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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

General statement and purpose: In 1939 the Commission on Teacher Education of the American Council on Education, through its Division on Child Development and Teacher Personnel, began a five-year study in the field of helping teachers understand children. Since its beginnings the program has been extended until at the present time there are teachers, school nurses, supervisors, administrators, and parents participating in Child Study groups in the school systems of several states and Washington, D. C. A number of the present programs have been in existence for several years. In the Parker School District, Greenville, South Carolina, where the program has been in effect for

---

1"The American Council on Education is a council of national education associations; organizations having related interests; approved universities, colleges, and technical schools, state departments of education; city school systems; selected private secondary schools; and selected educational departments of business and industrial companies. It is a center of cooperation and coordination whose influence has been apparent in the shaping of educational policies as well as in the formulation of American educational practices during the past twenty-eight years. Many leaders in American education and public life serve on the committees and the commissions through which the Council operates." (The Improvement of Teacher Education, prepared for the Commission on Teacher Education by Karl W. Bigelow. Washington: American Council on Education, 1946. End paper.)


3Arkansas, California, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, Virginia.
more than eleven years, a three-year study of children by all teachers
is basic to everything they do in the total school program. It is an
accepted part of the in-service training of all new teachers who enter
that District. In two states, Maryland and Texas, Child Study programs
have expanded until they are now statewide. In Louisiana, Child Study
programs have been in existence in twelve parishes and in the City of
Monroe - in one parish for seven years, in the others for six years.\footnote{Caddo, East Carroll, West Carroll, Franklin, Jackson, Lincoln,
Madison, Morehouse, Ouachita, Richland, Union, and Webster.}
Three new parishes undertook the program in 1950-51.\footnote{Bienville, Tensas, and Red River.} There is interest in Louisiana in establishing the program on a statewide basis.

Some steps have already been taken in that direction in New Jersey.
The growth and expansion of the Child Study program since its incep-
tion in 1939 seems sufficiently significant to warrant the present
investigation. What were the reasons that impelled the Commission to
establish a Division on Child Development and Teacher Personnel? Why
did this Division undertake the steps it took? How did the work of
the Division result in the Child Study program? What are the factors
in the program responsible for its widespread development? What is in-
volved in the development of statewide Child Study programs? In what
ways is it feasible to develop a program in states where it is not now
operating? These are some of the questions that this study will seek
to investigate.

\textit{Definition and limitation of the study.} This study is concerned
with three major tasks. The first deals with analyzing the steps that
led up to the emergence of a program of Child Study through the work of the Commission on Teacher Education. This includes the findings of the Commission which led to the establishment of the Division on Child Development and Teacher Personnel, the steps the Division took, the reasons why it took those steps, and the results that ensued.

The second task calls for an analysis of how statewide programs emerged in Texas and Maryland.

The final task involves the analysis of conditions and processes that seem to be essential in developing statewide programs of Child Study.

Limitation of the term "Child Study program." The term "Child Study program" as used in these pages will refer to the programs of in-service education of teachers in the understanding of children, that have been or are being carried on in local situations under local coordinators, and that either received consultant service in the early stages of the program from the Collaboration Center on Human Development at the University of Chicago or are at present receiving such service from the Institute for Child Study at the University of Maryland, from the Extension Division of the University of Texas, or from the Atlanta Area Teachers Education Project. Pre-service education in understanding children will be touched upon only if it is appropriate to the issue, but a detailed account of developments in this area is outside the scope of this study.

Availability of information. The materials for the first task, that of discovering the factors which led to the launching of this attempt to help teachers understand children and which were the bases for the initial plans of the Division, are readily obtainable, for the
Commission's work culminated in a complete series of published reports on all phases of its work.

Data for the second task, concerning the programs in Texas and Maryland, have had to be obtained mainly through interviews with persons who have coordinated the various programs since their inception, with local and county superintendents of schools, with state, county, and city supervisors, and with some participants. From twenty-five to fifty persons in different posts and in different relationships to the program were interviewed in each state. Letters and other documents in the various centers as well as those in the files of the Institute for Child Study were additional sources of data.

The third task, involving primarily conclusions and recommendations, will necessarily be based on the materials assembled in the pages of this study.

Organization of this study. The first five chapters provide a background against which the development of statewide Child Study programs can be more clearly seen and understood. They point up the factors which led to the development of a program of Child Study and describe what that program is. Chapter II is concerned with some of the important circumstances and ideas of the times that influenced the members of the Commission on Teacher Education in making their policies and plans. Chapter III proposes to describe the establishment of the

---

6The Improvement of Teacher Education, Appendix B. Except for the Proceedings of the Collaboration Center and the reports made by local centers to the Division on Child Development and Teacher Personnel, original sources from which these published reports were written are no longer available. (Information obtained by telephone on October 10, 1950, from Mr. Robert Quick at the office of the American Council on Education in Washington, D. C.)
Commission and the emergence of its study. It also seeks to ascertain the reasons why the Commission saw fit to create the Division on Child Development and Teacher Personnel. Chapter IV seeks to examine the work of the Division on Child Development and Teacher Personnel and how the steps it took resulted in a Child Study program. Chapter V aims to describe the present Child Study program.

The next three chapters deal with the statewide programs in Texas and Maryland. Chapter VI seeks to describe the program in Texas, and Chapter VII to do the same for the program in Maryland. Chapter VIII proposes to analyze these programs and seeks to identify 1) the factors which have been common in the success of these programs, 2) the processes that were common to all of the programs and that seem essential to the development of a program, and 3) factors and processes that were unique or peculiar to particular local situations or which were experimental and later found to be unnecessary or undesirable.

The analysis of the development of the program in these two states reveals significant factors in the statewide program of Child Study. On the basis of this analysis Chapter IX contains the author's conclusions regarding the factors involved in the extension of Child Study into additional state areas.

Possible value of this study. This study assembles and preserves an account of the early stages of a program which promises to be an important factor in the improvement of the educative process in the United States and elsewhere. It presents an account of the work of the Collaboration Center on Human Development at the University of Chicago and of the Institute for Child Study at the University of Maryland in launching and developing Child Study programs in Parker
School District, South Carolina, and in two states, Texas and Maryland. The analysis of the experiences of these places may be of value in developing statewide programs of Child Study in other places that may wish to consider the development of a program. This study may also be useful for strengthening the Child Study programs as they develop in the thirteen states not considered in this study but that have programs currently in operation.
CHAPTER II

TEACHER EDUCATION: A PROBLEM OF THE TIMES

Purpose of the chapter. The initial action steps that eventually led to the emergence of an in-service program of helping teachers understand children were taken by the Commission on Teacher Education of the American Council on Education. But this was not the beginning of thinking about such a program. The seeds of any full-blown program are found in the developments of the past which mature to a point at which action can and must be taken. The Commission did not act in a vacuum. What it did was immersed in the ideas and circumstances that characterized the period. The policies, the plans, the decisions the Commission made were greatly influenced by the times. This chapter will describe the prevalent conditions and ideas which led to the establishment of the Commission and influenced its work.

Teacher education in the 1930s. This period was marked by widespread interest in teacher education and its improvement. This wide interest was highlighted in the preparations for the centennial celebration of the founding of the first normal school in 1839 at Lexington, Massachusetts. Much had happened in teacher education in those hundred years, especially in the last decades which saw rapid and extraordinary changes which inevitably brought concomitant difficulties and problems. By the end of the century there was a great deal of criticism of teacher education both from outside and from within its own ranks.

The first world war, just as the second, had effects on teacher
Financial support was greatly reduced. Experienced teachers left in large numbers to take positions outside the field of education. Enrollment in teacher training institutions dropped. The shortage of teachers caused qualifications to be lowered and vacancies were filled by persons poorly equipped even according to the lowered standards.

The period between the two wars, however, was characterized by rapid expansions and advances in education. There was an influx of students into the high schools and colleges of the country which led to an insistent demand for qualified teachers. Salaries were raised, tenure improved to attract such teachers. As young people began to enter teaching in greater numbers it became possible to raise the requirements for certification. It also became possible to increase the amount of time a teacher spent in preparation. Many normal schools became four-year degree-granting teachers colleges. By 1940 one third of the states required degrees, and this qualification was met even in many states where it was not a requirement for certification. Not only was preparation taking longer, but there was a strong stimulation to keep on studying while in service. Teachers were crowding summer sessions and extension courses for further study, much of it leading to advanced degrees. To meet these demands, colleges and universities greatly expanded their services, especially in the graduate schools.²

¹The story of the war and the period following it has been told in Teacher Education in a Democracy at War, prepared for the Commission by Edward S. Eyrenden. Washington: American Council on Education, 1942. xi + 204 pp.

²The development of the graduate school and current graduate school problems are described and analysed in Toward Improving Ph. D. Programs, prepared for the Commission by Ernest V. Hollis. Washington: American Council on Education, 1945. xii + 204 pp.
The expansion was not without its serious problems. More and more of the courses offered were of limited scope, this being an age of specialization, and there arose a controversy between subject matter specialists and educationists as to how much time the student should spend on each phase of his advanced study. Another problem was that teachers in service did not have the time to spend a whole year in integrated study. The advanced work became more or less a piecemeal accumulation of credits. Teacher education institutions were severely criticized on these scores.

There were also criticisms of another kind. Rapid expansion with its resulting problems was characteristic not only of teacher education in this period, but of the whole educational scene. The enlarged enrollments, especially in the secondary school, the democratization of secondary education, forced changes in curriculum for which the traditionally trained teachers were unprepared. Pressure was continually being brought to bear on teacher training institutions to give the kind of training that would help teachers to deal effectively with the new type of students and the new problems. But this was not enough. Teachers on the job needed help. They had to find some solutions to the problems which confronted them. There was, for example, the problem of curriculum revision, for which they felt unprepared. To meet these problems school systems began to work on improving their school programs locally. Some curriculum revision programs were undertaken on a statewide basis. A great deal of the success of these programs depended on the quality of the teachers. In both the local and statewide programs the demand for well-trained teachers grew increasingly vocal. There was a feeling that teacher education was not keeping up
with the needs of the schools. Nor was it keeping up with the needs of the times.3

The social scene. It is not surprising that education was having its difficulties, for education along with every other institution felt the stress of the period. The times were characterized by tremendous and rapid changes rarely if ever experienced in the world. New discoveries and inventions had been changing every aspect of human living, notably industry, agriculture, and trade. Increase in leisure time brought with it increased emphasis on adult education. Family life was undergoing sweeping modifications. Religious beliefs were severely affected, basic convictions shaken. Traditional patterns of behavior were losing their sacredness.

There seemed to be something wrong with western civilization. Laissez-faire capitalism which developed the nation was coming to be regarded by many as a maladjusting force. There was the feeling that the social and economic systems that had been devised threatened to engulf all human beings unless they learned to develop a kind of organization in which human beings would be valued. A growing concern with the meaning of democracy and its processes was showing itself in all aspects of living. A great deal of thought was being given to the kind of citizens needed in a democracy, the nature of human beings, and how it was possible to develop personalities who were able to build

---

3A full account of the situation in teacher education when the Commission began its work, and of the Commission's views on the situation has been given in the Commission's first report, Teachers for Our Times, a Statement of Purposes. Washington: American Council on Education, 1945. xix + 178 pp. For sources of the foregoing exposition see especially Chapter I, passim.
sound values to live by, cope with the problems of the times, and enjoy rich, full lives. 

Interest in the nature of human beings. A very large body of research information was accumulated immediately after the first world war because of interest in human beings. As a result there was a maturing of a number of significant points of view both here and abroad. On the other side of the ocean, Freud and Beuhler in Austria, Kretschmer and Stern in Germany, Jung and Piaget in Switzerland, Janet in France, Decroly in Belgium, and Burt in England were some who were concerned with understanding why people behave as they do, and with utilizing constructively the implications of their new knowledge.

In this country and Canada much of the interest and work centered in Institutes, which were established at various universities. Among these were the Institute for Child Welfare at the University of California, the Iowa Child Welfare Research Station at the University of Iowa, the Institute for Child Welfare at the University of Minnesota, the Institute of Child Study at the University of Toronto, the Institute of Human Relations at Yale, the Psychological Clinic at Harvard, the Brush Foundation at Western Reserve, the Fels Research Institute at Antioch, and the Department of Child Study at Vassar. Other important researches were being undertaken by the American Youth Commission and by various committees of the Progressive Education Association.

Many of these research studies were being supported by foundations such as the Commonwealth Fund, the General Education Board, the Josiah Macy Jr. Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the Laura Spellman

---

^Ibid., Chapter II, passim.
Rockefeller Memorial Fund.

There was something new about all this research information. In the first place, there was the recognition that statistical norms of central tendency did not represent a picture of normal development. To understand normal development of individual children it was necessary to look for a pattern in something other than averages. In the second place, the research showed that averages based on measurements of large numbers of children at each successive chronological age covered up the true picture of individual development. To understand individual development, longitudinal research had to be done on individual children. In the third place, it gradually came to be recognized that a human being is shaped by a whole series of interrelated and interacting forces and that these cannot be studied separately if individuals are to be understood.

The emergence of these points of view is an interesting story. Psychological research was naive at first. There was little concern about methods other than introspection. By the early twenties, however, the study of human development and behavior was becoming more objective and quantified. In their desire to establish the study of human beings as a science, psychologists were following the methods of classical physics. Thus the methods of the psychologists were focused primarily upon the study of specific traits and capacities and investigators were concerned with devising instruments to measure these quantitatively and objectively. Lawrence K. Frank notes about this period:

At the height of this activity, child psychologists seemed bent upon substituting statistics for insights and ignoring, if not denying, other aspects of child behavior that could not be brought within the rigid prescriptions of a standardized test.
...The increasing prestige of the statistical methods not only operated to condition the problems which students selected for study but to a great extent necessitated the search for larger samples of child population from which could be derived the arrays of data that were necessary for this method. In turn, the very labor and cost of examining or measuring these large populations tended to limit the investigations to one or two aspects, or what are called "variables."

... Thus psychologists and investigators in other disciplines were at one time using the same group of child subjects with little or no interest in each other's work or attempt to utilize these diverse data for a better understanding of the children or the specific problems each was investigating.5

However, about that time, developments in scientific thinking were revolutionizing physical science.6 Scientists had learned that simple quantitative methods were limited in their capacity to solve the problems of this space-time world, and they were increasingly more concerned with formulating new concepts and devising new methods in keeping with these new conceptions. Scientific investigations were increasingly concerned with patterns, configurations, and fields, reflecting the movement away from the older atomistic conceptions and methods. Consequently, these developments in physical science were offering immense possibilities for advancing psychology as soon as the new concepts and assumptions were understood and the new criteria and methodologies could be accepted by psychologists.

Two lines of activity were slowly developing that were significant-

---


6 Fuller treatment of this subject may be found in Lawrence K. Frank, Projective Methods. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1948. Chapters I and II.
ly to hasten the above condition. One was the interest of pediatricians in problems of physical growth of individual children. The other was the concern of workers in child guidance clinics with the behavior of individual children.

Pediatricians and anatomists, starting with an interest in establishing norms, began to study and record various aspects of physical growth and development. They found that children of the same chronological age differed to an almost astonishing degree in measurements and in the capacity for physical performance. They were compelled to see the discrepancy between the statistical norms they were attempting to construct and the living material to which these were expected to apply.

The child guidance clinics were called upon to give help with children who presented behavior problems. Here the psychiatrists used clinical techniques.

The clinical method may be described as essentially relative, in the sense that it seeks to use all possible instruments and techniques for quantitative determination of the various parts and functions of the patient, but it insists that those quantitative findings must be ordered to the very specific, idiomatic frame of reference found in the individual patient with his peculiar personal life situation.7

Thus these techniques took into account the uniqueness of each individual and the fact that each individual has a life history, the understanding of which is essential to any attempt at diagnosis. The techniques also involved predicting how the individual would get along in the immediate and longer-term future on the basis of the therapeu-

7Child Behavior and Development, p. 5.
tic procedures offered by the psychiatrist. The clinical approach introduced the process of basing judgments upon the interaction of numerous dynamic factors within an organized configuration.

Up to the late 1920s the assumptions had been prevalent that one could construct norms appropriate for each chronological age group, on the grounds (1) that all children in each age group had equal opportunity to learn, and consequently (2) that any shortcoming was determined by lack of native capacity. On the basis of these assumptions it had been concluded that there were great differences in inherited mental capacity in different economic, racial and social groups. But there were psychologists who could not accept these assumptions and conclusions, and bitter controversy developed over the relative importance of heredity and environment. 8

To the resolution of this conflict the findings of the pediatricians and the clinical psychologists made two important contributions:

(1) The findings of the pediatricians challenged the assumption that children of the same chronological age are a homogeneous group simply because they have an equal period of organic existence. The evidence showed that children born at the same time differ widely in their development, that although the sequence of development is the same, the rate of development is different. It had also become evident that the developmental sequence showed a wide range of variation and a susceptibility to the influence of nurture.

(2) The findings of the clinicians revealed that a child whose behavior indicated pronounced deviation may have had a life history of

---

8 Ibid., pp. 6-7.
severe emotional difficulties or of deprivation.

Gradually, as Lawrence K. Frank points out, it was being recognized that the child as a living organism will yield as many different data as we have the capacity to record and, if possible, to measure, and that all these data are related as different dimensions of the organic field of the child. The problem of child development therefore shifts the interest from the relation between two variables measured in a large sample of children at one moment to the study of the developmental process as revealed through many different observations and measurements on one child over a period of years.9

Consequently in the early 1930s a different picture was emerging. Extensive data about individuals rather than a few data about masses of children were beginning to be gathered. Longitudinal studies were organized to observe the changing structures, functions and activities of the individual organism transformed through time.

The Harvard Growth Study, for example, used a combination of longitudinal and cross-sectional methods for accumulating data around individual cases. The study showed not only how the longitudinal picture differed from the cross-sectional, but also that chronological age categories produced large distortions in the picture of growth and maturation.10

Longitudinal studies were also being made at the University of

9Ibid., p. 10.

California. Some of the results have recently been published. In the foreword of one published volume Lawrence K. Frank states:

It is the peculiar, if not unique, significance of this study that it has sought for an understanding of process, of the dynamics of growth as revealed by a variety of simultaneous measurements on the same identified individuals, repeated at intervals over a period of years and then interpreted to reveal the underlying processes that have produced these different but equivalent products, in these identified individuals.

Because Dr. Stolz and his associates have courageously explored for new methods of analyzing and interpreting their data in this search for a more holistic conception and for an understanding of the different patterns of achieving maturation, this study makes a definite turning point in the field of child development. It shows how the clinical approach can be used in longitudinal studies.

At the same time that research was going forward on physical growth, similar studies were being made in the field of personality development. This was a new movement, only a few years old in the early 1930s. Yet, in a short time a great amount of valuable material was gathered from child psychology, animal psychology, psychopathology and social psychology.

At first attempts were made to construct instruments that would reliably measure the various specific components and expressions of personality, but by the end of the 1930s there was an increasing distrust of purely statistical methods and a criticism of the indiscrimin-
imate use of tests—a criticism which would have been impossible a few years earlier. Studies, such as the exploratory ones made by Henry A. Murray and his co-workers at the Harvard Psychological Clinic, began to attempt in a variety of ways and from many points of view to depict and account for the manifest individuality of a person. A new concept began to emerge which thought of personality not as an aggregate of discrete traits but as a dynamic process, the continual activity of the individual who is engaged in creating, maintaining and defending that private world wherein he lives. Experimental methods began to be developed to reveal the peculiar idiomatic functioning of the individual. Projective methods, such as the Rorschach Ink Blot, were devised for eliciting from individuals the way they organise and interpret experience and feel toward situations and people. In this country Henry A. Murray developed the Thematic Apperception Test.

