult Attitudes to Children's Misdemeanours. University of Toronto Studies: Child Development Series #8. The University of Toronto Press, 1937.
- Borg, Walter R. & Gall, Meredith D. Educational Research. New York: David McKay Compant Inc., 1971.
- Bowlby, J. Child Care and the Growth of Love. London: Pelican, 1953.
- Bradbury, Dorothy E. The contribution of the child study movement to child psychology. Psychological Bulletin, 1937, 34, 21-38.
- Braun, Samuel J. & Edwards, Esther P. History and Theory of Early Childhood Education. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1972.

- Bredin, Grace. The Child Study Centre of the University of British Columbia: its history and development. Journal of Education, Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia, January, 1966, 39-47.
- Brown, R., Cazden, C., & Bellugi, U. The child's grammar from I to III. In J. P. Hill (ed.), Minnesota Symposium on Child Psychology. Vol. 2. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1969, 28-73.
- Canadian Education Association. The C. E. A. Handbook. Toronto: Canadian Education Association, 1977.
- Child Study, The Bulletin of the Institute of Child Study, Spring 1966, 28 (1). The curriculum evolves.
- _____. Spring 1967, 29 (1). Another look at the Curriculum.
- Clark, Barbara S. The Brunswick Cornwallis Pre-School: a programme for disadvantaged white and negro children. Child Study, fall 1967, 29 (3 & 4), 17-27.
- Davis, Carroll. Room to Grow: A Study of Parent-Child Relationships. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1966.
- Deighton, Lee C. (editor-in-chief) The Encyclopedia of Education. The MacMillan Company and the Free Press, 1971.
- Dewey, John. The Child and the Curriculum: The School and Society. Chicago: Phoenix Books, University of Chicago Press, 1966.
- Esson, E. Joanne. The preparation of nursery school teachers at Ryerson Polytechnical Institute. Child Study, spring 1968, 30 (1), 8-9.
- Ferguson, C. A. Baby talk in six languages. American Anthropologist, 1964, 66, 103-114.
- Fletcher, Margaret I. & Denison, Margaret Conboy. A Nursery Revue: Songs and Playlets. Boston: The Boston Music Company, 1955.
- _____. The New High Road of Song for Nursery Schools and Kindergartens. Toronto: W. J. Gage Limited, 1960.
- Flint, Betty M. The Child and the Institution: A Study of Deprivation and Recovery. University of Toronto Press, 1966.
- _____. The Security of Infants. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1959.
- _____. New Hope for Deprived Children. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978.
- Forest, I. School for the Child From Two to Eight. New York: Ginn, 1935.

- Frank, Laurence. The beginnings of child development and family life education. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1962, 207-227.
- Gay, L. R. Educational Research. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1976.
- Good, Carter V. (ed.) Dictionary of Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.
- _____. Introduction to Educational Research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1973.
- _____. & Scates, Douglas E. Methods of Research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963.
- Grapko, Michael F. The construction of a primary form of the Institute of Child Study Security Test (The Story of Tommy). The Bulletin of the Institute of Child Study, winter 1965, 27 (4), 3-12.
- Greenberg, Norm. U. W. O. Laboratory Preschool: reports on research. Department of Psychology, The University of Western Ontario, June 1977 (Mimeo).
- Howd, M. Curtis & Browne, Kenneth A. National Survey of Campus Laboratory Schools 1969. The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1970.
- Hunter, Madeline. Expanding roles of laboratory schools. Phi Delta Kappan, September 1970, 52, 14-19.
- Hymes, James L. Jr. Early Childhood Education: An Introduction to the Profession. Washington, D. C.: The National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1969.
- Institute of Child Study. Program of Studies. Faculty of Education, University of Toronto, 1978.
- Jackson, Lola. Personal Communication, 1979.
- Johnson, Harriet M. Children in the Nursery School. New York: The John Day Company, 1928.
- _____. School Begins at Two. New York: New Republic, 1936.
- Kelley, Evan Hugh. College-Controlled Laboratory Schools in the United States, 1964. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1964.
- Landreth, Catherine. Child laboratories on university campuses. Child Development, 1964, 35, 989-992.
- Lueck, Phyllis E. Planning an outdoor learning environment. Theory Into Practice, 197 , 12 (2), 121-127.