In addition to this new research on physical growth and on the pattern of personality development within individuals, there also was emerging a greater readiness to recognize the influence of cultural patterns. Anthropologists were revealing that human nature is highly plastic and can be patterned into an amazing variety of group-sanctioned ways of living and feeling. To understand personality development it became necessary to understand the culture, how the culture is transmitted to the growing child, and how the child under the impact of this cultural training in intimate contact with cultural

---

13The results were published in Henry A. Murray, Explorations in Personality. New York: Oxford University Press, 1938, xiv + 761 pp. (See in particular the introduction, which describes how the study was carried on.)
agents develops his idiomatic ways of perceiving, acting and feeling.\textsuperscript{14} Kurt Lewin and his co-workers at the University of Iowa Child Welfare Research Station were making studies of the interaction of individuals in groups. Karen Horney and other psychoanalysts were making studies that were revealing that personality disorders cannot be understood apart from the culture.

As a result of all these research findings, the child came to be recognized as a dynamic unity of interacting forces. Nevertheless, scientific research continued to remain highly segmented. Data continued to be gathered by separate techniques. A culmination of a tremendous amount of undigested material resulted. It had not been put together. It was not available in understandable form to those who needed to make use of its findings and implications. The situation is cogently summed up by Dr. Daniel A. Prescott:

\textit{We grievously need a comprehensive and authoritative synthesis of essential scientific knowledge about human development and behavior, expressed in non-technical language that will communicate to the average teacher in service and student in training. We have made several efforts ourselves at producing such a synthesis but each time have been stymied by certain problems or conditions that we have not been able to overcome.}

In the first place a comprehensive and balanced synthesis of essential knowledge about human development and behavior involves the selective culling and functional interrelating of essential concepts from the following sciences: genetics, physiology and endocrinology, anatomy and anthropometry, neurology, pediatrics, cultural anthropology, sociology, most of the divisions of psychology, psychiatry, psychoanalysis, mental hygiene and education. The task is greater than a single individual could accomplish except over a period of a quarter-century — and then he would not be up-to-date! The task clearly calls for the collaboration of a group of experts in these sciences. This is very difficult to secure at the college level because the sciences are so segmented, and

\textsuperscript{14}Child Behavior and Development, p. 13.
specialists in each area prefer to write for colleagues in their own specialty rather than to collaborate in producing simple materials for the use of educators.

Even if we had been able to secure specialists in the necessary sciences they would have faced two serious difficulties. They could not simply write separate sections of a report for this would not constitute a synthesis that would show the interrelationships and interaction between the different processes that shape behavior and development. It would first be necessary for them to communicate their basic concepts to each other and to work out a group synthesis. This is very time consuming and difficult because the biological, social, psychological and medical sciences are really in different universes of discourse, employing different basic assumptions, axioms and procedures of investigation. This defines the second difficulty they would face. Each science not only has its own technical vocabulary with which its specialists think but it also has its fundamental assumptions, research techniques and rules for the admission of evidence.

We are not convinced that these difficulties are insurmountable for children are living, behaving and developing every day. We know that forces explored separately by different sciences are interacting to produce the behavior and development that each of us now sees and understands incompletely from our varied perspectives. We know that in truth the child is an individual unity. Surely it is not too much to hope that sooner or later a group of serious scientists will devote themselves as assiduously to the synthesis of our knowledge as they now do to the pursuit of segmented research. 15

Consequently, in spite of the fact that there existed a great body of knowledge about human growth, development, and behavior, educators were still experimenting blindly with all kinds of new methods to see what would "work." "The whole child," "individual differences," "self-expression," "causes of behavior," "learning by doing" were some of the terms that filtered down to the teacher from the cumulated body of knowledge, but very few teachers had insight into the meanings and implications of these terms. Many kinds of "systems" of education

sprang up all over the country. Mental testing, activity programs, teacher-pupil planning, ability grouping, child-centered curricula, core curricula were part of this period of experimentation. But what education needed was to have sound information, scientific reasons for making decisions about the educational program.

Views of the Commission on Teacher Education. This was the picture of the social and educational world as the members of the Commission saw it when they took over their tasks. The Commission was sensitive to the social significance of teacher education. It had the conviction that education can be a powerful instrument of social policy. It felt that education must be responsive to social needs and to the needs of children and must help them to become citizens who can deal constructively with the problems of our times. It saw the school as an instrument for improving ordinary living. It felt that education must move in the direction of perfecting democracy as the only hope for meeting the crisis of our times.16

The effectiveness of the school in respect to the above depended on many factors, but chief among these, the Commission thought, was the quality of the teacher. For this task teachers were needed who had respect for personality, who were community-minded, who acted rationally, who were skilled in cooperating with others. The task needed teachers who had sound, accurate, extensive knowledge, who understood how children grow and develop, and who liked children. It needed teachers who were a part of the social world, who had a philosophy of living as well as a philosophy of education. It needed fine, wholesome human beings, the

16Teachers for Our Times, Chapter I.
very best that could be found to live with the nation's children.17

To obtain such teachers the Commission saw that great improvements needed to be made in the recruitment and selection of, and in the pre-service education of prospective teachers. But most especially there was equal need for programs of in-service education so that growth for the teacher could be continuous and lasting. This in-service program should be centered locally, the Commission felt, where teachers had to grapple with the needs and problems with which they were faced. The Commission was impressed by such evidences of democratic planning and action as in the Tennessee Valley Authority, and felt that such a balance of centralization and decentralization was possible also in teacher education programs. Individuals, groups, institutions might work freely in small units in which it would be possible to have complete participation, and where each person involved would have a share in the making of decisions that affect the whole group. However, there would be a great degree of cooperation among these units on a wide basis, and this cooperation might be encouraged and guided through a more centralized body.

The Commission was sensitive to the educational ideas that were gaining recognition during this period and which had implications for the modification of both pre-service and in-service teacher education. First among these was the growing realization of the importance of understanding the growth and development of children. New insights into the wholeness of human beings were creating serious doubts about many teaching practices and school organizations. These had to be adjusted

17Teachers for Our Times, Chapter IV.
to fit the total needs of developing human beings. A second idea was that children develop not only in school but in the community and the larger society. The relationship of the schools to this society needed to be more clearly worked out. Schools needed to deal with social realities. A third idea resulted from this increasing awareness of children and of a democratic society. More attention was being paid to educational evaluation. Schools were becoming concerned with the goals of education in relation to the developing personalities of children and the demands of society. And they were concerned with the need for establishing criteria to evaluate the achievement of these goals. Finally, a fourth idea was that the method of achieving the educational goals was important. Democratic aims suggested that democratic means be employed if these aims were to be realized. There seemed to be two major emphases in the methods used. One was the emphasis on experimentation, on working out creatively and scientifically the ways needed in the solution of the problems and in reaching the goals set up. The other emphasis was on cooperative study by small groups of participants through which it could be possible to develop democratic relationships, democratic values, and democratic ways of working.16

Summary. At the time when the Commission was established, teacher education was drawing a great deal of notice and criticism. The tremendous rise in the school population led to rapid expansion which resulted in some serious problems. There was an increasing demand for qualified teachers. The colleges and universities were trying to meet

16 These views of the Commission are summarised in The Improvement of Teacher Education, p. 7, and Chapter V, especially pp. 253-255.
this demand, but without carefully made plans. For the most part they
did not know how to prepare teachers for the new kind of teaching.
Teacher education was not keeping up with the needs of the schools.
School systems began to turn their attention to improving their own pro-
grams. It became apparent that some kind of in-service training was
essential if teachers were to keep abreast of the rapidly changing times,
and that this in-service training had to take place locally in connection
with the teachers' work, where teachers were more aware of the nature of
the problems they faced. Teacher education was ready for a change.

The Commission was sensitive to the situation in the social, scien-
tific, and educational world, and its work was strongly influenced by
four educational ideas of the time. First, the Commission felt that it
was important to understand human growth and development, and to work
out the implications for education. Second, it was important for edu-
cation to relate itself to the life of the community and the larger
society. Third, it was necessary to examine the goals of education, to
become clear as to what these goals should be, and to learn to evaluate
the educational program in terms of these goals. Fourth, it was impor-
tant to give attention to method; for democratic goals cannot be attained
except through democratic means.

These four ideas were to have important influence on the subsequent
development of a program of Child Study. The next chapters will show
how these ideas permeated all aspects of the Commission's work.
CHAPTER III

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION ON TEACHER EDUCATION

AND THE EMERGENCE OF ITS PROGRAM

Purpose of the chapter. Because of the nature of its interests and of its coordinating activities, the American Council on Education\(^1\) was cognizant of the state of teacher education and found it necessary to do something about it. It established the Commission on Teacher Education to explore the nature of the problems and to take steps toward solving them. This chapter proposes to describe the creation of the Commission and the way its program emerged. This chapter also seeks to ascertain the reasons that led the Commission to establish the Division on Child Development and Teacher Personnel, for as a result of the Division's work the Child Study program was to be developed.

Studies concerned with the situation in education. In the last two decades many groups were at work intensively investigating the situation in education. Several commissions of the Progressive Education Association, the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association, the American Association of School Administrators, the American Youth Commission of the American Council on Education, all had recently completed or were in process of making studies at the time the Commission was formed. The U. S. Office of Education was sponsoring surveys and so were regional accrediting associations and subject matter groups. Many of these investigations indicated that teacher education

\(^1\)See n. 1, p. 1.

The need for our time. pp. 211-212.

The report of the committee addressed the point of view that another avenue of the fact

Major Issues in Teacher Preparation

Major Issues in Teacher Preparation

coopered in February, 1927, and was later published under the title

To bridge the gap between the special courses and the requirements of the special teacher

The problems and plans outlined called special conferences of

The problems and plans of the American Council on Education and

Each a proposal was made in December, 1927, to the Committee

Improving into the development of a national association of teachers

This situation which made the American Council on Education decide to

do with a development and analysis of existing conditions. It was

The survey of education, meaning was devoted to teacher education. This survey

need for students, but up to 1926 only one successful made by the N. S. O.
of previous careful study. The aims of such work would be to test these hypotheses by experimental control under normal conditions, to demonstrate and to help to extend such practices as prove of merit.

The report then went on to list some of the typical problems faced by those concerned with teacher education. The first of these was that the objectives of teacher education needed a thorough revision and restatement. All education was being interpreted in the light of new developments in American life and culture, and in the light of a substantially altered theory of education. The committee felt that teacher-training institutions should lead instead of follow in the betterment of education.

The second problem was that "prospective teachers possess a very inadequate understanding of child nature and its implications for teaching." Any scientific study of education must inevitably begin with a study of the child. Our present knowledge of the child represents a great expansion beyond that of even a few years ago. There is, however, a substantial lag in bringing this knowledge to the effective service of educators.

The problem is two-fold: first, to bring together the wide array of facts about child life and growth and to make them available for teachers; second, to develop fully the implications of this body of knowledge for the care and cultivation of youth. An important aspect of each phase of the problem is to establish these facts in practice on an adequate scale and test their worth as a means of improving our teachers.

---

5Ibid., pp. 7-8.
6Ibid., p. 10.
7Ibid., p. 11.
8Ibid., pp. 11-12.
consultations and special services were to be available to the groups.

What our committee has done here is to make suggestions for

problems. We have not been able to deal with these problems in
detail, but we have presented some general suggestions that

these groups may find helpful.

In the report we have attempted to bring

of these problems, but it is clear that the committee should

have given more specific advice. The study of the

groups is not the only way of determining the

the committees. It is not surprising, therefore, that the committee which took

of these problems is the one dealing with problems of teacher training.

most of these two problems, these are of the

society.
The report concluded:

The problem herein set forth would appear to call for study and experimentation in institutions and curricula for the education of teachers for a period sufficiently long to demonstrate the validity of proposed changes in both content and method. The new task confronting teacher education is, in part, the breaking down of the control of tradition and outworn practices and, in part, the building up of new concepts of education and a creative approach to the problems of teaching.

It is therefore recommended that (1) the utmost of ingenious collaboration be exercised to draw into this study all of those associations and institutions whose experienced judgments may contribute to the solution of the problems involved; (2) ample funds be secured to make possible a nation-wide study which will have wise judgments on the part of a governing committee or commission, skillful staff direction, diversified problem studies, far-flung demonstration projects, and cogent interpretation of findings which will be translated into procedures in practice as rapidly as may be.

Major Issues in Teacher Education became a kind of handbook or guide not only for the Commission on Teacher Education established by its recommendations but also for the Division on Child Development and Teacher Personnel that the Commission later set up. The report recognized the need for "strong, central, outside leadership to initiate the projects [in experimenting with ways of helping teachers understand children], ... to aid in developing procedures, evaluating results, providing materials, and in the coordination of work among institutions." The work of the Division in serving these purposes will be discussed later.

Creation of the Commission on Teacher Education. Following the

---

11 Ibid., pp. 73-74.
12 Ibid., p. 70.
13 Text, Chapter IV.
acceptance of the report, the Council made an effort to discover to what extent there was agreement that the proposed study should be made. A special conference was called of the officers of the six national associations particularly concerned with teacher education. The proposal received their enthusiastic endorsement. Additional educational organizations as well as a great variety of individuals were also consulted. All indicated their approval and promised cooperation.

Early in 1938 the General Education Board granted $200,000 for the support of a Commission on Teacher Education for a period of five years. Since the study that was proposed needed additional funds, the General Education Board was again approached and the Commission received $320,000 in addition to the original grant.

The Commission was composed of sixteen men and women appointed by the Council and representing all parts of the country and a variety of educational agencies. Four of the sixteen had also served on the

14 A list of these associations may be found on p. 5, n. 1, in the leaflet Cooperation in the Improvement of Teacher Education. A Statement Regarding the Plans of the Commission on Teacher Education. Washington: American Council on Education, 1939. 19 pp.

15 The General Education Board is a philanthropic foundation established in 1902 by John D. Rockefeller for the advancement of education in the United States. It is expending its funds for the support of projects that seem to the trustees of the foundation to be of outstanding importance.

16 The Commission actually existed for six and three-quarter years and was formally dissolved in September, 1941.

17 Cooperation in the Improvement of Teacher Education, pp. 5-6.

committee that produced *Major Issues in Teacher Education*. Karl Bigelow
was appointed director and staff members were gradually added as needed.19

Planning the Commission's study. The Commission met for the first
time in June, 1935, and four months later it had its preliminary plans
made. The program planned by the Commission was in general accord with
the recommendations of *Major Issues in Teacher Education*. The Commission
agreed that emphasis should be put on experimentation and demonstration
in the field, and that institutions whose major responsibility is the
training of teachers should bend their efforts to testing hypotheses of
current educational thought. It also agreed that each institution
should be permitted to choose the special problem it wished to attack
and should have full responsibility for determining the direction of the
study and for changing its course as experience directed.

But at the same time the Commission added two important extensions
to the original recommendations. The first and chief extension was in
the area of in-service education. The Commission was much more con-
cerned about teachers "on the job" than was the committee that wrote the
report. The Commission felt that programs for growth should be planned
in relation to the teachers' working situations, and, though they did
not minimize the contributions of teacher-training institutions to pro-
grams of in-service growth, they felt that this purpose could best be
accomplished through the local school system. Consequently the Commis-
sion decided to invite representative school systems as well as teacher-
training institutions to undertake the study of the problems of teacher

19A list of staff members may be found in *The Improvement of Teacher
Education*, Appendix A.
education, especially in relation to the in-service education of teachers.

The Commission's nationwide cooperative study thus came to have two parts: one dealing with the pre-service training of teachers that was the concern chiefly of the teacher-training institutions, and the other dealing with in-service education. The Commission saw the latter as primarily the responsibility of school systems. There was an interchange of ideas among the teacher-training institutions and school systems as the study progressed, but each center had its own program and at the end of a three-year study two separate reports were written.20

The second extension made by the Commission to the program suggested in Major Issues in Teacher Education was the creation of statewide cooperative studies. The report had suggested only a nationwide cooperative study. Yet, state departments of education were certifying teachers for positions and were offering some leadership in their training. Teachers were seeking employment in states where they had received their professional training. The state seemed to the Commission to be a good unit for a joint attack on the whole problem of teacher education by the cooperative efforts of teacher-training institutions and the school systems of a state. The Commission felt that when its work came to a close these statewide programs would have a permanence that the nationwide studies could not hope to achieve.21


In keeping with the recommendations made by the report the Commission deliberated on the services that should be set up to help the cooperating units. At first the creation of six service divisions staffed with expert consultants to work with the field was considered, but this was decided against on the basis that it might block the creative development of the studies in the field. There was no assurance that these were the particular services that would be needed, and ultimately the Commission abandoned the idea with one exception. From the very earliest explorations of the Council, in all the contacts with the field, it was evident that there was widespread interest in problems relating to child study and to the selection and adjustment of teachers. Therefore the Commission set up a Division on Child Development and Teacher Personnel. Daniel A. Prestcott was made head of the Division, and $200,000 from the original grant of $520,000 was allocated to its work. 22

After the Commission arrived at these policies and plans, an informative pamphlet, Cooperation in the Improvement of Teacher Education, was prepared and distributed in an effort to obtain suggestions for institutions and school systems to be included in the study. The Commission tried to select institutions and school systems of different

22 Cooperation in the Improvement of Teacher Education, p. 14. Originally separate grants were requested for carrying out plans in the area of child development, and in that of teacher personnel, but instead, the two services were combined under one budget. The General Education Board, however, made it clear that it hoped something significant could be done in the field of child development, and that the amount of time and effort given to consideration of teacher personnel problems would depend on the demand from the field. (Division on Child Development and Teacher Personnel, Collaboration Center, Diary of Proceedings, October 3, 1939 - December 6, 1939, Vol. II, Copy 1, typewritten, unpaged, October 3.)
types and sizes, and from widely different parts of the country. The
final criterion was that the center already be experimenting and working
out solutions to important educational problems. All responses were
carefully considered and a great many centers were visited. Finally, the
Commission selected thirty-four centers which included six universities,
five liberal arts colleges, seven state teachers colleges, two negro
colleges, and fourteen school systems. At this time only the coopera-
tive study was instituted. The statewide study did not get under way
until a year later.

Launching the study. It took the Commission a year to formulate
its policies and plans and to select the cooperating centers. The
national study was officially launched during the last two weeks in
August, 1939, on the campus of Bennington College in Vermont, with a
planning conference of representatives from the teacher-training
institutions and school systems taking part in the nationwide cooperative
study. One hundred twenty-four persons, including four members of the
Commission, all six staff members, ten specially invited guests, and
from two to six delegates from each of the thirty-four cooperating

23A list of the cooperating institutions and school systems may be
found in The Commission on Teacher Education, pp. 4-6.

24The first of these statewide studies were made in Georgia,
Michigan, and New York. Later Alabama, Colorado, Kentucky, Ohio,
Florida, Mississippi, and West Virginia took some part.

25A complete report of this conference was prepared by the staff
of the Commission and published under the title Bennington Planning
Conference for the Cooperative Study of Teacher Education: Reports and
Addresses, August 12 to September 3, 1939, Washington: American Council
In keeping with the views it held, the Commission gave careful thought to procedure at the Bennington Conference. The Commission hoped that there would be complete participation on the part of the delegates so that any conclusions arrived at would grow out of the conference process. And it did not intend that in these conclusions the delegates would finally determine what was to be undertaken in the study and how it was to be done. The Commission hoped that by experiencing creative methods of group effort here, the delegates would be influenced in the ways they worked in their local situations.

The Commission drew up a statement of objectives for the conference that was handed to the delegates on the opening day. The Commission also set up a tentative program in advance. However, a Committee on Conference Procedure was appointed on the first day to review the tentative program and to guide its development throughout the conference.

Both the objectives and the program were designed in terms of helping the group reach some practical conclusions that would aid in carrying the study forward. The delegates were first divided homogeneously into five groups according to the type of institutions or size of the school system. These groups were to list the problems of teacher...
education that they thought were important. The five reports were then presented to the entire conference, and that body voted on the relative importance of the problems in each group. Although there were some striking differences in each of the five lists, due to the wide differences in the background of experience of the delegates, it is interesting to note that when the relative importance of the problems was voted upon there was widespread agreement on them, and there was a considerable overlapping with the list in Major Issues in Teacher Education. Again, concern was shown with the objectives of teacher education, with helping teachers to develop a dynamic philosophy of education, with helping teachers to understand the growth and development of children and of society, and their implications for education, and finally, with continuous evaluation of the effectiveness with which these were being accomplished.

The Committee on Conference Procedure drew up a list of a dozen problems of relatively common concern, and the delegates were regrouped to consider the problems according to their interests. There was an effort made to have each type of institution and school system represented in each group. Reports were made by these groups. From these reports, two composite reports were drawn. One report was concerned with the way any single participating institution or school

---

30These are recorded in the Bennington Planning Conference Report, pp. 5-23.

31See pp. 21-23.

32Bennington Planning Conference Report, pp. 24-29.

33Ibid., pp. 30-92.
system might work in improving its own program. The other considered ways and means of cooperating in the attack on common problems of teacher education.\textsuperscript{34}

**Organization of the local studies.** Immediately after the Bennington conference the cooperating teacher-training institutions and school systems began to set up organizations for their own studies.\textsuperscript{35} Local coordinators were appointed. Planning committees began to be formed that worked closely with the Commission's staff. Study groups were organized. During the first few months members of the Commission's staff, serving as field coordinators systematically visited the centers assigned to them. They acted as general consultants, helping the centers to get under way, planning conferences and workshops, and advising regarding the preparation of reports. Consultant help and special services were available also from the two service divisions, the one on Child Development and Teacher Personnel and a newly established Division on Evaluation. A Collaboration Center was set up at the University of Chicago in connection with the Division on Child Development and Teacher Personnel. Here research materials were gathered together and were made available for study by the participants in the cooperating centers for the purposes of enriching their own thinking and improving their regular work.\textsuperscript{36} A clearing house and information service was set

\textsuperscript{34}Ibid., pp. 95-117.

\textsuperscript{35}Fuller treatment of this subject may be found in The Commission on Teacher Education, pp. 3-14, and in Teacher Education in Service, pp. 23-24.

\textsuperscript{36}The functions of the Collaboration Center are described in Chapter IV.
up to communicate not only to participants but to others as well what was going on in the study. From time to time specialists were called in to provide additional consultant service, and intervisitation among cooperating centers was facilitated.

During the first year there was a great deal of trial and error, and much confusion. This was the prevailing feeling when the Commission scheduled a workshop for five weeks in the summer of 1940 at the University of Chicago. All the Commission's staff, some special consultants, and one hundred sixty representatives from all the centers were in attendance. The delegates pooled their experiences. After the Chicago meetings the centers began to delimit their efforts rather than to tackle many problems simultaneously. Each cooperating center selected some aspect of its work that was felt to be important and gave it comprehensive attention.

Concerns of the cooperating school systems. Interest tended to focus on specific local problems. Centers were interested in curricular matters, such as integrated core programs in junior high schools, reading difficulties, activity periods, audio-visual aids, reporting to parents, and school-community relationships. Another group of concerns had to do with tenure, salary, and other matters relating to the welfare of the teachers. A major interest of the school systems was in community study. This was closely related to their interest in child study.

Widespread interest in child study. A widely held interest was in

---

37 The College and Teacher Education, pp. 11-12.
38 The Improvement of Teacher Education, pp. 130-133.
39 See p. 23.
child study. This received primary emphasis in the first summer workshop at Chicago because of the active interest of the school systems where child study was felt to be needed as a guide to curriculum development. Ten of the fourteen school systems in the cooperative study focused their activity on understanding children. No doubt the existence of the Division on Child Development and Teacher Personnel partly accounted for the fact that so many centers undertook to study children.

Three of the twenty teacher-training institutions in the cooperative study also were concerned with helping teachers understand children. They undertook to make changes in the content of their courses to bring about a synthesis of scientific knowledge about human growth and development. They also tried to provide opportunities for students to study children directly, and to correlate the facts about these children with the scientific principles that would help to explain their behavior. But the teacher-training institutions, on the whole, did not have the compelling interest in child study that the school systems had.

Of the ten states participating in the statewide studies, only two, New York and West Virginia, devoted the major portion of their efforts to understanding human growth and development and its implications for teacher education. In both of these states emphasis was put on pre-service education. The study remained in the hands of the teacher-training institutions involved and little or no contact was made with school systems.

---

40 This first workshop was a general one in teacher education, but subsequent workshops under the auspices of the University of Chicago and later of the University of Maryland were devoted entirely to child study.

41 The Improvement of Teacher Education, p. 90.
To give guidance and help to the groups engaged in attempting to understand children was one of the major responsibilities of the Division on Child Study and Teacher Personnel.

**Summary.** Concern over the problems in teacher education in the middle 1930s led the American Council on Education to propose that its Problems and Plans Committee explore the desirability of undertaking a study of these problems. The thorough investigations and deliberations of this committee resulted in a report, *Major Issues in Teacher Education*, which asserted that a study of teacher education was vitally needed, but that it should be one of action and implementation - rather than of research - leading to the improvement of teacher education. The report recommended that a commission be created to guide the development of such a study, and that sufficient funds be found to carry the study forward on a nationwide basis. These recommendations were adopted by the Council, and in June, 1938, the Commission on Teacher Education came into being.

The authors of *Major Issues in Teacher Education* did not try to predetermine how the Commission would operate. They did, however, set forth certain ideas as to procedure that exercised considerable influence on the Commission. The report called for a nationwide cooperative study by associations and institutions "whose experienced judgments may contribute to the solutions of the problems involved." Local centers were to determine their own problems, experiments, demonstration projects, interpretation of findings and implementations. Cooperation among the centers was to be encouraged and facilitated, not to obtain uniformity but to promote mutual stimulation and assistance.

All the proposals in *Major Issues in Teacher Education* were
followed by the Commission, and these determined important aspects of
the program. But the Commission made two important extensions: (1) In
addition to teacher-training institutions, school systems were to be in-
cluded in the nationwide study, and (2) statewide cooperative studies
also were to be undertaken.

The Commission selected twenty institutions and fourteen school
systems to participate in the nationwide cooperative study, and invited
their representatives in August, 1939, to attend a planning conference
at Bennington College. By its emphasis on creative and democratic
group processes in its own deliberations, the Bennington conference set
the tone for the studies subsequently undertaken by the individual
centers.

The Commission was careful not to define for the local centers -
nor to influence - the way their studies were to develop. Consequently
it refrained from setting up services to aid the cooperating units until
a need for certain kinds would become apparent. However, so abundant
was the evidence of a widespread interest in understanding children,
that one of the first steps the Commission took was to establish the
Division on Child Development and Teacher Personnel. The need in this
area was reported in Major Issues in Teacher Education as two fold:
first, "to bring together the wide array of facts about child life and
growth and to make them available to teachers;" and second, "to develop
fully the implications of this body of knowledge for the care and cul-
tivation of youth." The report added that it was important "to estab-
lish these facts in practice on an adequate scale and test their worth
as a means of improving our teachers." It recommended that "strong,
central, outside leadership" be provided to assist in attaining these
goals. It was for these reasons that the Commission established the Division on Child Development and Teacher Personnel. The move was heartily endorsed by the participants at the Bennington conference. It is noteworthy that there were twice as many school systems as teacher-training institutions engaged in studies concerned with understanding children. If the Commission had not seen fit to extend the cooperative study to include school systems as well as teacher-training institutions, the Division on Child Development and Teacher Personnel might have accomplished only a small part of what it was charged to do.  

---

1 See p. 27 and 29 of this thesis for complete quotations.

2 See Chapters IV and V.
CHAPTER IV

THE DIVISION ON CHILD DEVELOPMENT AND TEACHER PERSONNEL

AND ITS WORK

Purpose of the chapter. One of the first things the Commission did as soon as it came into being was to establish the service Division on Child Development and Teacher Personnel. The reasons why it did so have already been stated.¹ This chapter will seek to examine what the Division did, what steps it took, why it took these steps, and how the work of the Division resulted in a Child Study program.

The Division's program. The Division on Child Development and Teacher Personnel became active on October 1, 1939.² In accordance with the suggestions in Major Issues in Teacher Education,³ the Division undertook two major tasks. First, it established the Collaboration Center at the University of Chicago;¹ second, it began a field program of consultant service to those centers in the cooperative studies that were interested in understanding children. The two parts of the Division's work will be dealt with separately in this chapter.

The Collaboration Center. From the late 1920s the General Education Board had been supporting research studies of child development


²For a list of the staff members see The Improvement of Teacher Education, p. 275.

³Pp. 27-28 supra.

¹The director of the Division on Child Development and Teacher Personnel had recently been appointed to the faculty there.
in a number of universities. The Collaboration Center at Chicago was to take the findings of this research together with other available research findings and make them available to teachers. An unusual collection of research materials was gathered together: books, periodicals, reprints, and unpublished research findings from the fields of biology, neurology, genetics, endocrinology, physiology, physical and cultural anthropology, sociology, psychology, psychiatry, psychoanalysis, pediatrics, education, as well as anecdotal data and case records. These materials were studied intensively during each of two years by a group of collaborators. The first year, fifteen men and women, most of them college professors, were invited; the second year, twenty-two persons from the colleges and public school systems in the nationwide cooperative study and from the statewide study in Georgia. About fifteen other persons, psychologists, college teachers of education, public school officers, and classroom teachers spent from three to ten months at the Center studying the assembled materials and discussing their educational implications. In addition to studying these materials the collaborators conferred with specialists in the various sciences and in education who were invited to the Center to discuss research projects and experiments on which they were currently working.

**Purposes of the Center.** The staff of the Division and the collaborators had three major purposes in relation to the Center: first, to collaborate in the study of the materials, to synthesize the findings of

---

5 See pp. 11-12.

6 A list of the collaborators may be found in Division on Child Development and Teacher Personnel, *Collaboration Operational Facts, 1939-1941*, Vol. I, Copy 2, typewritten, unpaged.
research in the various sciences, and to bring together the concepts gained in such a manner that teachers would have a comprehensive picture of the way human beings grow and develop; second, to draw out of this knowledge of human growth and development the implications for educational practice — educational organization and administration, curriculum, classroom procedure, evaluation, guidance, and remedial work; and third, to discover the kinds of experiences teachers must have for developing these insights, and the implications of these insights in the teachers' relationships with children. 7

There were some related purposes. One of the important aims of the Collaboration Center was to demonstrate the value of group methods in furthering in-service professional growth at an advanced level. Another aim was to provide opportunities for individuals to carry out their own professional purposes. Some of the representatives of the teacher-training institutions wished to develop plans for new courses or for curricular reorganization, and individuals from the school systems desired to work at various tasks they had brought with them from their centers. It was recognized that the benefits which each participant personally would derive from a sharing of experiences could influence the whole field when these persons returned to their respective centers of activity.

Methods of work at the Center. The collaborators faced the formidable task of converting the mass of unorganized, piecemeal research into a useful body of knowledge about human beings, the implications of

7Diary of Proceedings, October - November 14, 1940, Vol. XI, Copy 1, October 2, 1940.
The second committee proposed for ways of applying the
behavioral needs and strategies needed to make an inclusive
and educational impact in the field of child development. The third committee
investigated in the field of child development.

The center of the collaboration during the first year created the purpose of
meeting with small committees groups. In accordance with the purposes of
about half of each collaborator's time was spent in study in con-

committee of the whole for discussion and decision.

the center of the group, and the membership were then submitted to the
chief of the group, and the result was to develop the text and plan and to keep

for the sake of efficiency, a committee on planning and research was

other consultants.

committee, By regular staff members, and By visiting scholars and

any staff member, by the committee of the whole met approximately one third of the time to deal

the policy-making was determined by the committee of the group.

the most important group was the local body of collaborators. This

upon

found to solve it, Group methods of study and research had to be tested

the extraordinary nature of the problem, and because new ways had to be

indeed the initiative of the majority of the committee," because of

which could be translated into practice as soon as possible. The task
knowledge of human beings and of the techniques of studying children to recurring educational situations, such as problems of promotion, use of behavior journals in studying problem children, and social analysis of a classroom. The third committee analyzed the needs of cooperating institutions for the Collaboration Center's services as revealed in the Report of the Bennington Conference.9

During the second year four committees were formed relating to the first two purposes of the Center. Three committees attempted to draw together the concepts and principles in the areas of the physiological, sociological, and psychological development of human beings and at the same time to point out some of the implications of these for teachers. The fourth committee dealt with the learning processes.

In addition to the regular working committees, action committees were set up as needed. A Committee on Documentation accumulated and organized the documentary resources of the Center. An Editorial Board prepared reports of the various committees for mimeographing. Still another committee was responsible for recreation and experience with the arts.10

Time was set aside for individuals to work alone or with others on their own purposes. During the second year the collaborators visited their own and other cooperating centers and shared with each other as well as with the staff what they learned on these visits - the progress being made, the problems faced, and the help requested. There was


10Division on Child Development and Teacher Personnel, Collaboration Center, Committee Activities, 1940-1941, Vol. XVI, Copy 1, mimeographed, unpaged.
considerable discussion of the kind of help consultants should give and
the materials the collaboration center should prepare for the cooperating
centers.11 This work culminated in a conference in the spring of 1941
when all the collaborators who had participated in the work of the Center
for the previous two years came together to discuss what had been accom-
plished in their home centers and to plan next steps.12

In many ways the Collaboration Center was like a workshop. It
differed in that it concentrated on a single field—human development,
and it had one major emphasis—advanced subject matter analysis. But
it operated in a workshop mood, though it had more than the usual "growing
pains" of a workshop. The record clearly shows that the collaborators
were constantly struggling with two problems: one, clarifying the role
of the collaborators in their home centers, and the other, learning the
cooperative techniques so necessary to their purposes. Nevertheless,
the methods here described did succeed in accomplishing much that the
Center was set up to do.

Some results of the work of the Collaboration Center. The Collabora-
tion Center had proved its worth as an effective way of pursuing advanced
study at a high level, and at the end of two years' sponsorship by the
Division it was taken over by the University of Chicago and established
as part of the resources of the inter-departmental Committee on Human

11Division on Child Development and Teacher Personnel, Collaboration
Center, Reports of the Collaborators' Hours and Home Visits, 1940-1941,
Vol. XV, Copy I, mimeographed, unpaged. See also Diary of Proceedings,
December 6, 1939 - January 28, 1940, Vol. III, Copy I, typewritten,
unpaged, January 4, 1940.

12Collaboration Center Operational Facts, Vol. I, Copy 2, May 5-9,
1941.
Development. This step became necessary after the funds allocated by
the General Education Board were depleted. The Division was no longer
able to carry on both aspects of its program. A choice had to be made.
The Division staff decided to continue the consultant service to a few
selected centers for the remaining two years of the Commission's study,
for it was felt that in the experiments already begun in those places
there were contributions still to be made to the general work of the
Commission in respect to teacher education. 13

The work at the Collaboration Center accomplished three things: a
considerable body of material was built up, a synthesis of concepts
valuable for teachers was made, and methods were developed for commu­
nicating this synthesis of knowledge to teachers. In the process con­
siderable personal growth on the part of those participating resulted.

To the mass of research information, previously referred to, were
added the materials resulting from the collaborators' study and writing.
These included syntheses of scientific concepts and principles to de­
scribe and explain the processes underlying human development and
behavior; 14 selected bibliographies of materials on various aspects of
human development; descriptions of working procedures and of techniques
for studying children, prepared for the use of the cooperating

13 Diary of Proceedings, October 1 - November 14, 1940, Vol XI,
Copy 1, November 13, 1940.

14 Division on Child Development and Teacher Personnel, Collaboration
Center, Concept Committee Reports, 1939-1940, Vol VII, Copy 1, type­
written, unpagd, Overviews of Collaborators, 1939-1940, Vol. VIII, Copy
2, mimeographed, and Committee Reports, 1940-1941, Vol. XVII, Copy 2,
mimeographed.
centers and summaries of the presentations of the invited specialists.

The methods devised by the collaborators for accumulating and exploiting the resources of the Center have already been described. In addition, during the second year, plans were made for a more extensive use of these materials and procedures. These resulted in a Human Development workshop, held during a full summer quarter of ten weeks in 1941, and operated jointly by the Division and the University of Chicago. Forty persons from the cooperating centers receiving consultant service from the Division attended this workshop. They were assisted in their study by four full-time staff members from the Division and several part-time members from the University of Chicago faculty. Each participant selected from a list of fifteen areas three he wished to consider for a period of three weeks each. Study groups were formed around these choices. Each participant also had an advisor who consulted with him regularly about his developing ideas and their relation to his work and to the central problem he brought to the workshop. A person interested, for example, in planning a counseling program for a junior high school would work on this problem with his advisor for the entire ten weeks.

---


17 *Diary of Proceedings, October 1 - November 14, 1940*, Vol. XI, Copy 1, November 13, 1940.
But with a group he might study during the first three weeks the physical development of adolescents, during the second three weeks their social relationships, and during the third period the psychological factors in their development.

A similar workshop was repeated in the summer of 1942 entirely under the auspices of the University of Chicago.

Workshops in human development have been conducted under the auspices of the University of Chicago each year since that time. In 1947 an Institute for Child Study was established at the University of Maryland, directed by Daniel A. Prescott. Since then a six-weeks summer workshop has been a regular part of that Institute's program each year. The University of Texas, Southern Methodist University, and the Atlantic Area Project now conduct annual workshops on Human Development and Education.

The first task the Division undertook — that is, the development of the Collaboration Center — resulted in an effective way of bringing together the great array of facts about child life and growth and of making them available to teachers. The Commission hoped that similar programs, so widely needed, would be developed at other universities.

The field program of consultant service to cooperating centers. The second task the Division undertook was the field program of consultant service to about one-third of the cooperating centers in an attempt to find ways of communicating to teachers the synthesis of knowledge of human development formulated at the Collaboration Center.

Groups of teachers, led by various members of the Collaboration Center, engaged in systematic study based on selected bibliographies. But these procedures fell far short of the Division's hopes. Though the
teachers earnestly endeavored to understand, this knowledge gave them little insight into the behavior of individual children. In most of the centers little noticeable change occurred in the teachers, but in one center, the Parker School District, South Carolina, there was a great deepening of the teachers' understanding of the children in their classrooms. Here a strikingly different approach had been made, and the procedures that evolved subsequently became the basis for the present Child Study program. When after two years of operation the Division had to curtail its activities because of lack of funds, it decided to continue consultant service only to this one school system. The steps that the Division staff took in cooperation with the teachers of Parker School District, and the program that evolved as a result of their efforts will now be described.

The cooperative study in Parker School District. Parker School District was one of the school systems invited to participate in the Commission's nationwide cooperative study. The administrators and teachers in this system were already skilled in working together experimentally along the lines described in Chapter II, and they were


20 The Division continued its services also to two statewide programs, Florida and West Virginia. A field program of consultant service did not seem to be helpful to the teacher-training institutions. (Diary of Proceedings, October 1 - November 14, 1949, Vol. XI, Copy 1, November 13, 1940.)

21 Pp. 21-23.
able to appreciate the significance of the Commission's undertaking. The Assistant Superintendent attended the launching of the cooperative study at the Bennington conference, and in the fall of 1939 one of the Commission's field staff visited the school system to help with plans for organizing their program.

The major emphasis was to be placed on studying children. Parker School District teachers had been studying and changing the curriculum for many years and a need for understanding children as a basis for this work was strongly felt. Consequently, plans were made for obtaining the services of a consultant from the Division on Child Development and Teacher Personnel for two days in the spring of 1940, and for three additional visits in 1940-1941.

On his first visit the consultant met with a representative group of school personnel: the superintendent, the assistant superintendent, the elementary principals, the high school principal, and teachers representing each grade level through the high school. A great deal of interest was evidenced and a direct study of individual children was agreed upon. The director of the observational program was selected by the superintendent to organize and lead the child study program. She attended the general workshop in teacher education held in Chicago that summer and made tentative plans for carrying on the program.

The first study group was formed shortly after the beginning of school in September, 1940. Twenty-five classroom teachers and principals, representative of all the schools in the community, met each Wednesday night at the high school. In response to increasing interest, a second group of twenty had to be started late in November, 1940. The following September the two groups merged. At the same time a new group
of twenty-two was formed that followed very much the same course the other two groups had developed the preceding year. By September, 1942, the study had proved its worth and was extended to the rest of the school system on a voluntary basis. There were now six groups in the elementary schools totaling 122 participants and a group of twelve in the high school. These groups were led by persons who had been active in the study since the beginning. The leader of the high school group had attended the workshop in child study in the summer of 1942 at Chicago.