- McGeoch, Dorothy M. Function and Future: The Public Campus Laboratory Schools in Wisconsin. U. S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare: Office of Education, 1968.
- _____. The Campus Laboratory School: Phoenix or Dodo Bird? Washington, D. C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1971.
- McNeill, D. The acquisition of Language: The Study of Developmental Psycholinguistics. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.
- Millichamp, Dorothy A. The organization of the Institute and its place in the community. In Institute of Child Study Staff, Twenty-five Years of Child Study. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1951, 18-25.
- _____. An overview of preschool teacher preparation. Certification of preschool teachers. Child Study, spring 1968, 30 (1), 18-24.
- _____. & Northway, Mary L. Conversations at Caledon. Toronto: The Brora Centre, 1977.
- Northway, Mary L. Laughter in the Front Hall. Toronto: The University of Toronto Press, 1966.
- _____. Child study in Canada: A casual History. In Lois M. Brockman, John H. Whiteley & John P. Zubek (eds.), Child Development: Selected Readings. McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1973, 11-46.
- _____. and Research Staff. The research programme and the longitudinal study. Bulletin of the Institute of Child Study, 1964, 26 (1), 1-19.
- _____. and Institute of Child Study Staff. Well Children. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1956.
- M. L. N. & N. F. Karl S. Bernhardt: Editor 1938 to 1964. Bulletin of the Institute of Child Study, 1965, 27 (2), 12-13.
- O'Bryan K. G., Kuplowska, O. M. & O'Bryan, M. H. The Junior Kindergarten Study. Ministry of Education, Ontario. Toronto: The Ontario Institute of Studies in Education, 1975.
- O'Connell, M. Sheila. Child Study Survey. Institute of Child Study, University of Toronto, 1968 (mimeo).
- Ohm, Robert (ed.) The Laboratory School Administrators Newsletter, 2, January, 1960.
- Omwake, Eveline. Preschool programs in historical perspective. Interchange, 1971, 2 (2), 27-40.
- Osborn, D. Keith. Early Childhood Education in Historical Perspective. The University of Georgia: Education Associates, 1975.

- Parten, Mildred. Surveys, Polls and Samples. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1950.
- Perrodin, Alex F. (ed.) Functions of Laboratory Schools in Teacher Education. Thirty-Fourth Yearbook, Association for Student Teaching. Cedar Falls, Iowa: the Association, 1955.
- Piaget, J. The Language and Thought of the Child. Cleveland: Meridian Books, 1955.
- _____. Play, Dreams and Imitation in Childhood. New York: Norton, 1962.
- Quigley, Laurence A. & Chaves, Arthur (eds.) Report of the Task Force on Teacher Education and Laboratory Schools. Massachusetts State College System. U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Institute of Education, 1974.
- Rubin, Kenneth H. Play behaviors of young children. Young Children, 1977, 32 (6), 16-24.
- Russell, Bertrand. On Education (published in North America as Education and the Good Life) New York: Boni & Liveright, 1926.
- Staff of the Institute of Child Study, Parent Education Division. Outlines for Parent Education Groups: Discipline. University of Toronto Studies: Child Development Series #5. University of Toronto Press, ND.
- Stapleford, Elsie. History of the Day Nurseries Branch: A Personal Record. Government of Ontario: Ministry of Community and Social Services, 1976.
- State of Florida, Department of Education. Evaluation of State University Laboratory Schools. U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Institute of Education, 1976.
- State University System of Florida. Campus Laboratory Schools in the State University System of Florida. U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, 1969.
- Van Til, William. The Laboratory School: Its Rise and Fall? Indiana State University and Laboratory Schools Administrators Association. U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, 1969.
- Williams, E. I. F. The Actual and Potential Use of Laboratory Schools in State Normal Schools and Colleges. Contributions to Education, No. 846. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, Bureau of Publications, 1942.

Wright, Mary J. Recent trends in early childhood education in the U. S. A. and Canada. In Lois M. Brockman, John H. Whiteley & John P. Zubek, (eds.) Child Development: Selected Readings. McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1973, 271-280.

. Compensatory Education for Preschoolers: A Non-technical Report on the U. W. O. Preschool Project. Department of Psychology, University of Western Ontario, London, Canada, 1978.

APPENDIX A

LETTERS

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

(Name, position and institution of administrator)

I am a graduate student in early childhood education at the University of British Columbia, advised by Dr. Glen Dixon.

I am requesting information from you which will allow me to collect data for my M. A. thesis during April and May, 1978.

Would you please answer the two questions on the enclosed self-addressed card, at your earliest convenience? The questions are defined below.

The information which I will put together about child study centres in Canada will undoubtedly be of interest to all the centres.

Thank you for your assistance.

Yours very truly,

(Signed)

Dona Coates

Definition of questions:

1. Does your institution operate a child study centre or centres in any capacity or faculty, as defined here?

Child Study Centre: a group program for children of any age between birth and nine years old which has as part of its mission the development and/or dissemination of knowledge about children and/or children's programs.

Operated by your institution: a child study centre will be considered to be operated by a degree-granting institution if that institution assumes at least half the capital or operating costs of the centre, or administers funds which do so.

2. The name, address and telephone number of the person or people whom I should contact for further information.

Person or people: those most knowledgeable about the centre or centres.

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

(Name, Institution and address of person named by administrator)

I am a graduate student in early childhood education at the University of British Columbia, advised by Dr. Glen Dixon. I am conducting a study on the status of child study centres operated by degree-granting institutions in Canada.

My hope is that a study describing the twenty Canadian child study centres could provide a basis for further communication for those who are concerned about child development in this country. Mutual knowledge of the varied missions and functions of the centres could result in cross-fertilization of ideas about the development, examination and dissemination of exemplary child care/education practices in Canada.

You have been named by the dean or head of your department as the person who is best informed about your child study centre.

Two kinds of information are requested for this study.

1. The enclosed questionnaire refers to a wide range of possible child study centre functions. Some questions may have scant relevance to your centre, while others may require elaboration. Would you take time to complete this questionnaire before the end of September?
2. Should a list of publications about the child study centre be available; should members of its staff or faculty have published material about the centre or its work; or should reports or brochures supplying information about the centre be available, these would be valuable additions to a composite picture of Canadian child study centres' activities.

You will be provided with a summary of the study findings, and the questionnaire provides a space for the name and address to which this should be sent. If warranted, the results of the study will be published in a relevant Canadian journal.

With the utmost appreciation of your time and effort, I am,

Yours very truly,
(Signed)

Dona Coates

APPENDIX B

RESPONSES TO OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

RESPONSES TO QUESTION 29

IDEAS OR PROJECTS DESIRED (N=19)

Children's Programs

A more diverse program for children (toddler; 3 year olds; 4 year olds; 5 year olds).

A program that began with infants through to 5 year olds, probably day care, to provide excellent and necessary services to the community as well as providing the possibility for longitudinal studies in research.

More children from low socioeconomic backgrounds - transportation is a problem and one that we don't have money to resolve.

Compensatory program offered to "disadvantaged" and other special populations.

More "scholarship" children (i.e., ones from low-income families).

We intend to move into the area of early education of gifted children. Additional resources not anticipated to be necessary.

A daycare centre - we need another room and time/energy to organize.

Resident classes.

Broader base of selection - socioeconomic.

Integration of special needs children.

Physical Facilities

A new physical facility.

Larger facility to allow more movement (gross motor skills development) to the children.

Parent Education

Systematic parent education.

We are seeking ways to expand involvement of parents in the program's operation.

We would like to see more opportunities to work with parents both in the laboratory setting and in home environments.

Research

More research involving range of children's ages, 3 to 11, on child development, related to such things as reading, attitudinal development.

Research at the program level and at the individual level.

Longitudinal study of children attending same centre from 2 - 5 years of age.

A research component (designated staff).

Research on children's play.

Curriculum development.

Development of A/V Materials

More filming/videotaping/parent education programs - again its a matter of who has the time and energy as we don't have money for more staff.

Use of video-tape to collect and analyze data relating to behavioral change in preschool setting of selected children.

A series of films which demonstrate: children's conversations with one another; teachers talking with children; children's ability to make choices; views of significant behaviors that occur in a classroom where children are in control.

Audiovisual material.

Community Service

Community service developed in such areas as:

- workshops for day care workers and nursery school teachers
- diploma course for day care workers
- encouragement of a professional organization (e.g., local C. A. Y. C.)
- cooperation with others advocating better provision for young children (parents, social workers, health workers, etc.)

Il nous faut un Centre de coordination pour les services à l'enfant pour le secteur français de la province du Nouveau-Brunswick. Cette année à cause de l'année internationale de l'enfant nous faisons des démarches pour avoir un centre.

Centralization of services for learning disabled children.

Early infant identification and stimulation program.

Supervise infant care group homes or have well developed infant unit.

A resource centre for students and community.

People to work in the various programs.

More service to the community (e.g., a parent education program, counselling service).

RESPONSES TO QUESTION 30

INSIGHTS, CONCERNS, AND QUESTIONS TO SHARE

WITH OTHER CENTRES (N=15)

Uses and Purposes of Centres

Purpose for laboratory schools.

The need for children's centre (2½ - 5 years) to be located within the Faculty of Education building. Teachers should be aware of young children's growth and development.

Exchange of programs, philosophy, etc.

Development of novel programs for Canadian preschools.

Uses to which their centres are put, e.g. availability of the centres for community use.

How are other faculties making use of their "lab" schools for teacher training, research and community involvement?

How to move the Centre from a functional facility to a research facility which also provides a functional service.

Approaches to Teacher Education

Teacher education.