The groups met regularly every other week, and the leaders, with the director of the observational program in charge, met on alternate weeks for additional study. The director had attended the workshops in child study in 1941 and 1942, as well as the initial workshop in teacher education in 1940, and was the most advanced student in the school system.

The consultant service to these study groups was supplied for the first three years by the Commission on Teacher Education. After contributions from the Commission were no longer available, the program was continued at the expense of the school district. A basic three-year study of children has become a permanent part of the in-service education of teachers in Parker School District.

Beginning stages of the study. At first the same procedure was used in Parker School District that was being followed in the fourteen other cooperating centers - that of attempting to build a better under-

22 Documentation for the foregoing exposition may be found in Helping Teachers Understand Children, pp. 102-112, passim.
standing of children through imparting a synthesis of scientific knowledge of human development and behavior. This did not seem to provide the understanding the teachers were seeking, however, and the teachers asked that they be given less theory. They wanted instead to understand why a particular child behaved as he did in a particular situation.

The teachers wanted to understand children, but in the beginning stages of the study they were looking to the psychologist for answers to specific behaviors of children and for techniques for managing these behaviors. Teachers were not seeing that behaviors had underlying causes, that they were symptoms of needs and of aspirations, and that they had their roots in the individual's past experiences. They did not understand why children behave as they do and inferred that general procedures applicable to dealing with all children could be worked out.23 These teachers were not to be blamed for this attitude, for it was characteristic of teachers all over the United States. There had been little in their training designed to develop genuine insight into human behavior.24

How teachers were to develop this insight was the problem confronting the Division. Through what kinds of experience could the concepts and principles of child development be made to function in the minds of teachers so that these would not be merely verbalizations but would make a difference in the teachers' dealings with children? The Division had no preconceived plan and the steps it took evolved developmentally.

For a number of years the teachers of Parker School District had

23 Ibid., pp. 1-3.
been keeping cumulative records of pupil progress. But although they had been giving a great deal of time to these, they felt they were getting nothing from them. The first study group, with the help of the psychologist-consultant, began to analyze some of these cumulative records to determine whether they might provide sufficient information for developing the understanding which the teachers were seeking.²⁵ Through this process the teachers discovered that the records consisted of generalized summary statements and of subjective judgments that told more about the teacher's personal prejudices and reactions than they did about the child. There was very little real information. The teachers came to see that they needed to learn how to record valid, objective information.

Gathering information about a child. The analysis of cumulative records led the teachers to decide that each of them should study and keep records of one or two children during the year. At first the teachers wanted to study the children who gave them trouble, but the consultant suggested that each teacher select one of the two children without acute problems in order to see what conditions, relationships, and experiences lead to wholesome development.

Each teacher agreed to write three or four anecdotes a week. These were to be exact descriptions of what a child did or said and of the situation that led up to this incident. In addition, the teachers were to accumulate as many facts as possible about the child's life and to incorporate these into the record. The teachers were asked to refrain

²⁵For details see Helping Teachers Understand Children, pp. 3-8, and 21-27.
for several months from evaluating and interpreting the data they were gathering.

The teachers found that it was difficult to write objective, descriptive anecdotes. They tended to record how they felt about the children or the situation. They were inclined to characterize a child in terms of a single trait, to make quick judgments about a child and offer immediate explanations of his behavior.

At first the teachers did not know what sort of anecdotes to record. In response to the consultant's suggestion that they write whatever seemed significant to them, they wrote about what was uppermost in their own minds and overlooked other important things. But as they read their anecdotes to each other in their study group they began to perceive that some anecdotes were more meaningful than others. They came to see some happenings as the children saw them, and gradually took their cues as to what was important from the children themselves.

At the same time the teachers were listening to lectures by visiting scientists from the Collaboration Center, and were reading case histories and study guides prepared for them by the collaborators.26

Gradually the teachers began to form new conceptions of what is important in the development of a child. They looked for incidents in their classrooms that illustrated these ideas and included them in their records.27

The teachers were also encouraged to see the children they were

26 A list of these materials may be found in The Improvement of Teacher Education, pp. 282-283. (They are no longer available.)

27 For a fuller account of how the teachers learned to write anecdotal descriptions see Helping Teachers Understand Children, pp. 21-31.
studying in their family settings. These teachers were already aware of the importance of the family in the development of the child, and had been visiting homes before they entered upon this project. Now in their study group they made preparations for a much more careful examination of the home environment of a child. At the teachers' request the administration set aside school time for visiting homes. Through this study the teachers began to notice other factors besides the physical, sanitary, and economic conditions of the home. They became conscious of the pattern of relationships in the family, the parents' expectations for the child, their techniques for handling the child, the culture of the home. They saw that parents were individuals with their own values, anxieties, and behavior, and that these had their effects on the children.  

Teachers came to seek more and more thorough information. By the third year of the Child Study program they had learned to use the Wetzel Grid to give them some facts relating to the physical development of the children. They had used various kinds of achievement, intelligence, and personality tests. They had obtained information about the social interaction among the children through sociometrics. The teachers developed skill in using these techniques, learned to follow the necessary precautions in using them and to recognize their limitations.

Interpreting accumulated information about a child. After the first two or three months of data gathering, the teachers began to complain

---

28 For an extended treatment of how the teachers learned to see a child in his family see Ibid., Chapter III.

29 See Ibid., Chapters IX and X, and pp. 419-423.
that they could see no purpose in merely writing anecdotes and gathering other data. It seemed to them that some use ought to be made of all this material. What, they asked, did these records show? How do they help a teacher to know what to do about a child?

Consequently, a plan was worked out to help the teachers see the significance of their records. Between visits of the consultant, various teachers periodically sent several months' accumulation of material to the Collaboration Center. The psychologist, who was the consultant to this system, selected ten records, organized and interpreted them, offered tentative hypotheses to account for the behavior recorded, and made suggestions concerning further data needed, the testing of the hypotheses, and the possible next steps to be taken. The consultant's report was then discussed by the teachers in their study group.30

These procedures, which were followed for two years, were reassuring and helpful to the teachers. But they were not adequate as permanent procedures. Who was to interpret the records of the teachers and make suggestions for helping a child when a psychologist was no longer available? Besides, there were many children to be helped daily. In some places clinics were offering help to severely maladjusted children, but how were normal children, facing developmental tasks and temporary adjustment problems, to be understood and provided with the conditions, experiences, and relationships conducive to their wholesome development? Teachers needed enough skill to make their own tentative hypotheses and to develop confidence in them so that they could use them as a basis for

---

30For a detailed account of how the psychologist helped the teachers see ibid., Chapter IV.
finding ways of helping children.

To make their own hypotheses teachers had to have two kinds of information: a background of scientific knowledge about human development and behavior, and a body of pertinent facts about the particular children they wanted to help. But this knowledge alone was not enough to insure understanding of a child. These two kinds of information had to be brought together into some kind of meaningful organization, and this was a complex process.

In studying a case record, consultants working in the field found themselves referring to a framework of concepts about human development and behavior to get an understanding of how the child is operating and how his personality is emerging. They raised the question: How vital is it that teachers should have a similar framework to refer to in attempting to understand children? By the end of the third year of the cooperative study the consultants and local leaders had not yet reached full agreement concerning the use of a conceptual framework for organizing the information about an individual child and for checking the scope of the interpretation of a record. The general feeling was that one should be given, but the problems of when this should come in the sequence of experiences and how detailed it should be had not been resolved. It was hoped that some kind of framework could be worked out that would not lead itself easily to memorization and verbalization but that would serve instead to stimulate thought and to deepen insight.

---

31 Diary of Proceedings, March 10, 1941 - May 20, 1941, Vol. XIV, Copy 1, April 30, 1941.

32 Helping Teachers Understand Children, pp. 426-433.
Some steps in the interpretation of their records were outlined for the teachers during the third year of the study. The teachers learned to identify the recurring situations and patterns of behavior in a child's life and they gradually become more sensitive to the uniqueness of each individual, for the list of recurring patterns was different for each child. The teachers sought the appropriate scientific principles to explain these recurring patterns, and formed a series of hypotheses to account for them. The record of information about a child was studied for evidence to support or refute these hypotheses. Insufficient evidence either way pointed to additional information about a child that the teacher needed to have, and hypotheses were modified in view of the new data. Through this process the teachers became aware that the causes of behavior are multiple, complex, and interrelated, and that a specific piece of behavior could rarely be accounted for by a single, simple hypothesis.

The teachers checked these hypotheses against a preliminary organization, provided by the consultant, of scientific generalizations concerning the physical, social, and psychological factors in child development. They noted the interrelatedness of the series of hypotheses they had made and could begin to see each child as an organized whole, a developing personality. And finally, the hypotheses were used to guide attempts to help the child.  

It was not until the summer of 1945 that an organizing framework for

33For a detailed development of how the teachers came to learn to interpret information about a child see Ibid., Chapters V, VII, and VIII.
the use of teachers in analyzing their records was finally presented. This was done in a laboratory group in the Human Development workshop at the University of Chicago, exploring procedures for the second year in the Child Study program. In this group were members of the field service consultant staff, the director of the program and some representatives from Parker School District, and the coordinators and representatives from Corpus Christi, Texas; Shreveport, Louisiana; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; and Wilmington, Delaware. Some conclusions of the Division concerning a program of Child Study. Based on its experience in the fifteen centers that undertook to study children, especially in Parker School District, the staff of the Division came to some conclusions that greatly influenced the subsequent development of the Child Study program.

1. The staff was convinced that to help teachers build up and use scientifically valid hypotheses about how to help normal children accomplish their developmental tasks and solve their adjustment problems requires a long-term, well-planned program of direct study of children.

2. Studying one or two children through time seems to be the most effective way of becoming sensitive to the meaning of the behavior of children. After three years of closely observing at least three children, and discussing the records of the three children studied by each of the eight or ten other members of the group, the teachers would find it easier to understand all children at various developmental levels.

---

34 This framework is described on pp. 75-76.

35 All these centers, with the exception of the Parker School District, had begun the Child Study program during the previous year.
Once they were skilled in recognizing the pertinent facts in a child's life and in interpreting his behavior according to scientifically valid hypotheses, it would no longer be necessary to study every child with the same thoroughness.

3. A program of child study can best be carried on by a school system, with some advice and assistance from outside consultants. Such a study should be a part of a continuous program of in-service professional education carried on in small study groups formed on a voluntary basis, and also in more concentrated form in summer workshops of at least two weeks' duration. Within the larger framework of direct study of children each system has to work out its own pattern of study according to its needs, its resources, its philosophy, traditions, and practical problems.

4. It is essential to the success of the program that the key administrators be wholeheartedly in support of it. The smooth running of the whole program - obtaining time and places to meet, buying books, getting financial support, uncovering resources, arranging for consultants, conferences, and workshops, and taking care of a host of all kinds of details - all are dependent not merely upon the blessing of the administration, but on its active interest. The morale in Parker School District was high, and probably an important factor in this was the understanding and painstaking effort given to the program by the superintendent of schools, the assistant superintendent, and the director of the observational program. The majority of the school principals were also genuinely interested in the study.36

36 *Helping Teachers Understand Children*, p. 438.
5. The quality of leadership is a major factor in the success of a Child Study program. It is important that the local coordinator be well trained in order that he might have the long range view necessary for wise planning and for guiding the development of group leaders. It is important, too, that leaders of the study groups have adequate training through frequent leaders' meetings during the year, through local two-weeks workshops, and through the more extended six-weeks child study workshops, away from their own centers, where they come in contact with representatives of programs in school systems in other parts of the country.

6. In school systems where the quality of the leadership referred to above is not only scholarly but democratic as well, a Child Study program has a good chance to deepen immeasurably the participants' understanding of children and of the teachers' role. The leaders do not use their training to tell the teachers what they must do, nor do they give answers to the problems that come up, but instead they make it possible for the teachers in a group to think things through together and to develop to the maximum the inner resources of each person.

When teachers share in the selection of a study, voluntarily undertake it, participate in the planning, executing, and evaluating of it, what develops is bound to be meaningful and useful to them. Such teachers do everything they can to facilitate a program and do not build up resistance to it. A sound professional spirit can prevail.

7. It is important for the development of the participants in a Child Study program that they be consciously aware of what they are doing and grasp its full import each step of the way. In Parker School District the teachers were ready for the study, and the members of the
groups shared in most of the planning steps, yet the Division felt that they did not always grasp the ultimate significance of each activity in which they engaged. Consultants have a responsibility for helping teachers analyze their activities sufficiently so that they fully understand the purposes of the experience. However, the study must remain in the hands of the teachers so that they do not become dependent on the approval of some authority for the decisions they must make.37

**Summary.** The Division on Child Development and Teacher Personnel established headquarters at the University of Chicago, and on October 1, 1939, began a two-fold program in keeping with the recommendations in *Major Issues in Teacher Education*. The Division set up a Collaboration Center and also began a field program of consultant service to those centers in the cooperative study interested in understanding children.

At the Collaboration Center the Division gathered together a mass of research materials from the various sciences dealing with human development and behavior and invited a number of scientists and educators to collaborate in studying these materials, to synthesize them, and develop sets of scientific principles to describe and explain human behavior, and finally, to draw out the implications of these materials for teaching education. Later, representatives from the cooperating units spent some time at the Collaboration Center, and at workshops conducted by the Division, making themselves familiar with the work of the collaborators and planning programs of study for their own centers.

---

37 For further details concerning the Division's conclusions see *Ibid.*, Chapter XII, passim (especially pp. 413-414, 433-433), and Chapter XIII.
In the field program, the child development information organized in the Collaboration Center was passed on to teachers in thirteen cooperating centers through systematic lectures and study programs led by the Division staff, collaborators, and other experts. In these places little improvement in teacher education resulted.

In the fourteenth center, the Parker School District, however, the teachers decided that they did not want a course in theoretical materials, but wanted instead to study an individual child intensively over a year or two. In the first three years that the Parker School District carried on this direct study of children the teachers, working in groups, through intelligent and persistent study of individual children grew from a level of limited insight to one of much greater understanding. They developed skill in gathering and organizing objective, accurate data about particular children, acquired a background of information about human development and behavior, and learned to make use of the scientific principles as they needed them to understand and help children.

Since the study of the Commission on Teacher Education came to an end Parker School District has continued the Child Study program at its own expense. The successful experience in this system led the Division on Child Development and Teacher Personnel to work out a definite program of Child Study that could be followed, with local modifications, by any group of teachers interested in understanding children.

As a result of the experiences in fourteen centers, especially in Parker School District, the Division came to the conclusions that understanding children requires a long-term, well-planned program of direct and intensive study of individual children and that such a program can
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CHAPTER V

THE CHILD STUDY PROGRAM

Purpose of the chapter. The approach to understanding children that emerged in Parker School District has evolved into a definite program with sequential steps, and as such has since been adopted by school systems that were not engaged in the cooperative study. However, since its beginnings many changes have come about in the program. New procedures have been and still are being suggested, tried out, and evaluated for inclusion. This chapter proposes to describe the Child Study program as it is currently being conducted from the Institute for Child Study at the University of Maryland. 1

Objectives of the Child Study program. The present program 2 consists of three years' training to help teachers 1) to become familiar, in an effective way, with the wealth of scientific knowledge about human development and behavior; 2) to become able to use the scientific method in gathering significant information about a child, in interpreting the information, and in planning a course of action to help the child; and 3) to become aware of the implications for education of their new

1The Institute is a division of the College of Education and the Department of Education of the Graduate School. It is directed by Dr. Daniel A. Prescott, assisted by a staff of eleven. The field program of consultant service to Child Study groups in various school systems over the country is one of the five aspects of the Institute's work. The other aspects include a program of undergraduate and graduate instruction, parent education, research, and service to the United States government.

2This exposition of the Child Study program is based on the personal knowledge and experience of the author who for the past three years has been a member of the consultant staff of the Institute.
learnings, and to learn to translate these into action programs.

If these objectives are to be fully realized, some changes must come about in teachers. Consequently, a first objective of the program is to help teachers develop certain attitudes that are prerequisite to a genuine understanding of children. These attitudes have to do with understanding and accepting the basic assumptions that are the foundation of the Child Study program.

Basic assumptions underlying the program. The Child Study program is built on the following six basic assumptions. Four of these have scientific validity. The last two are philosophical.

1) Behavior is caused. It is not willful or impulsive; it is not something that has to be controlled by adults. What a child does is based on his past experiences, on his interpretation of the present situation, and on his aspirations for the future. If these are known, his behavior can be understood, and unacceptable behavior can be changed by influencing the causes.

2) The causes of behavior are multiple, complex, and interrelated. Behavior cannot be understood or changed on the basis of a single, oversimplified explanation of it. All the factors and processes influencing a child's development and behavior must be taken into consideration. Leaving out any aspect would lead to errors in judgment and ineffectiveness in the attempts to help a child.

3) A child is a unified whole. What goes on in one aspect of his development affects all the other aspects. All the factors and processes, interrelated, influence and produce any specific behavior.

4) Each child is unique. There are many variables in a developing human life so that no two persons can be alike. To help a child, the
special combination of factors and influences that are shaping his life must be seen and understood. Each child must be dealt with separately, and differently, according to his needs.

5) Every human being is inherently valuable. If the foregoing assumptions were accepted, it follows that what a child is and what he does are natural under the circumstances and he cannot be blamed. Nor can he be rejected as hopeless and unworthy. Every child by virtue of being a human being has the right to those conditions, relationships, and experiences that will lead to his maximum development.

6) A democratic society, with its democratic processes, offers the best organization for respecting and valuing individuals and for providing the opportunities for each to reach his maximum self development.

Introducing the program into a school system. At the request of a school system, the Director of the Institute for Child Study meets first with the administrators and then with the personnel to explain the program. Usually a brief history is given, the objectives and basic assumptions are stated, and the experiences for the first year are outlined. This is followed by an organizational meeting for those interested in undertaking this intensive study of children. A coordinator is appointed. Study groups are formed and leaders are selected from among those enrolled in the groups. The initial procedures are explained. Each teacher selects a child in whom she is interested and begins to gather information about him.

Sources of information about a child. Teachers seek information from six sources: 1) school records: including health data; test data concerning intelligence, subject matter knowledge, and basic skills; facts about a child's family; the teacher's evaluation of the child's
In order that the work may proceed in an informative, flexible, and efficient manner, a great deal of effort is made to find comprehensive plans to meet the needs of students.
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Code of professional ethics. Because the teachers are dealing with
the lives of human beings it is essential that they rigidly adhere to a
code of professional ethics. The teachers agree that they will not dis-
cuss in public places individual children or their families either with
each other or with others not in the study group, and that they will
safeguard all the personal data they are gathering. These records are
closed to anyone who is not a member of that child study group. The
teachers also agree that at no time will a member's teaching methods
or his way of handling children be discussed outside of the study group.
It is vital that a relationship of mutual trust and consideration exist.

Sequence of experiences in the first year. Experiences in child
study are graded according to what teachers in the past have worked out.
In the first year they are planned, primarily, to train teachers in the
use of the scientific method. Specifically, the purposes are to help
teachers learn how to gather pertinent information, how to observe and
record behavior, and how to analyze this information and come to some
valid conclusions. Secondly, the experiences are planned to help
teachers deepen their understanding of the meaning of behavior and to
begin to accept children as they are.

Step 1. For several months teachers gather information about in-
dividual children, read this information to each other and analyze it
for objectivity and scope. Some groups devote a meeting to each of the
six sources of information, exploring how to tap them most effectively.
Some part of several meetings is devoted to studying what makes a good
anecdote. As the teachers read to each other they keep asking: Are
the data objective? Is the anecdote full and complete? What do these
data or these anecdotes tell us about the child? Gradually valid,
objective information about each child accumulates, and the teachers begin to know the children better.

Step 2. After a time, almost automatically the teachers begin to try to explain the things the children are doing. Usually this will begin to happen about the third or fourth month of the study. The leader then tries to get the participants not to make judgments but to think scientifically. He encourages the group to find more than one possible answer, and the process of making multiple hypotheses is introduced. A member reads to the group an anecdote of a specific piece of behavior he wishes to explain. The group then lists as many possible explanations of this behavior as they can imagine, usually twelve to sixteen. The member then reads aloud his entire record while the group helps him search for facts that are clues to the possible causes of the child's behavior. As a fact is found to support a given hypothesis a plus sign is placed beside it; if a fact tends to negate an hypothesis a minus sign is placed beside it. This results in a list of hypotheses, supported by the facts in the record, as to why the child acted as he did in this situation. Other possible explanations are also suggested by the group from their background of scientific knowledge of human behavior. These hypotheses suggest to the teacher what additional data he needs before he can substantiate or refute them. Sometimes the above procedure is reversed. The group will suggest a list of hypotheses first, and then the record is read for evidence to support or reject each of them. A group may use four or five meetings for this experience. In some cases, after the process is understood and the purpose clear, the group breaks up into units of two or three to help each other explain a puzzling bit of behavior in each of their
records. In other cases, each participant does this individually.

Step 3. As participants hear entire records read they become aware that each child does some things over and over. The leader takes advantage of this opportunity to point out that there are threads of consistency running through all a child does, and that these recurring patterns of behavior are clues to the child's motivation and needs. About the fifth or sixth month the teachers learn to recognize the recurring patterns, to list them, and to explore them. Finally, they use what they have already learned about making multiple hypotheses to account for the recurring patterns in the life of each child.

These hypotheses partly answer two summarizing questions at the end of the year's study: 1) What is this child trying to do? 2) What is he up against? In most groups teachers ask additional questions on the positive aspects such as: What factors are in his favor, that help him in what he is trying to do? What has been done, and what still needs to be done to help this child, or to create the conditions, relationships, and experiences for his continuous best development?

Sequence of experiences in the second year. The steps in the second year parallel those of the first year, but have greater depth. Primarily, the purpose of this year's study is to help teachers learn to use a more systematic procedure for organizing and interpreting a record about a child. The experiences are planned also to accomplish two other purposes: to help teachers increase their functional knowledge of scientific concepts and principles of human development and behavior, and to deepen their understanding of the complexity of behavior, and of the uniqueness of each child.

Step 1. As in the first year, the participants gather information
about individual children and analyse these data in their study groups.

Because the essential aspects of an individual's development and behavior are too complex to grasp all at one time, the teachers are given a framework such as this one to help them in their analysis:

1. Organic processes in human development— including general health, health habits, nutrition, physical disabilities, rate of growth, maturity level, available energy, rhythm of rest and activity, motor coordination, management of body, physical appearance.

2. Affectional processes in human development— including relationships of each member of the family with each of the others, climate of feeling in the family, sources of security, threats to security, (relation to relatives, teacher and other parent substitutes, religion, and pets, on the part of the child.)

3. Peer group processes in human development— including child's place (role, status) among his age-mates, child's knowledge of the codes and customs of the group, child's ability to participate in the preferred activities of the group, skills required for the activities.

4. Socialization processes in human development— including cultural patterns the child is learning—masculine-feminine, rural or urban, regional, ethnic, class, caste— family's aspiration for the child, methods used to train the child, effects of present rapid social change on the child.

5. Self-developmental processes in human development— including the child's experience background, his knowledge, skills, generalizations, concepts, his capacities, interests, and aptitudes, his attitudes, values, goals and aspirations.

6. Self-adjustive processes— including kinds of situations that threaten the self-concept of the child and that set off emotional responses in him, how he handles the emotion, variety of adjustment mechanisms he uses, appropriateness, timing.

The three major influences on human development and behavior— organic, social, and psychological— have been arbitrarily divided into six areas to focus attention on certain aspects that have special importance in the development of children in our culture. Affectional and peer group processes are basic socialization processes— too
essential to have teachers possibly overlook them in the complex socialization area. In the same way self-adjustive processes have been separated from the self-developmental in order to emphasize the vitally important feeling or emotional aspects of development.

Early in the second year, a consultant or the leader presents the framework. Usually this includes an account of its historical development, an interpretation of each area, and a description of how the framework will be used. In most places subheads for the six areas are worked out by the participants through discussion and study over a period of time.

In the meetings that follow, the teachers begin to use the six-area framework in the analysis of their data. As a bit of information is read from a record the teachers ask themselves such questions as these: In what area or areas of this child's development does this datum or this anecdote give us factual information? What do the facts tell us about the child's physical development? about his affectional relationships? The teachers must give reasons for their answers to such questions by drawing upon explanatory scientific principles. Most of the teachers by this time have felt a lack in their scientific knowledge, have come to appreciate its usefulness, and have a real desire to read. The reading each member does contributes to the accumulating knowledge upon which the whole group can draw.

As a teacher analyzes each anecdote he notes beside it the numbers of the areas to which the anecdote contributes factual information. This helps him to check easily whether or not there is a good balance in the data being gathered. A teacher may also jot down on a worksheet, perhaps on the opposite page or in a margin, anything he needs to
remember - additional information the group suggests he needs, a scientific principle a member of the group gives him in explanation of the anecdote, a possible hypothesis that occurs to him and for which he needs to seek supporting or refuting evidence, and suggestions for pertinent reading. This helps the participants keep their purposes in mind. It is important to keep this step from becoming a superficial, mechanical classification of data rather than an experience in deepening understanding. The framework is a useful tool to aid in preventing analysis on the basis of preoccupation, in showing what must be known about a child, in checking the scope of the information, in selecting and recalling scientific concepts explaining human growth and behavior and in seeing which principles apply to the incidents in the child's life, and in serving as a guide to reading.

Some of the material from each record is analyzed by the study group as a whole. But after the purposes and procedures are clear much of the analysis is done in smaller units.

Step 2. After several months of accumulating and of closely examining data the teachers want to look at the record as a whole to see what they have so far. They begin to organize and interpret the materials in their records area by area, usually starting with the organic processes. One participant reads aloud his entire record while the group listens and notes all the facts and recurring patterns that show how the child is developing physically. A series of hypotheses are then made on the basis of these facts for each subhead in the area of organic processes. The recurring patterns in this area help the group to see what developmental tasks the child is working on, and what adjustment problems he is facing. Hypotheses about these are also included. These
explanations must be supported by sufficient facts in the record and also must be valid according to scientific principles of human development and behavior.

After the entire group participates in interpreting one member's record in a given area, sub-groups of two or three are formed to assist each other in formulating hypotheses on their own data in that area. Each teacher continues to gather information all year long to fill in the gaps. The framework is useful here in protecting teachers from coming to conclusions on the basis of too little data or on only one aspect of the child's life as though it were the whole.

Step 3. When the teachers complete the hypotheses in each area they study all of them together to discover their interrelatedness and to see the child as a whole. They come to appreciate the great variety of forces that influence what a child becomes and how he behaves. The participants conclude their records with a summary statement that answers these questions: 1) What developmental tasks is this child working on? 2) What adjustment problems does he face? In most groups teachers include also answers to these questions: What help is he getting in accomplishing his developmental tasks and in solving his adjustment problems? What still needs to be done? Essentially these are the same questions that were asked at the end of the first year but at a more technical level.

Sequence of experiences in the third year. The steps of the study in the third year are not as clear-cut as they are in the first and second years. They are still in process of evolution and consequently the third year of the program is different in each school system, and often also in each study group within a school system.
In general, the purpose of the third year's work is to help teachers develop insight into the mystery of personality, into the dynamic "self." It also aims at giving teachers some insight into the structure and dynamics of the class as a group. Throughout the second year the members of the study groups were seeking out all the influences that act upon a child to make him what he is. They concentrated mainly on the first four areas and saw the personality of the child emerging from the interaction of his physical organism that is his inherited equipment and potential with the complex outside environment and culture. But the teachers have been aware that the evolving "self" is also a dynamic force influencing learning and behavior. To deepen their understanding of this force is the purpose of all their efforts in the third year.

Step 1. The process of analyzing data in the records is the same as it was in the second year, but now the participants try to look at the elements in the anecdote from the child's point of view. In addition to asking what the facts tell about the various areas of the child's development, they also ask: Are there any clues as to how the child feels about these influences? How do the facts in his life look to him? The participants make a special attempt to build up a record that reveals the child's point of view about himself and his relationship to the world. Some study groups try out various measures of personality. The children's autobiographies and creative works also receive special attention.

Step 2. When the teachers have sufficient data they begin to make two sets of hypotheses in each area. The first set consists, as it did in the second year, of explanations of the influences on the child's
development and of the reasons for his behavior. The second set parallels the first and consists of hypotheses that explain how the facts and influences in his life look to the child.

Step 3. This year, if they have not already done so in one of the previous years, the teachers learn to gather sociometric data and to analyse the interaction between the child and his group.

Step 4. To summarize the year's study the participants answer the same questions that were raised at the end of the second year, but this time from the point of view of the internal organization of the child. Sometimes the teachers like to write the summary in paragraph form using the first person. They try to show how the child must see himself now as a result of his past experiences, of the assets and the limitations of his present situation, and of his goals and aspirations for the future.

Curriculum implications of the Child Study program. If this study is thoughtfully carried on, teachers' attitudes toward learning and behavior are being modified all along the way in keeping with the purposes the study is set up to accomplish. With increasing insight, the teachers begin to make changes in their classrooms, first, usually, in their relationships with the children, and later, to some degree, in the conditions they arrange and in the experiences they provide. But in addition, they become aware that major changes must take place in current educational policies and practices if the maximum development of each child in our society is to be the ultimate aim. To bring about these changes can become the goal for a five- or ten-year program in the improvement of education for a faculty group or a school system.

Elements of a successful program. There are four
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find good ways of dealing with them, so that each child might reach his best development in our society. In this program the teachers learn the scientific concepts they need in order to understand children. Through a series of sequential experiences the participants are trained to use the scientific method of arriving at judgments. Working together in small study groups, teachers learn, each year at increasingly complex levels, how to gather data about individual children, how to build objective, comprehensive records, how to interpret the information, and how to come to some valid conclusions on which they can act.

The Child Study program is based on the assumption that the behavior of an individual is caused, and though the causes are multiple, complex, and unique, they can be discovered, influenced, and the behavior changed. The Child Study program is based also on the belief that every human being is valuable and has a right to the relationships, conditions, and experiences that will encourage his maximum self development, and that democratic processes provide the best means for bringing this about.

For the Child Study program to be successfully carried forward, it has been found necessary that participants meet regularly for intensive group study of the records they compile about individual children, that their study be aided by regular consultant help from outside and leadership training locally, that participants attend local two-weeks workshops, and that coordinators and leaders attend six-weeks workshops for more concentrated study of the science of human development.
CHAPTER VI

THE EMERGENCE OF A STATEWIDE PROGRAM OF CHILD STUDY IN TEXAS

Purpose of the chapter. This chapter proposes to describe how a statewide program of Child Study in Texas emerged in order to discover what is involved in the development of statewide Child Study programs in general. In collecting information about the programs in various parts of the state, the author made use of the following questions, though the individual questions did not necessarily have equal significance in the development of each Child Study center.

How was information about the Child Study program obtained by the school system?
What factors were particularly influential in interesting people to undertake the program?
What were the steps involved in reaching a decision to undertake the program?
How was the program brought to the attention of possible participants?
What were the conditions of participation?
How was it organized?
What sort of outside service was obtained? From what sources?
What changes have been made in the organization and administration of the program? Why?
What were the costs involved? How were they met?
How were the outcomes evaluated? What were the results?

The Child Study program in Corpus Christi. The first Child Study program in Texas was launched in Corpus Christi. It grew out of the enthusiasm and untiring activity of a self-appointed committee consisting of E. W. Smith, the principal of the senior high school, Virginia Hufstedler, the counselor of the same school, and Charles A. Gregg, the principal of a nearby junior high school. These three persons participated in the Human Development workshop in the summer of 1943 at the University of Chicago, and learned of the services of the Division on
Child Development and Teacher Personnel and of the program of Child Study being carried on in the Parker School District.

Long before this, however, the Corpus Christi in-service education programs had been concerned with the welfare of children. Since 1938, Dr. James Knight, Director of the Extension Bureau of the University of Texas, had been giving extension courses each year in Corpus Christi. These were centered around some aspects of mental hygiene.

In addition to the series of extension courses centered around the mental health of children, C. E. Burnett, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, also gives credit to the counselors for the readiness of the teachers to undertake the Child Study program. The persistent efforts of the counselors in behalf of children led in 1941 to the organization of the Council of Community Agencies coordinating the services of the school with the twenty agencies of the community that dealt with the welfare of children and youth. The following year, Dorothy White, another member of the staff of the Extension Bureau, served as consultant in Corpus Christi and advanced the project begun the previous year. She had spent some time at the Collaboration Center at the University of Chicago, and through her some of the school personnel first heard about the Human Development workshop. Also, through her, Mrs. H. E. Butt, who with Mr. Butt had established the H. E. Butt Foundation to aid in the promotion and support of certain child welfare projects in the southeast corner of Texas, became interested in the in-service education programs in Corpus Christi and made scholarships available

---

1Information obtained through interviews with C. E. Burnett, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, March 28, 1950, with C. A. Gregg, March 30, 1950, and with Virginia Hufstedler, April 12, 1950.
to two of the three who attended the University of Chicago.\textsuperscript{2}

Miss Hufstedler, Mr. Gregg, and Mr. Smith had been interested in going to school again to seek help in setting up a guidance program and in learning how to achieve greater articulation between the junior and senior high schools. They were drawn to the seminars and interest groups of the Human Development workshop for they sensed that there they might find solutions to the problems they had brought with them. They were deeply impressed with what they found. In a series of conferences with the staff of the Division on Child Development and Teacher Personnel, they explored the possibility of organizing a Child Study program in Corpus Christi as a basis for the guidance program in the junior and senior high schools.\textsuperscript{3}

On their return from Chicago, the three high-school staff members made a full report to the Superintendent of Schools and to the administrative staff and recommended that a summer workshop be held for secondary teachers to acquaint them with the program. The superintendent had already been thinking of launching an in-service program to improve instruction, and he felt that a study of children might serve as a basis for the improvement of instruction as well as for guidance. He felt, too, that elementary school teachers should also be included in the program.\textsuperscript{4} Through correspondence during the following year, 1943-

\textsuperscript{2}Information obtained through interview with Mrs. H. E. Butt, March 27, 1950.

\textsuperscript{3}Information obtained through interview with O. A. Gregg, March 30, 1950, and with Virginia Hufstedler, April 12, 1950.

\textsuperscript{4}Information obtained through interview with Marvin P. Baker, Superintendent of Schools, March 28, 1950.
1944, the superintendent and Dr. Daniel A. Prescott, Head of the Division on Child Study and Teacher Personnel, University of Chicago, made plans for a Child Study workshop in Corpus Christi.5

The Child Study program was brought to the attention of the Corpus Christi school personnel at a two-weeks workshop held in June, 1944. The superintendent required the attendance of all principals, for the three who had been to the University of Chicago impressed upon him that it was important for the administrators to become familiar with the plans and convinced of the value of such a program before any work was undertaken by the teachers.6 The principals were asked to select a few teachers from their faculties to attend with them. Twenty principals and thirty teachers attended the first workshop. The superintendent, the assistant superintendent, and all the administrators from the central office were present the full time and participated in all the activities. One parent from the City Council of Parents and Teachers also attended.

Dr. Prescott, who was the consultant, gave a ninety-minute lecture each morning on some aspect of child development. This was followed by a period during which participants analyzed case records borrowed from the Parker School District, South Carolina. The participants became greatly interested in these techniques of studying children and early in the second week expressed the desire to continue these activities during the following year. The consultant then met separately with school

5 See correspondence file, Institute for Child Study, University of Maryland.

principals as a group and with different school faculty groups. Gradually plans for the following year took shape.

Morale was high. The workshop had been planned by committees of principals and teachers. It was housed in an old unused hotel at Bayside on the Gulf of Mexico. Cots were set up, school cafeteria equipment moved to the hotel, and about a dozen principals swept, mopped, and hammered to prepare the place for the participants. This plan of "roughing it" was a radical departure from the usual meetings held by the school personnel. It proved to be so successful that the same plan was continued another year. The workshop was then moved to the campus of the Texas College of Arts and Industries until the spring of 1951 when for various reasons the workshop had to be brought back to Corpus Christi.  

In the fall of 1944 a general meeting was held to explain the Child Study program to the entire school personnel. This was followed by an organizational meeting. Previously, the teachers and principals who had attended the workshop personally invited other members of their school faculties to join them in study groups. It was agreed that participation would be voluntary and that no person would be pressured in any way to undertake the study.

The first year one hundred twenty five persons participated in study groups with principals as leaders. Each participant began to keep a record of one child, and groups met every other week for a two-hour

---

7Information obtained through interviews with C. E. Burnett, March 28, 1950, and with C. A. Gregg, March 30, 1950.

8See p. 70.
period to study the records. Two members of Dr. Prescott's staff at the University of Chicago served as consultants to the groups for a week each early in the school year, and a third went in January to remain five weeks. The superintendent and the assistant superintendent regularly participated in groups, and visited all the groups when the consultants were present. The groups worked enthusiastically and completed the series of experiences that constitute the first year of the program. The Child Study program was now an accepted part of the in-service education of the personnel of the school system.

Each year's work thereafter was preceded by a two-weeks workshop cooperatively planned by committees that included School Board members as well as teachers and principals. The purpose of the workshops was partly to help participants increase their scientific knowledge and develop skill in studying children, and partly to clarify the purposes and procedures of the Child Study program for the next year. The plan of the program was similar each year. Participants had one ninety-minute period for lecture-seminar in specific scientific areas, another for laboratory sessions analyzing case materials about individual children, and a third for reading. Rest, recreation, arts and crafts were also provided for. An average of one hundred persons attended each workshop and were assisted by four consultants from the University of Chicago.

During the school year groups of ten to twelve persons continued

9The information for this paragraph and for the three following paragraphs was obtained from the files in the office of the coordinator of the Child Study program, School Administration Building, Corpus Christi.
to meet regularly for two hours twice a month. Leaders met for longer
periods once a month for more intensive training. In the second year
a local coordinator was appointed on a half-time basis to facilitate
the work of the groups. Each year thereafter a full time coordinator
directed the program except for the year 1947-1948, when three counsel-
ors were released part time to share this responsibility. Three or
four consultants from the University of Chicago spent from six to
eight weeks each year in Corpus Christi, meeting with groups and giv-
ing additional training to leaders. Each participant had direct con-
tact with a consultant three times a year. Leaders had at least six
meetings with the consultant.

Throughout the study a great deal of emphasis was placed on the
thorough training of local leaders. In addition to help given during
the year by the consultants, and in the two-weeks local workshops,
leaders of groups were encouraged to attend the Human Development Work-
shop at the University of Chicago. Nine persons attended during the
summer following the first year of the program and an average of ten
have attended each summer thereafter.

As leaders were trained, the content of the program increased in
depth. And yet, benefiting by the experience in Parker School District,
the participants in Corpus Christi were able to accomplish in two years
what it took the first groups in the program four years to develop. ¹⁰

The sequence of experiences of the first two years remained relatively
stable, but the third year of the program was continually being

¹⁰Letter from Dr. D. A. Prescott to Virginia Hufstedler, April 4,
1947, correspondence file, Institute for Child Study, University of
Maryland.
modified. In the beginning the groups spent the first half of the year gathering, analyzing and summarizing the data as they did in the second year, except that now they tried to see how the child himself felt about his world. During the second half of the year they kept records of what they did to try to help the child or to facilitate his development. As the participants went into a deeper analysis of how the self is formed and how it develops, they found that it was taking longer than a half year to make an adequate analysis. In addition, by 1946-1947, the participants were making sociograms to obtain additional facts to help them learn about the child's ability to find and play effective social roles. These activities were crowding out the period in which the participants considered how they may help the child. To save time for this, groups began to hurry what went before, and this was not entirely satisfying, either.\textsuperscript{11}

For a while in the spring of 1947 some principals believed that the Child Study program should be condensed into two years, primarily because of the pressure to deal directly with phases of the curriculum such as visual aids and music. Dr. Prescott advised the coordinator that this was not wise. He wrote: "Once one has the knowledge that comes during the first couple of years, one can see that the concepts are relatively simple, and it seems just common sense to start out the program by telling the teachers these things. On the other hand, an examination of our experience and that of the teachers will show us that they have been told these things for years, but that they never

\textsuperscript{11}Information obtained through interview with the counselors, Corinne Britt, Mrs. Jennie Lou Dominy, Lucille Frazier, and Metha Scaife, March 27, 1950.
understood them. Actually the learning process seems to proceed much more effectively by the analysis of one's own experience than it does by having someone tell us the answers that they have arrived at from their experience. The third year groups showed significant improvement beyond where they were at the end of the second year and the program has remained a three year study.