Approaches to student training.

Orientation to training of professionals.

Student participation.

The professional competence of community college trained personnel (an acute problem in Ontario where graduates of CAAT college programs typically unskilled at administering, evaluating, and developing curricula are hired to do administering, etc. Does such a "policy" effect the kids in the programs (how well do these teachers compare to those who have B.A. or M.A. degrees re: various aspects of teacher competence?).

Children's rights in a classroom.

Research

Current research other facilities are involved with.

Early childhood research in Canada on culturally different, cognitive development, self concept and motivation.

What are current research problems being addressed by other faculties?

Cooperative ventures in research, programs, etc.

Research findings (formative and summative evaluations)

Emphasis on research and publications from the child study centres.

Research findings.

Internal Problems of Centres

Le personnel nécessaire pour commencer et faire fonctionner un tel centre.

Planification des activités pour parents et enfants.

Information re: staff salaries in preschool institutions outside of the public school systems.

Time constraints and burn-out effects of lab. school staff.

L'organisation physique d'un centre de services à l'enfant dans un contexte universitaire.

Learning disabilities.

Role of the parents' association.

Regular association with other child study centres.

Ideas about record keeping, program planning (curriculum issues), teaching styles, administrative problems such as salaries.

Teacher selection.

Funding.

RESPONSES TO QUESTION 31

GENERAL COMMENTS (N=13)

The focus in this centre is on training graduate students in psychology. They may opt for a specialty in early childhood education (as part of our M.A. or Ph.D. program). We have produced six M.A.'s and hopefully will produce 3 Ph.D.'s this year who have taken the E.C.E. specialty. The aim is to train scientists in the field who will be able to advance knowledge and give leadership at "high" levels. If they opt for E.C.E. they take the equivalent of a professional year of training as an E.C.E. educator so that they can qualify for certification by the Association for Early Childhood Education, Ontario. One honours E.C.E. course is taught at the undergraduate level but we do not train teachers at the undergraduate level. The course is Psychology 346.

I believe that our preschool centre is fulfilling a need in our community. By maintaining a warm, friendly atmosphere with the children in our program as well as with other members of the community, centres of this type can do a great deal to promote the growth of the young child.

It is a centre where teacher education students actually learn ways of developing an appropriate curriculum for children by listening and observing them. Children are the informers.

The teachers seem to be the determining factor in the successful operation of the centre. The implementation of innovative programs and response to research all depend upon the flexibility and cooperative nature of the teacher.

As a teacher training facility it is highly lauded by the students who participate. Schools in N.B. tend to be very traditional and there is little opportunity for students to see modern educational theory being put into practice within the public school system.

Les stagiaires sont complètement responsables de l'enseignement auprès des enfants, la planification de l'enseignement et des ateliers de parents, le curriculum l'administration budgétaire, le recrutement des enfants, etc. est la responsabilité des stagiaires. C'est un endroit où les stagiaires ont l'entière responsabilité du progrès de l'enfant. De plus elles sont préparées à tout les niveaux pour l'organisation de leur propre centre plus tard.

Our "Centre for Child Studies" was founded four years ago by several enthusiastic and high ranking faculty from various departments. Since this time they have either left the university or gone on to other interests, leaving the Centre under a semi-interested committee of two. The staff have concentrated their efforts on establishing an excellent program for children with enthusiastic parental support. For the most part our centre is unused for research - at least at the present time.

This study should provide the E.C.E. community with some valid information which could help each centre assess its purposes and practices. Certainly it will provide knowledge of Canadian practices to Canadians who then can make clearer judgements.

This study provided a vehicle for interfaculty communication and goal setting re the Children's Centre. I was personally glad that we were asked to complete the questionnaire for this reason. I asked other members of the Early Childhood area and the teachers in the Centre to complete it and then compared the various answers. This has given me, as the new director, a valuable insight into the perspectives of these various people. I look forward to receiving a summary of the results of your survey and I hope you can make the idea of a meeting of faculty people who are involved in centres a reality.

This study could illuminate common problems and concerns.

In Ontario the universities have an informal conference twice a year where lab. school directors and teachers all meet to hear learned papers, discuss programs, status of staff, share ideas and problems and current research. We all find it of great value.

You should be aware that a group exists which discusses many of the aspects of your questionnaire on a regular basis (twice a year). The Ontario Universities Laboratory Preschool Group has been meeting for over 3 years now (includes Carlton, Guelph, Ryerson, Institute for Child Study, McMaster, Western and Waterloo). Would be nice to have a national group meeting at some point. I'd be pleased to aid in the organization of such a meeting at some point.

If this study could lead to improved communications and perhaps an association of representatives of child study centres, that would be useful.