The plan of considering during the latter part of the third year the implications of Child Study for the curriculum served to make groups want to continue projects started at that time. Consequently, several groups worked together for a fourth year, and at the present writing a few groups have been working together for as long as seven years.

The number of participants increased each year of the program. During the second year one hundred new participants and the faculty of one of the negro schools undertook the program. By the third year participation had increased to almost three hundred. At the end of the present school year, 1951, seven years after the beginning of the program in Corpus Christi, 590 - or over 85 per cent - of the 685 elementary and high school teachers will have completed three years in the Child Study program. Naturally, the number of participants in the three years of the program has declined. For this reason the spring workshop that up until three years ago was concerned entirely with

---

12Letter from Dr. D. A. Prescott to Virginia Hufstedler, April 4, 1947, correspondence file, Institute for Child Study, University of Maryland.

13Information obtained through interview with the counselors, and also with Weldon Gibson, Principal of the Lamar Elementary School, March 29, 1950.
Child Study now deals mainly with curriculum implications. There are, however, Child Study groups for those who are new to the school system.\footnote{Information for the foregoing and also for the following account of the financing of the Child Study program was obtained from the files in the office of the coordinator of the Child Study program, School Administration Building, Corpus Christi.}

When the Corpus Christi school system decided to undertake the Child Study program with consultant help from the University of Chicago, funds were no longer available from the General Education Board for this service. It was necessary for the system to find its own means of supporting the program. On their return from Chicago, Miss Ruffedtler, Mr. Gregg, and Mr. Smith were given permission by the superintendent to explain the program to the local School Board, the Faculty Club, which is the local unit of the State Teachers Association, and the H. E. Butt Foundation. As a result the first workshop was sponsored and financed by these three groups jointly. Members of the Board of Education spent a day observing the activities of the workshop. They conferred with the administrative staff and with Dr. Prescott and assured them of financial support to allow study groups to meet in school time and to provide consultant service to these groups.

The budget for in-service education has increased from $3500 in 1944-1945, the first year of the Child Study program in Corpus Christi, to $10,500 for 1950-1951. The budget for 1949-1950 included the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultants (through the year)</td>
<td>$1260.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants (summer workshop)</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses of workshop</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous expenses</td>
<td>140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,500.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The fees are paid by the Corpus Christi Board of Education. For the first few years the Board of Education paid all the expenses of the summer workshop, which amounted to about $60 per teacher for the two weeks. Since 1947 the teachers have been asked to pay a registration fee of $15.

Scholarships were also made available for attendance at the six-weeks summer workshops at the University of Chicago and later at the University of Maryland by the Bivens Corporation Foundation, the City Council of Parents and Teachers, the General Education Board, the H. E. Butt Foundation, and the Hogg Foundation for Mental Hygiene.

Teachers pay no fee for the work carried on during the year unless they desire academic credit. During the first and second years of the program college credit was given for the work in Child Study by the South West Texas State College at San Marcos and by the University of Texas. Dr. Prescott was appointed a member of the University of Texas faculty without salary to evaluate the work. Following the war the Corpus Christi Board of Education began to enforce the ruling made before the war requiring all members of the instructional staff to earn a minimum of six semester hours of credit during each four-year period. The Board added that three consecutive years of approved participation in the Child Study program would meet the requirement in any one four-year period. Soon after that several institutions began to give credit for the program of Child Study carried on during the school year. The

15 The Bivens Corporation Foundation is a philanthropic organization in Ohio interested in promoting mental hygiene in the United States.

16 The Hogg family left an endowment for the promotion of mental hygiene in Texas to be administered through the University of Texas.
University of Texas offered three credits per year and the work was evaluated by the Director of the Extension Bureau. In 1949-1950 the Texas College of Arts and Industries at Kingsville offered three credits; the coordinator of the Child Study program in Corpus Christi was appointed to the faculty without salary and she evaluated the work submitted. In each of these places a maximum of six hours in the field program of Child Study is accepted toward fulfillment of the requirements for a master's degree. Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College offered to negro participants three credits for a maximum of one year's work. At the present time it is possible for both negro and white participants to obtain two hours of credit from the University of Maryland for the work in each year of the program. The work submitted is evaluated by the staff of the Institute for Child Study.

Evaluation of the Child Study program has been going on since its beginning stages, but it has consisted mainly of informal expressions of opinion. There have been two formal attempts at evaluation in Corpus Christi. One study sought to determine whether the participants felt that their work in the Child Study program had been worthwhile. The response was decidedly in the affirmative. Principals reported that teachers developed a more accepting attitude toward children, that they became more skillful in dealing with "discipline problems," and that there was a more permissive atmosphere in the classrooms. Teachers reported that they were more understanding of all children and also of each other as teachers.

The study showed that the longer the participation in the Child Study Program, the higher the percentage of students who have been helped to become more understanding teachers and the higher the percentage of attendance at the workshop. The study showed that the nature of the participation in the Child Study Program has occurred in the system as a whole.

The change that has occurred in the system has been a greater acceptance by the teachers and the parents of the idea of the program. The study showed that the teachers and the parents have been more involved in the program and have attended more meetings and workshops. The study also showed that the teachers and the parents have been more involved in the program and have attended more meetings and workshops. The study also showed that the teachers and the parents have been more involved in the program and have attended more meetings and workshops.
are no short cuts to understanding children. The study also noted that "the people who have never been in the Child Study program checked the highest percentage of responses indicating objection to the program." The same was true of those who had never been to a workshop. That is, ninety per cent of the people who indicated that the program was a waste of time, who were not helped by it, who indicated a feeling of misunderstanding and confusion as a result of the program, had never been to a workshop.

Some other interesting facts were brought out by this study. It indicated that ninety-six per cent of the administrators had participated in the program, as against eighty-three per cent of the teachers; and that while only twenty-three per cent of the teachers had participated in workshops, eighty-nine per cent of the administration had attended. The study found that the highest percentage of favorable responses came from those who had twenty years or more of teaching experience. Generally speaking participation consistently rose with each year of experience in the Corpus Christi schools.

Two other more recent studies analyzed the records kept by teachers. One of these19 sought to determine what changes occur in teacher's records during two years of Child Study, in respect to the sources used for gathering information about a child, the scope of the information, and the form of recording. The data used were obtained from a random sampling of forty first year records written by teachers in Corpus Christi and in one other center outside Texas, and also from the second

---

year records written by the same teachers. By means of check lists tabulations were made of the sources from which information about a child were drawn, of the facts classified in each area of the six-area framework, and of objective and subjective materials. The investigation revealed 1) that in two years of Child Study teachers become very aware of the numerous sources, other than the classroom, from which information about a child must be secured for adequate understanding of him, 2) that teachers record an increasingly greater number and variety of significant facts, and 3) that teachers develop skill in recording information more objectively. The conclusion arrived at was that the operational procedures used in Child Study are effective in developing the skills needed in accomplishing the data-gathering purposes of the program.

The second study endeavored to ascertain whether teachers were recording the behavior of children differently after being engaged in Child Study, by analyzing the number of, and content emphasis in, the anecdotes in each half of each record kept during the teachers' three-year participation in the program. Three records of each of five teachers in Corpus Christi, fifteen records in all, were the sources of the data employed. The analysis revealed that four of the five teachers recorded more incidents in the latter part of the record than they did in the first half, and that in the latter half of the record all the teachers recorded the behavior of children in all six

---

20 The six area framework is described on pp. 75-76.

areas\textsuperscript{22} to a greater degree than in the first half. The conclusions
drawn were 1) that after being engaged in Child Study teachers became
more aware of the variety of sources from which to gather information
about a child, 2) that they became more skillful in recording informa-
tion objectively and 3) that the material recorded grew increasingly
more complex. These were essentially the same as the findings of the
study made by Madelaine Hershon.

Another evaluative survey revealed that parents felt that the
teachers understood their children. Some of the teachers had been tak-
ing an extension course in Educational Sociology offered in the fall
term of 1949 by the University of Houston. Three teachers sponsored
a survey in their school community, using the "Illinois Inventory of
Parent Opinion" by Harold Hand. The forms were sent home with the old-
est child in each family and checked anonymously. Two hundred thirty
completed forms were returned. Over ninety per cent of the parents
were satisfied with the way their children were treated in school and
felt that the teachers understood and cared about their children.\textsuperscript{23}

The Assistant Superintendent of Schools, G. E. Burnett, believes that
there is a direct correlation between the results of this survey and
the fact that this time almost eighty per cent of the teachers in the
school where the survey was made had been in the Child Study program.\textsuperscript{24}

There are some parent study groups in Corpus Christi. The parent

\textsuperscript{22} See pp. 75-76.

\textsuperscript{23} Information obtained from the files in the office of the Super-
intendent of Schools, School Administration Building, Corpus Christi.

\textsuperscript{24} Expressed by G. E. Burnett in an interview with the author,
March 28, 1950.
who represented the City Council of Parents and Teachers at the first Child Study workshop was instrumental in starting many of these. She worked jointly with the Coordinator of Home and Family Life Education. They were greatly assisted in their early efforts by Dorothy White who was the consultant to Corpus Christi in 1942-1943 when the program of the Council of Community Agencies was being developed. The parent study groups receive consultant service from the guidance counselors, the principals of the schools, classroom teachers in the Child Study program, the Home and Family Life Education staff, nurses trained in child development, and also from the University of Chicago, the University of Maryland, the University of Texas and Wayne University.\textsuperscript{25}

On the whole the Child Study program is well received by the teachers and by the community. The administrators believe that the "esprit de corps" in the school system is unique. They attribute this to the Child Study program and especially to the workshops. In a period of high turnover of teachers it served to keep a core group united and acting as leaven for the new people. The relaxed, friendly, first-name relationship among the teachers and administrators that resulted from the workshops served to unify the system.\textsuperscript{26}

Some resistance to the program has come from two or three principals who were not associated with the beginning of the program and therefore feel it is not their program, and from one or two other

\textsuperscript{25}Information obtained through interviews with Mrs. Edwinna Williams, Chairman of the Committee on Special Children, Council of Community Agencies, with Mrs. Marion Underwood, Coordinator of Home and Family Life Education, March 29, 1950, and with Virginia Kufstedler, May 10, 1951.

\textsuperscript{26}Information for the foregoing and also for the following paragraphs was obtained through interview with C. E. Burnett, March 28, 1950.
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to help the rejected children in their school.

This group begins to approach what we think the outcomes of child study should be, people who can choose their own problems and work together for the benefit of the school and its children.

Dean Haskew raised the question as to whether we were not postponing the real payoff in the program unless we could develop a second three years as definite and as well organized as the first three years. That is a question to which some people in Corpus Christi are finding an answer but not enough of us in Corpus Christi or elsewhere. 28

The Child Study program in four Rio Grande Valley communities.

From Corpus Christi the program spread into four communities in the Rio Grande Valley. Late in 1945, when Dr. James Knight returned from service in the Armed Forces to his duties as Director of the Extension Bureau of the University of Texas, he learned of the experiences of two of his staff, Carl Brett and Dorothy White, at the Human Development Workshops in Chicago. He also heard about the in-service program of Child Study in Corpus Christi, then in its second year. At the same time Mrs. Butt sent him a copy of Helping Teachers Understand Children, and in the spring of 1946 she talked with him about the possibility of making consultant service available from the Extension Bureau to centers desiring to undertake Child Study. 29

Also in the spring of 1946, two South Texas administrators, D. U. Duckner, Superintendent of Schools at Pharr-San Juan-Alamo, and Ernest R. Poteet, Superintendent of Schools at Laringen, expressed to Dr.

28Quoted from a letter from Dr. James Knight to Corinne Britt, February 21, 1950, in the files in the office of the coordinator of the Child Study program, School Administration Building, Corpus Christi.

29Information for the foregoing and for the following two paragraphs was obtained through interviews with Mrs. H. H. Butt, March 27, 1950, and with Dr. James Knight, April 1, 1950.
Knight their need for some systematic plan of in-service education, and one of them added that he had heard excellent reports of the program at Corpus Christi. As a result of this conference, Dr. Knight and the two superintendents attended the workshop in Corpus Christi and conferred with Dr. Daniel A. Prescott, Mrs. Butt, and Dr. Otte Nielsen, Professor of Education in the Texas College of Arts and Industries, about starting a program of Child Study in their school systems. Mrs. Butt and Dr. Nielsen promised some financial support.

Since Mr. Buckner and Mr. Potest felt that their school systems were not large enough to sponsor the undertaking alone, they interested Leon R. Graham, Superintendent of Schools at Mercedes, and S. V. Nelley, Superintendent of Schools at San Benito. The four superintendents discussed the program with their respective Boards of Education and received their support.

Willie Holdsworth, who had recently spent twelve months at the Collaboration Center at the University of Chicago, was engaged as full-time coordinator. In the fall of 1946 Miss Holdsworth visited the faculty groups in the four school systems, and explained the program. The work was organized with one hundred fifty, or about one-third of the teachers participating.30

The organization of Child Study in the Rio Grande Valley was similar to that in Corpus Christi. However, since there was a full-time, well qualified coordinator who was able to meet each group approximately every third session, less consultant service from the University of

---

30Information in a letter from Willie Holdsworth to Dr. Daniel A. Prescott, October 5, 1945, in the files of the Institute for Child Study, University of Maryland.
Chicago was needed. The first year only two consultants for a week each were required.

Another point of difference was that these four school systems could not afford to establish their own local workshop until the beginning of their fourth year in the program.31 During the first three years, teachers, especially group leaders, were encouraged to participate in the Corpus Christi workshop, the expense being borne by their own Boards of Education. The H. E. Butt Foundation also made available several scholarships for leaders to attend the Human Development workshop at the University of Chicago.32

Academic credit was granted by both the University of Texas and the Texas College of Arts and Industries. With the exception of those desiring such credit, participants paid no fees. The program was sponsored and financed jointly by the H. E. Butt Foundation, the Hogg Foundation for Mental Hygiene, the Texas College of Arts and Industries, and the local Boards of Education.33 The annual budget was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator's salary</td>
<td>$4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator's expenses</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant's fees</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other expenses</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5200</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31 Their first local workshop was held in the summer of 1949 at Monterrey, Mexico, and had as one of its major purposes the planning of a fourth year's work designed to develop more fully the implications of what the teachers had learned during the first three years. (Information obtained through interview with Willie Holdsworth, April 1, 1950.)

32 Information obtained through interview with Willie Holdsworth, April 1, 1950.


In September 1948, when Willie Holdsworth was appointed full-time staff member of the Extension Bureau of the University of Texas, the activities in the four communities of the Rio Grande Valley became a part of the Child Study program sponsored by the University of Texas. From that time on the consultant service was provided by the University of Texas and was financed entirely by the local Boards of Education.

Development of Child Study programs sponsored by the University of Texas. Early in the development of the Child Study program in Texas, Mrs. H. E. Butt and a few superintendents believed that increasingly more teachers should be engaged in Child Study groups. They believed also that Child Study was so important that it would be sounder to maintain a staff of consultants at their own state university than it would be to depend entirely on outside and distant services. There were involved here. One was to spread Child Study and so make necessary consultant service from the University of Texas, and the other was to obtain staff qualified to assist groups in their work.

Consequently in January, 1947, Mrs. Butt talked with Mr. M. P. Baker, Superintendent of Schools in Corpus Christi, about what the Butt Foundation might do toward furthering Child Study in Texas. They agreed that the program should be brought to the attention of superintendents. Mrs. Butt believed that this could be done by providing

---

35See the following section on Development of Child Study programs sponsored by the University of Texas.

36Information obtained through interviews on April 1, 1950, with Willie Holdsworth, and on May 14, 1951, with Dr. John J. Kurtz, Professor of Education, Institute for Child Study, University of Maryland.

37Information obtained through interview with Mrs. H. E. Butt, March 27, 1950. See also pp. 101-102.
scholarships to enable the superintendents to work intensively for a short period in the Human Development Workshop at the University of Chicago. The proposal was communicated to Dr. Daniel A. Prescott and he replied that if the men would come to Chicago, he would arrange a short summer course for them. Mrs. Butt immediately began correspondence with the superintendents of southern Texas, and Dr. Knight spent the last week in March visiting the superintendents in the Rio Grande Valley and acquainting them with the proposed plan. As a result twelve superintendents and university staff members attended a special Human Development Workshop at the University of Chicago for three weeks in July. All returned feeling that the experience had been unusually valuable. Eventually all these men became active in the Child Study program.

In the fall of 1947 Child Study programs were undertaken in Clear Creek, Kerrville, Marshall, Midland, and San Angelo, and for the first

\[35\text{See correspondence between Mrs. H. E. Butt and Dr. D. A. Prescott, January 15, April 2, and May 15, 1947, Institute for Child Study, University of Maryland.}\]

\[39\text{Dr. James Knight, Director of the Extension Bureau of the University of Texas; Dr. Otto Nielsen, Professor of Education at the Texas College of Arts and Industries; D. U. Buckner, Superintendent at Pharr-San Juan-Alamo; E. H. Potest, Superintendent at Harlingen; Leon R. Graham, Superintendent at Mercedes; S. V. Neely, Superintendent at San Benito; William T. Puryear, Assistant Superintendent at Marshall; J. B. Smith, Superintendent at La Feria; C. A. Thormählen, Superintendent of Jim Wells County; R. F. Ward, Superintendent at Edinburg; Frank L. Williams, Professor of Education, Southern Methodist University; and D. L. Woodson, Superintendent at Taft.}\]

\[40\text{W. T. Puryear wrote to Mrs. H. E. Butt, "This has changed my life." J. B. Smith wrote, "This was the most profitable time I have ever spent in study in connection with school work." (Quotations from letters in the file of Mrs. H. E. Butt.) Similar statements were written by the others who attended the workshop.}\]
time consultant service for the study groups was obtained from the University of Texas as well as from the University of Chicago and the University of Maryland.  

Dr. Prescott had encouraged the idea held by Mrs. Butt, by Dr. Knight, and by a number of superintendents, that the University of Texas should become the center of a statewide program of Child Study. An effort was now made by the University of Texas to obtain staff members who were able to provide the necessary consultant service. Dr. John J. Kurtz, who had spent the previous semester as a fellow in the Institute for Child Study at the University of Maryland, joined the staff of the Extension Bureau in February 1945. Willie Holdsworth was appointed on a part-time basis and the following year full time. Virginia Hufstedler, coordinator of the Child Study program in Corpus Christi, and E. C. Watts, formerly of the Texas College of Arts and Industries, became part-time staff members of the Extension Bureau. Additional consultant service from the Corpus Christi school personnel also was made available as it was needed.

At this time a plan was set up for financing the consultant service to the Child Study groups sponsored by the University of Texas. This plan is still in operation. The local boards of Education make an agreement with the University of Texas and pay a fee for the nine months of the school year. The fee ranges from $500 to $1,000, according

---

1 The Institute for Child Study under the direction of Dr. Daniel A. Prescott had been established at the University of Maryland in the fall of 1947.

2 Information for this and the following paragraphs was obtained through conference with Dr. James Knight, Willie Holdsworth, and Ralph Duke, Assistant Professor of Education, Extension Bureau, University of Texas, April 1, 1950, and through interview with Dr. John Kurtz, May 14, 1951.
to the extensiveness of the consultant service needed. The larger the
system and the more groups participating, the more consultant hours are
needed and the greater the expense of the program.

In 1947-1948 participating school systems received consultant serv-
ience from the University of Texas two to four days a month. Each teacher
had contact with a consultant approximately every third meeting, and
leaders met with the consultant every month. Without additional fee
the University of Texas also provided consultant service two or three
times a year from the Institute for Child Study, University of Maryland.
These consultants from the Institute met with leaders, administrators,
and with some small groups. They also lectured to large groups on
aspects of the synthesis of knowledge about human development and be-
havior. No fees were paid by teachers except by those desiring academ-
ic credit.

The Child Study programs in San Angelo and Marshall. The launch-
ing and development of Child Study programs in San Angelo and in Marshall
will be described in some detail here, for the developments in these
places influenced other school systems to undertake Child Study.\(^3\)

San Angelo\(^4\)

Ralph Duke, one of the principals in San Angelo, had attached the
Human Development Workshop in Chicago in the summer of 1946. On his

\(^3\)See pp. 112, 114, 115-116, 122.

\(^4\)Information for this account of the San Angelo Child Study program
was obtained through interviews on April 1, 1950, with Ralph Duke, and on
May 14, 1951, with Dr. John Kurtz and A. G. Murphy, formerly on the staff
of the Extension Bureau, University of Texas, and at the present writing
(1951) a fellow at the Institute for Child Study, University of Maryland.
return he talked with the administrators and suggested that in-service education in San Angelo be centered around Child Study. The administrators were interested, for the school system had reached an impasse in curriculum development. There was dissatisfaction with repeatedly writing curriculum revisions, and the feeling prevailed that neither the teachers nor the administrators had a foundation of understanding of children on which to base recommendations for curriculum changes. In the year that followed, Ralph Duke talked with teachers individually and in school staff meetings, and he found them receptive to his proposal. The Board of Education also gave its approval.

Concrete action was taken in the fall of 1947, when about 150 San Angelo teachers voluntarily organized in small Child Study groups. Ralph Duke, who had been appointed Director of Elementary Education, acted as coordinator.\(^4\) No workshop was held to prepare for the first year, but for six weeks the following summer twenty teachers attended the first Kirby Hall workshop in Human Development on the University of Texas campus. Immediately following this workshop the first two-weeks local Child Study workshop in San Angelo was held. Two-weeks workshops have preceded each year of the program since.\(^5\) There has

\(^4\) In 1948 Ralph Duke joined the staff of the Extension Bureau of the University of Texas, and Fern Van Court succeeded him as Director of Elementary Education and Child Study coordinator. Miss Van Court was an elementary teacher who had been a leader in the program since its inception. In 1950 she went to the Institute for Child Study at the University of Maryland for further training.

\(^5\) An interesting feature of these workshops is that parents were included on the same basis as teachers. Six parents attended the first year, thirty the second, and fifty the third. After the second workshop, parent study groups were formed in each of the schools in the system, and two hundred sixty-four parents participated in 1949-1950. They received the same services the teachers received.
been widespread participation both in the local workshops and in the
six-weeks workshop sponsored by the University of Texas.

By the spring of 1950, over two hundred of the two hundred seventy-five elementary and high school teachers were engaged in Child Study.
About one hundred fifty were completing three years of work.

In the fourth year of the program the teachers began again to examine school practices and curriculum, but now they were looking to see how these either contributed to or hindered the normal growth and development of children.

Through the Child Study program, growth in understanding has been evidenced. Teachers are indicating more professional interest and are asking for more opportunities for action research in schools than ever before. The sincere interest evidenced by the parent-study groups and the sympathetic understanding they have communicated to the teachers have given both assurance and self-confidence to the teachers. We are on our way toward building an understanding in community relationships that will promote an educational program where children's needs will determine the criteria for curriculum change.57

Marshall58

In 1946 the Board of Education in Marshall began to enforce a


58 Information for this exposition of the Marshall Child Study program was obtained in conference on March 22, 1950, with Vivian H. Hackney, Superintendent of Schools; Norma Purvey, Principal of Stephen F. Austin School; Hilda Berglund, Principal of Van Sandt Elementary School; Emma Mae Brotto, Principal of Marshall Junior High School; and Ella Virginia Greer, a teacher; and through interviews on April 1, 1950, with Dr. Knight, and on April 5, 1950, with E. W. Dennard, Assistant Superintendent of Schools in Dallas, and with W. F. Puyear, coordinator of Child Study in Dallas. Both Mr. Dennard and Mr. Puyear had previously been employed in the Marshall School system.
regulations made before the war requiring all teachers to engage in some formal study every third year. The teachers themselves, however, were already aware of their need for in-service education. That year Dr. Henry Otto of the Education Department of the University of Texas had been giving some help in curriculum development in the Marshall schools. He suggested that educators be called into Marshall and that the teachers be given college credit for work done locally. Following his suggestion, E. N. Dannard, Superintendent of Schools, wrote to five colleges in Texas asking for help in setting up an in-service program. They replied that staff was not available for that kind of service. Six months later, early in the school year of 1946-1947, a committee of teachers and principals representing the seven Marshall schools appealed to the superintendent and again the colleges were canvassed for help with an off-campus workshop. This time a favorable response was received from the University of Texas.

Dr. Knight met in January, 1947, with the superintendent, the workshop committee and the teachers to determine what kind of help they wanted. The subjects most prominently mentioned were better classroom instruction, child growth and development, remedial reading, guidance, and curriculum development. On his return to the University of Texas it occurred to Dr. Knight that a workshop in child growth and development would coordinate, and lay the foundation for, the kinds of things the teachers were hoping to learn to do. He communicated this thought to the superintendent and suggested that the Child Study coordinators in Corpus Christi and in the Rio Grande Valley school systems be used as consultants. Their services would be supplemented by those of staff members from the University of Texas and other Texas colleges. Dr.
Knight wrote: "This sort of program would be definite, there would be no lost motion in getting it underway, and it would serve as an excellent background for in-service programs in the future." The workshop committee was enthusiastic, and soon afterwards Dr. Knight, Willie Holdsworth, and Virginia Hufstedler met with the Marshall workshop committee to make definite plans. On Dr. Knight's recommendation Norma Forsyth, chairman of the workshop committee, visited Child Study groups just across the border in Shreveport, Louisiana, and on her return made a most favorable report to the committee.

The first workshop was inspiring and challenging. It was held in Marshall for four weeks in June, and seven colleges and universities cooperated in the enterprise sponsored by the University of Texas: East Texas Baptist College, East Texas State Teachers College, North Texas State Teachers College, Sam Houston State Teachers College, Southern Methodist University, Stephen F. Austin State Teachers College, and West Texas State Teachers College. This was the first time so many Texas colleges and universities combined their faculties and facilities to extend four semester hours credit to an off-campus workshop. Teachers who participated had the privilege of matriculating in any one of the cooperating colleges. The matriculation fee was $35 and was

---

149 Letter from Dr. James Knight to E. W. Dennard, January 31, 1947, in the files of the superintendent of schools, Marshall.

50Serving as consultants from these institutions were Dr. T. R. Shelby, Dean of the School of Education at the University of Texas; Dr. J. G. Umstatta and Dr. C. T. Gray, Professors of Education at the University of Texas; Dr. Frank L. Williams, Professor of Education at Southern Methodist University; Dr. J. G. Matthews, Dean of the School of Education at North Texas State Teachers College; Dr. J. G. Gee, President of East Texas State Teachers College; and Dr. James Franklin, Professor of Education at East Texas State Teachers College.
paid by the teacher. No examinations were given, no check on reading
was made, and a grade of "B" was given each person who attended. Par-
ticipation was entirely voluntary. Sixty-five Marshall Teachers and
principal and twelve from schools in the surrounding areas attended.
The superintendent and all the principals attended full time and par-
ticipated in all the activities. The plan was similar to that of the
workshops held in Corpus Christi. Willie Holdsworth, Virginia Hufsted-
ler, and Mrs. Jenny Lou Dominy, a counselor in Corpus Christi,
coordinated the activities of the workshop and conducted the laboratory
sessions. The visiting consultants contributed scientific information
from their own areas of specialization through lectures and seminars.

Directly after the workshop, teachers in the seven schools organ-
ized Child Study groups with seven to twelve members each, selected
their leaders and co-leaders, and a program of in-service education
with Child Study as its basis was launched in Marshall. William T.
Puryear, Principal of the Senior High School, acted as coordinator.
The University of Texas sponsored the program and through the Extension
Bureau, consultants were obtained from the University of Chicago, the
University of Maryland, Southern Methodist University, and from Corpus
Christi, as well as from the University of Texas.

Since the first year, regular two-weeks local workshops, similar
to those held in other Child Study centers, have been conducted under
the sponsorship of the University of Texas. In addition to a large at-
tendance at the local workshop, there has always been a group of five
or six Marshall teachers at the Kirby Hall workshop on the University
of Texas campus. At the present writing (1951) the Child Study program
in Marshall is in its fourth year. Approximately one hundred of the
one hundred fifty teachers have completed three years in the program. 51

Expansion of the statewide program sponsored by the University of Texas. For six weeks in the summer of 1948 the University of Texas held at Kirby Hall the first workshop in Child Growth and Development on its campus. 52 It was sponsored by the University of Texas and aided by grants from the General Education Board, the E. E. Butt Foundation, and the Hogg Foundation. It was planned by the staff of the Extension Bureau in consultation with Dr. Daniel A. Prescott.

The plan was similar to that of the Human Development Workshops held at the University of Chicago and at the University of Maryland. A series of overview lectures was given three mornings a week from 8:30-9:45. Seminars in the various aspects of scientific knowledge about human growth and behavior were held from 10:00-12:00. Teachers had the opportunity of participating in two seminars, each of three weeks' duration. The seminars were limited to twenty individuals. Laboratory sessions in the techniques of studying children were held from 2:00-4:00 three times a week. These were limited to ten or twelve individuals. There were ample library facilities and time was available for reading. Provisions were also made for recreation and for activities in the arts.

The sixty participants were assisted in their study by eighteen consultants from the University of Chicago, the University of Texas,

51 Information for this paragraph was obtained from the files of the Superintendent of Schools in Marshall.

52 Information for the following account of the Kirby Hall workshop on the campus of the University of Texas was obtained from the files of Dr. James Knight, Extension Bureau, University of Texas.
and from the local area. Four of the consultants were full-time staff members, the others gave part-time service with lectures, seminars, or laboratory groups. Credit for six semester hours on the graduate level was granted and the total cost of the workshop, including board and room, to each participant was $115. The roster of participants includes many persons who subsequently assumed important leadership roles in Child Study programs in their communities. The six-weeks summer workshop on the campus of the University of Texas has become a regular part of the Child Study program sponsored by the University.

In the fall of 1948 new centers were established at Abilene, Alamo Heights, Burnet, Dallas, Edinburg, Fort Stockton, Kilgore, La Feria, Laredo, New London, Odessa, Overton, Spring Hill, and Weslaco.

It is illuminating to see what influences brought these new centers into being. Teachers in Abilene heard of the program from teachers in San Angelo and sent a committee there to look into the program. Four school systems - Kilgore, New London, Overton, and Spring Hill - are in East Texas near Marshall and were influenced by the enthusiasm of the teachers there. In addition, the superintendents in these five systems work together closely. Each knows what is happening in the other school systems. Teachers in Burnet and Odessa had participated in the Kirby Hall workshop at the University of Texas and started groups on their return to their school systems. The teachers in Odessa had known of the program in Midland the year before and were ready to have a workshop of their own locally, following the Kirby

53Information for this paragraph was obtained through conference with Dr. James Knight, Willie Holdsworth, and Ralph Duke, April 1, 1950, and through interview with Dr. John Kertz, May 14, 1951.
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the superintendent of Fort Scott was favorably the high school principal.

ment workshop for experimental students in 1947 at the University of Chicago.

supervision of the whole and the workers had appeared the human need.

were instrumental in introducing CHITA Study into the school system. The

the CHITA Workshop while serving as an experimental coordinator.

HALL workshop. The superintendent of Prairie Heights, who had attended
Study groups in their own schools. W. T. Puryear, Principal of the Marshall Senior High School, was appointed to the Dallas staff as Director of Guidance, and he coordinated the Child Study program. This program differed from the others in that no academic credit was given for the work and no school time was allowed for group meetings. Although the schools kept records of extension courses and travel engaged in by teachers, no record was kept of their participation in Child Study. Participation was completely voluntary. Some groups met at 7:00 A.M. and conducted their Child Study over breakfast.

In 1938-1939 the University of Texas sponsored Child Study programs in twenty-three school systems with about three thousand participants. That year closer coordination was established between the Extension Bureau and the Department of Educational Psychology. Dr. O. B. Douglas, head of this department, had been one of the participants in the Collaboration Center at the University of Chicago in 1940-1941. When Dr. Douglas returned to the University of Texas in the fall of 1942 the Board of Regents made it possible for him to spend half time as consultant in Human Development. He worked with the faculty to implement what he had learned at the Collaboration Center. As a result some courses in Human Development were initiated on campus, and the offerings were gradually expanded until by 1945-1949 it was possible to grant a doctoral degree in Human Development. Dr. Douglas believes that this expansion would not have occurred if it had not been for the growing field program of Child Study that produced the demand for courses on campus leading to a degree in Human Development.55

55Statement made by Dr. O. B. Douglas to the author in an interview, April 1, 1950.
Nine credits in the field were accepted toward requirements for a degree. Several members of the Educational Psychology department spent time in the field, and Dr. Douglas himself gave an average of one day a week to consultant service.

Because of rapid expansion of the program it was difficult to provide as much consultant service to each group in 1948-1949 as had previously been possible. Teachers met with a consultant about every fourth meeting. An attempt was made to remedy this the following year by adding staff and curtailing the centers.56

In 1949-1950 new Child Study groups were formed in only four centers: Brownwood, Burnet County, Lampasses County, and Sweetwater. Of the four school systems in the Rio Grande Valley that were the earliest to undertake the program, Harlingen and Pharr-San Juan-Alamo were still conducting Child Study groups. Some fourth year groups were organised in those places that year. All the school systems that had undertaken Child Study in the fall of 1947 were continuing. Of the fourteen systems that undertook the program in 1948, ten continued.57

Consultant personnel had been increased. There were in 1949-1950 four full-time staff members (Dr. Knight, Ralph Duke, Willie Holdsworth, and A. C. Murphy, formerly Superintendent of Schools at Weslaco) and seven part-time staff members, five of them in the Educational

---

56 Information for this and the following paragraphs was obtained through conference on April 1, 1950, with Dr. James Knight, Willie Holdsworth, and Ralph Duke, and through interviews on May 11, 1951, with Dr. John Kurts and with A. C. Murphy.

57 Of the school systems that discontinued Child Study, five - Mercedes, San Benito, New London, Overton, and Weslaco - had a change of administration. In one, Alamo Heights, there were a number of teachers working for degrees who found it necessary to devote full time to that.
Psychology Department, serving as consultants to Child Study groups.

In the fall of 1950 Mercedes re-entered the Child Study program. New centers were established at Alice, Beeville, Camp Hood, and Temple. The staff of the Extension Bureau was further expanded by the addition of one full-time staff member (Charles Dent of the Educational Psychology Department) and several part-time members recruited from the faculty of the College of Education. This made it possible again to provide consultant service to the groups every third meeting.

Formal evaluations of the Child Study programs sponsored by the University of Texas are just beginning to be made. Several masters' theses are in preparation.

Mainly the evaluations have been verbal and informal. Superintendents usually found out how teachers felt about Child Study by talking with them. Sometimes simple questionnaires were sent out for the purpose of evaluating the year's accomplishments, and the results of these were used as a basis for improving future work. This method was especially favored during workshops.

Dr. James Knight, Mrs. H. E. Butt, M. F. Baker, all believed that an important reason why the Child Study program had been popular with teachers was that they found it an easy, relaxed way of learning a great deal that was useful to them. Teachers stated that studying with a small group of people in a friendly, professional atmosphere, devoid of pressures and threats was for many of them a new and happy

---

55 In answer to the author's question as to why Child Study seems to be so popular with teachers, each, in separate interviews (M. F. Baker on March 28, 1950, Mrs. H. E. Butt on March 27, 1950, and Dr. James Knight on April 1, 1950) expressed the above opinion first.
experience in education. Undoubtedly one reason the program spread was that many teachers passed on the word that they had never learned so much with so few difficulties.

A second reason, given by Dr. James Knight, was that the Child Study program did a great deal for the teachers personally. Many found acceptance by, and respect from, other members of the group in a way they had not had previously, and they grew to have confidence in themselves and in their own capacities to solve their own problems.

Staff members of the Extension Bureau were aware, however, that not all people derived such benefits as the above from the Child Study program. Some resistance has come from superintendents and principals who did not seem to understand the purposes of the program or the reasons behind the operational procedures. These administrators took advantage of study group meetings for their own purposes.

Some resistance also had come from teachers who have felt pressure to join study groups. Pressure seemed to emanate from four sources:
1) Some superintendents believed Child Study was so vital that all teachers should be engaged in it.
2) Some principals, also, believed that Child Study was essential for all teachers, or these principals, too, may have felt some pressure to have their schools "make a good showing."
3) Some teachers urged others in their schools to undertake the study in order to have a sufficient number to form a school group.
4) Finally, some teachers felt pressure from within themselves. They

59 In an interview on April 1, 1950.

60 The resistances to the Child Study program were discussed in conference with Dr. James Knight, Ralph Duke, and Willie Holdsworth, April 1, 1950.
were the persons who wanted to be in on everything happening.

There were two other kinds of resistances. A few teachers discontinued their study at the end of the second year, for the third year of the program with its complex self-concepts and its tremendous scope seemed somewhat terrifying to them. A few were unable to face what they would learn about themselves in the third year of Child Study. 2) Some teachers became impatient with spending so much time learning to understand children. They wanted to do something, to get on with the implications of what they were learning for their work in the classroom.

Staff members of the Extension Bureau were aware that this latter view was shared also by many who genuinely valued Child Study. The most important present problem facing the staff seemed to them to be the development of a program as effective in helping teachers implement their new knowledge of children as the Child Study program is in helping teachers to understand them. Attempts are being made to find solutions to this problem in workshops and in connection with advanced Child Study groups. One design was formulated at the Rio Grande Valley program workshop in Monterrey, Mexico, and a description of it has been published. The plan proposed

that the fourth year of the child-study program direct more attention toward the educational program of the school while at the same time, continuing to utilize the understandings and abilities gained by the teachers during the previous

61 Discussed in conference with Dr. James Knight, Ralph Duke, and Willie Holdsworth, April 1, 1950.


63 See n. 31, p. 103.
three years. 64

And it suggested that

the vehicle which gives the greatest hope for including the whole staff in continuing the study of both the child and the educational program is the recording and analysis of the learning episodes that children have in school.

The article describes and illustrates the use of a framework developed at the workshop in Monterrey to guide teachers in recording and analyzing learning episodes, and it concludes:

This article suggests that the transition and extension of the attitudes and skills gained from the study of children can be accomplished through the study of learning episodes. It is argued that the learning episode permits the examination of all important questions of curriculum and that, if continued, such analysis will force the teacher to consider the important values he is using to make crucial decisions about children and the nature of their educational experiences. The analysis of these learning episodes, moreover, will furnish the staff with a source of emerging educational problems of high significance and importance.

The staff members of the Extension Bureau felt that probably a concern of equal importance with this one just reported was that of maintaining adequate highly skilled staff personnel to guide the work. Child Study was spreading and reaching into every corner of Texas. Dr. James Knight believed it was not necessary or wise for the University of Texas to attempt to sponsor and serve all the Child Study programs in the state. He was encouraging institutions to develop staff to provide consultant service to study groups in the area they serve.

Child Study programs sponsored by other institutions in Texas. In addition to the University of Texas, six other institutions - North

64 This quotation and the following ones are taken from Virgil N. Herrick and James Knight, "Child Study and the Improvement of the Educational Program." *Elementary School Journal*, March 1951, 71: 371-379.
Texas State Teachers College, Southern Methodist University, Southwest
Texas State Teachers College at San Marcos, the Texas College of Arts
and Industries, the University of Houston, and West Texas State College
at Canyon - are developing and sponsoring Child Study programs in their
areas. One other institution, the Sul Ross School in Alpine is making
plans to sponsor groups in 1950-1951.65

In three of these places - North Texas State Teachers College, the
Texas College of Arts and Industries, the University of Houston -
there is definite association with the University of Texas, which is
attempting to prepare a core of resource persons in other institutions
in the far flung corners of Texas. North Texas State Teachers College
was one of the cooperating colleges in the first workshop at Marshall.
Several of their staff members meet with Dr. Knight's staff regularly
in preparation for giving consultant service to Child Study groups in
the North Texas area. One staff member of the University of Houston is
giving consultant service in Clear Creek in cooperation with the Univer-
sity of Texas, and the Texas College of Arts and Industries at Kingsville
is sending consultants to groups in the lower Rio Grande Valley.

The programs sponsored by the other three institutions - Southwest
Texas State Teachers College, Southern Methodist University, West Texas
State College - are independent of the University of Texas.

65Information for this and the following paragraph was obtained
through interview with A. C. Murphy, May 14, 1951.
66 Information for the Account of the Child Study Program

College credit was granted by the University of Chicago, the University of Texas, and several other accredited institutions. The schools system that year, consultant, suggested that study groups in the high school system be used to introduce students to the importance of child study groups. At the end of the fall and spring semesters, the high school graduation class was selected to participate in the Child Study Program at the University of Chicago.

The Child Study Board of Education at the University of Chicago requested conference attendance. The conference was held at the University of Chicago. The conference was held at the University of Chicago. The conference was held at the University of Chicago. The conference was held at the University of Chicago. The conference was held at the University of Chicago. The conference was held at the University of Chicago.

The Child Study Program at the University of Chicago was developed through the participation of the Child Study Program at the University of Chicago. The Child Study Program at the University of Chicago was developed through the participation of the Child Study Program at the University of Chicago.

The Child Study Program at the University of Chicago was developed through the participation of the Child Study Program at the University of Chicago.

Southwest Texas State Teachers College
of Texas, and by Southwest Texas State Teachers College.

Additional groups were formed the following year. These were led by six teachers who had attended the Human Development workshop at the University of Chicago the previous summer on fellowships from the General Education Board that Dr. Flowers had obtained for them. Irma Bruce was released from some of her duties to coordinate the Child Study programs in the five school systems.

In 1946-1947 Irma Bruce was appointed to the faculty of the Southwest Texas State Teachers College and her primary responsibility became pre-service education in Child Development. She continued to give some consultant service to the few groups already established and to new groups in Floresville and Carrizo Springs. To provide the necessary trained leaders for groups Miss Bruce instituted a series of four Saturday leadership training conferences in connection with a larger college conference on campus. These conferences drew teachers within a radius of one hundred fifty miles.

In the summer of 1947 Southwest Texas State Teachers College sponsored its first Human Development workshop with about fifty participants. Miss Bruce directed the workshop, and members of the college faculty served as consultants. The teachers received academic credit for the work. Workshops have been continued each year with an average of one hundred participants.

The Child Study program sponsored by the Southwest Texas State Teachers College has been a small one. Each year there have been about twelve groups in operation with approximately one hundred participants. A few days of consultant service have been provided from the University of Texas and the University of Chicago, but for the most part Irma Bruce
has been responsible for aiding the groups in their study.

Southern Methodist University

Southern Methodist University was first involved in Child Study in June, 1947, as one of the cooperating institutions in the first local workshop at Marshall. Dr. Frank L. Williams represented the University as consultant. Later that summer Dr. Williams attended the three-weeks workshop in Human Development at the University of Chicago that had been especially planned for superintendents in Texas. On his return he proposed to Dr. J. Nichols, Director of the School of Education, that a center for Child Study be established at Southern Methodist University. Dr. Nichols agreed, and that fall Dr. Williams organized his all-male seminar in Dallas. Some of the results of this seminar have already been noted.

Another result of the seminar was that school systems outside of Dallas became interested in Child Study. A member of the seminar, Fred R. Thompson, Superintendent of Schools in Cleburne, invited Dr. Williams to explain the Child Study program to the Cleburne school personnel. The teachers responded favorably. A two-weeks workshop to launch the study was held before the opening of school in 1948. Dr. John Kurtz and Willie Holdsworth of the University of Texas were consultants for

---

67 Information for this account of the Child Study programs sponsored by Southern Methodist University was obtained through interviews on April 5, 1950, with Dr. Frank L. Williams, Professor of Education, on April 4, 1950, with E. C. Watts, Assistant Professor of Education, and on May 19, 1951, with Fred R. Thompson, formerly Assistant Professor of Education and at present (1950-1951) a fellow in the Institute for Child Study at the University of Maryland.

68 See pp. 115-116.
the workshop. Thirty teachers participated. They financed the workshop themselves and received academic credit for the work.

That fall, in addition to Cleburne, four other school systems - Bonham, Gladewater, Grand Prairie, and Sherman - initiated programs of Child Study with a total of two hundred participants. The superintendents invited Dr. Williams or Fred Thompson, who had become his assistant, to explain the program to the staff. When the teachers indicated willingness to undertake Child Study the superintendents approached the Boards of Education for their approval. Southern Methodist University has continued to use this procedure in establishing centers. A plan similar to that of the University of Texas was adopted to finance the program and to provide consultant service. Teachers desiring academic credit had the privilege of registering either with Southern Methodist University or with one of several other institutions cooperating with the University.

Early recognition was given to the need for training local personnel to become competent consultants, especially since financial resources to make it possible to draw upon consultant service from the University of Texas and the University of Maryland were unavailable. Southern Methodist University held its first Child Study workshop in June, 1949, and a second one in 1950. The latter was sponsored jointly by the Dallas Public School system, Southern Methodist University and the University of Texas. These workshops were of three weeks duration, and an average of one hundred teachers participated. Consultants for the first workshop came from the University of Chicago and from Corpus

---

any second problem is that of getting the superintendent to understand that the program as well as its work is difficult to make.

It was therefore decided to begin the work of selecting the executive assistant to the superintendent. As the superintendent is the one who will be responsible for the program, it was necessary to find a person who would have both the ability and the desire to work closely with the superintendent and the executive director, the one who will actually carry out the program.

The first step was to send out the program of consultants and select those who would be needed. After that was decided, the second step was to begin the process of getting the program to meet the needs of the students, and the expenses of carrying on the program, and the reasons for making them willing to do so.

Where there are not enough persons with advanced training who can be used, one of the most important of these Southern Methodist Univerities is a number of programs in open, conducted with child study. So new centers could be sponsored because of the interest of the parent and the parent's school system.

In 1949-1950, 125 centers were opened with your help. As the number of centers increased, so did the interest of the parents and the parents' schools.

In 1949-1950, schools were formed in the new centers: Antiochian.

In 1949-1950, schools were formed in the new centers: Antiochian.

In 1949-1950, schools were formed in the new centers: Antiochian.

In 1949-1950, schools were formed in the new centers: Antiochian.

In 1949-1950, schools were formed in the new centers: Antiochian.

In 1949-1950, schools were formed in the new centers: Antiochian.

In 1949-1950, schools were formed in the new centers: Antiochian.

In 1949-1950, schools were formed in the new centers: Antiochian.

In 1949-1950, schools were formed in the new centers: Antiochian.

In 1949-1950, schools were formed in the new centers: Antiochian.

In 1949-1950, schools were formed in the new centers: Antiochian.

In 1949-1950, schools were formed in the new centers: Antiochian.
I was a fellow in the Institute for Child Study at the University of Kentucky and was employed in the Child Study Workshop at the Kentucky Experiment with the Child Study Project at the State Children's Home, a member of the Department of Education. I was also a member of the State Board of Education. The project was directed by the Kentucky State College of Education. The most recent instruction was to expand a Child Study Project of the State Department of Education.


to the effectiveness of the program.

These workshops, whose participants should be encouraged for they are essential, should be enriched by the addition of new participants. Only three school systems have been able to conduct local workshops to that many participate. Trained local coordinators are essential.

It is assumed that the effectiveness of the program has been enhanced by the presence of the participating school systems. At the University of Kentucky, the school systems to which a program of Child Study has been assigned are the only school systems but were the result of interaction. The program was sponsored by the University. It was not intended that the program be used as a model of the program sponsored by the University of Kentucky. Those of the program's success, they will not reduce the need to implement it.
The project was initiated at expectations, as a meeting of the

The program was conceived of as process of

The program was developed to train human personnel needed and in the promotion of the school system and the general education of children.

In the fall of 1990, eleven conferences were organized child study groups.

Materials were immediately utilized from San Angelo and from the university.

Consultant. In addition to Dr. Walter Houston of the University of

Thousand three persons interested that they would participate. Three
drop answer sheet that attendance would be subpoenaed. Two.

Other as consultant. A preconference which made a week before the work-

workshops to be held during the summer part of the summer with the

motivators were enthusiastic and plans were made for a child study program. The ad-

Even to a week's conference, with the child study program.
part to the passage of the Gilmer Aiken Bill.\textsuperscript{73} Many teachers found that they were not qualified to teach under the provisions of this bill and that they were required to take additional courses in order to be properly certified. Child Study could be carried on locally and this was a less arduous way of meeting the requirements than it would have been to go away to school.

The large enrollment poses the immediate problems of providing consultant help and training leaders. Mrs. Sliger will need at least one assistant. Since funds will probably not be available for the salary of this second person, plans are being made to send a staff member in the Educational Psychology Department to the 1951 Child Study workshop at the University of Maryland. On his return he will be available part-time for consultant service. Several teachers from Amarillo are also planning to attend the summer workshop at Maryland.

West Texas State College seems to be facing the same problems in connection with the Child Study program it sponsors as does Southern Methodist University.

**Summary.** In Texas the statewide programs in Child Study resulted from independent programs started in various part of the state. Beginning in Corpus Christi, Child Study programs soon spread to the Rio Grande Valley where for three years four communities were involved, and later two additional communities requested the program. In the meantime some of the staff of the University of Texas and of other colleges and universities of Texas became interested, and the Child Study program

\textsuperscript{73}A bill passed by the State Legislature in 1949 that redefined, among other things, the certification requirements for teachers in the State of Texas.
program spread into more than twenty-seven school systems involving around 4000 teachers. Southwest Texas State Teachers College, Southern Methodist University, and West Texas State College also came to sponsor Child Study programs of their own.

People in the various school systems and institutions in Texas learned about the Child Study program in at least six different ways. 1) Some had their first contact with Child Study through participating in the Human Development workshop or in the Collaboration Center at the University of Chicago. 2) A few had read Helping Teachers Understand Children and were stimulated to look into the program further. 3) As the program spread, teachers and administrators in several school systems learned about it from nearby school systems engaged in Child Study. 4) The Child Study program was deliberately brought to the attention of some superintendents and college people by certain laymen and educators who were convinced of its worth. 5) Others first learned of the program through participating in Human Development workshops conducted by several universities and colleges in Texas. 6) Finally, some came into contact with Child Study through more than one of these ways simultaneously.

Certain factors were particularly influential in interesting people to undertake a program of Child Study. These fall into two groups: the factors that lie more or less outside the intrinsic value of the program, and the factors that are aspects of the program itself.

Directly after the war, Boards of Education again began to require teachers to spend a certain amount of time in formal study. Superintendents were keenly aware of the need for some kind of in-service education for the teachers in their school systems. Later the passage of
the Gilman Aiken Bill made it necessary for a great many teachers to take additional courses to fulfill requirements for certification. These factors made it imperative for a large number of teachers to pursue some kind of in-service education. Child Study appealed particularly because it was a definite program, it could be carried on locally in connection with the teachers' work, and it fulfilled the necessary credit requirements.

These, however, were superficial inducements. These were important factors related to the Child Study program itself that were influential in getting teachers to participate. 1) In many school systems there already existed a genuine interest in the welfare of children. Teachers were concerned with the guidance not only of exceptional children, but of all children. The Child Study program seemed to point the way to the solution of some of the problems faced in this connection. 2) Some school systems had been struggling with curriculum revisions and had reached a point where it was difficult to make further changes without knowing more about children. Child Study seemed to them a promising approach to curriculum problems. There was readiness on the part of the teachers to do more than a superficial job of understanding how children develop and how they learn.

The steps involved in reaching a decision to undertake the Child Study program were similar in most of the school systems, though every step was not taken in all school systems, nor were they taken in the same order in each case. 1) First of all, the administrators were informed of the program and their support established. 2) Investigations were made to ascertain the nature of the program, how it would be
carried on, the results expected, the costs involved, and how these costs could be met. Administrators and committees of teachers held conferences with consultants who would guide the program; they made visits to school systems engaged in the program to observe study groups in operation; they made inquiries among the teachers to find how general the interest was in undertaking the program. 3) Finally, if it seemed desirable to organize a program of Child Study, the permission and support of the Board of Education was sought. In some cases members of the Boards of Education shared in the investigation procedures.

The Child Study program was brought to the attention of possible participants in two ways. 1) A few school systems were able to hold local workshops for two weeks, and in one case for four weeks, to give teachers experience with the program. 2) In most of the school systems a general session was held early in the school year to explain the program. Sometimes teachers were informed of the program informally, individually and in faculty groups before the orientation session. An organization meeting for those who wished to undertake Child Study followed the orientation session.

Participation was put on a voluntary basis in all the school systems. In almost every system it was possible for teachers to participate with or without academic credit.

The organization of the Child Study program took essentially the same form in all the school systems. Teachers entered upon a three-year study of children following the general procedures of Child Study already developed by the Division on Child Development at the
University of Chicago. Only a few of the school systems were able to employ a full-time coordinator. In most places the superintendent or some other person coordinated the Child Study program in addition to his regular duties. Local two-weeks workshops were held annually in connection with about half the programs sponsored by the University of Texas, and with three of the nine sponsored by Southern Methodist University. A few participants, leaders of groups, and administrators in many of the school systems attended Human Development workshops at the University of Chicago, the University of Maryland, and later at the University of Texas for more intensive training.

In the earliest stages of the development of the Child Study program in Texas, consultant service amounting to six to eight weeks a year was obtained through the Division on Child Development at the University of Chicago. Later, consultant service for two or three weeks annually was obtained from the University of Maryland. In addition, more concentrated help was given during two-weeks local workshops. As the program expanded, as well-trained coordinators came to be employed by some school systems, as the University of Texas and several other universities and colleges began to sponsor Child Study programs, less consultant service from outside the state was used. Local centers began to receive consultant help through the sponsoring institutions. Advanced participants in the Child Study programs in various school systems served as consultants to groups in other school systems, especially as leaders of laboratory groups that were concerned with learning the techniques of building and analyzing records of children.

7See chapters IV and V.
Various members of the faculty of the sponsoring institutions were used as consultants to seminar groups dealing with the scientific information relating to human development, and some of these even gave consultant service in the field. This consultant service, provided from the resources of institutions sponsoring Child Study groups, was supplemented by a limited amount of service from the Institute for Child Study at the University of Maryland, especially to coordinators and leaders of groups during the school year, and also to local and campus workshops in the summer.

Consultant service staff members of the institutions sponsoring Child Study programs had spent a year or two studying with the Division on Child Development at the University of Chicago or with the Institute for Child Study at the University of Maryland, or had attended for several summers the workshops conducted by these two centers. Other staff members in sponsoring institutions are still being trained by the Institute for Child Study. To obtain staff qualified to give the necessary services remains a pressing problem faced by the institutions sponsoring rapidly expanding Child Study programs.

Perhaps the greatest change in the organization of the Child Study program in Texas has been the shift from depending for consultant service and training of staff almost entirely on the Division on Child Development at the University of Chicago and the Institute for Child Study at the University of Maryland, to relying mainly on resources within the institutions sponsoring Child Study groups and also within the Texas school systems experienced in the program. There had been a conscious attempt early in the development of the Child Study program to establish a center for Human Development and Child Study at the
state university. This became increasingly possible as time went on and more people became experienced in the program, thus providing trained staff personnel and resource people in various parts of the state. As the program expanded it became more and more difficult for the University of Texas to reach the far corners of such a large state with consultant service from its own staff. It seemed inevitable that other universities and colleges should cooperate with the University of Texas in developing and sponsoring programs in the areas surrounding them.

The costs involved in carrying on a program of Child Study were for consultant fees and expenses throughout the year and in workshops, for workshop expenses, for books, and for the salary of a coordinator if one was employed. The consultants' fees and expenses were usually the greatest expense to the school system. The expenses of the local workshop in most cases were shared by the school systems and the teachers. In the campus workshops consultant fees were paid by the sponsoring institutions, and other expenses were paid by the participants. Several philanthropic foundations in Texas contributed substantially to the support of the workshop at the University of Texas, and to certain local workshops. They also contributed scholarships for interested people to attend the Human Development workshops at the University of Texas, the University of Maryland, and the University of Chicago for leadership training. Teachers desiring academic credit either for work carried on during the year or at workshops, paid their own fees in the usual manner.

Evaluations of the Child Study programs in the various school systems have been informal for the most part. Personal interviews and
simple questionnaires were used by superintendents and by the participants themselves to evaluate accomplishments and the worth of the program carried on during the year and in the workshops. These evaluations were used as a basis for improving the work of the following year and of the subsequent workshops.

Several formal studies have been made to evaluate the Child Study program in Corpus Christi. Two of these revealed that participants felt that their work in the Child Study program had been decidedly worthwhile and that the program was highly effective. Two other studies analyzing the records kept by teachers in Corpus Christi revealed that teachers grew in each year of the program significantly over each previous year in being more aware of sources of information about children, in using a greater amount and variety of facts about a child, in developing skill in recording information more objectively, and in their understanding of scientific concepts of human development.

Other studies evaluating various aspects of the Child Study program are being made by students at the University of Texas.

There have been some resistances to the Child Study program from superintendents and principals who were not in on the program from the beginning, or who did not seem to understand what purposes might be accomplished by Child Study. There have been resistances also from young teachers who had recently taken courses in Child Development, and from teachers who felt some pressure, either from the administrators, from other teachers, or from within themselves, to participate in the study; who were intimidated by the scope of the study; or who were impatient to explore the implications of their new understanding of children.
A problem of growing concern to those engaged in guiding Child Study groups in Texas is that of finding an effective way to help teachers use the learnings resulting from their three-year study in making changes in the various aspects of curriculum. The shortcomings in this area constitute the basis for the chief criticisms of the Child Study program voiced by college and university personnel, administrators, and teachers in Texas.
CHAPTER VII

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE MARYLAND STATEWIDE CHILD STUDY PROGRAM

Purpose of the chapter. This chapter proposes to describe the development of the statewide program of Child Study in Maryland in order to discover what is involved in the development of statewide programs of Child Study in general. The same questions were used to obtain information for this chapter as were used to gather the data concerning the emergence of the Child Study program in Texas.

The development of the State Department sponsored Child Study program. In the fall of 1943, Dr. Theresa Wiesfeld, President of the State Teachers College at Towson, Maryland, wanted to organize a conference to acquaint the College staff with the work of the Commission on Teacher Education. Dr. Thomas G. Pullen, Jr., State Superintendent of Schools in Maryland, suggested to her that the faculties of the two other teachers colleges, as well as the county and city supervisors, also be invited. Plans were made, and on December 19-21, 1943, a Conference on Teacher Education was held. Several members of the Commission on Teacher Education, among them Dr. Daniel A. Prescott, Director of the Division on Child Development and Teacher Personnel, reported on various aspects of the Commission's work. The program of Child Study reported by Dr. Prescott excited the interest of the State Superintendent and of Grace L. Alder, State Supervisor of Elementary Schools. They had been recently concerned with two problems in the State: 1) A great many new elementary supervisors had been added to the staffs of the various counties, and a training program of some kind was needed
for them. 2) About 2,700 first grade children, of whom 1,800 were boys, had been retained in the first grade that fall. Both teachers and supervisors needed to know more about the development of children, Miss Alder felt. 1

Following the Conference, Miss Alder invited Dr. Prescott to come again later to talk with a few county superintendents in the area of Tucson State Teachers College for the purpose of interesting them in a program of Child Study.

I have had little opportunity to talk with Dr. Pullen. However, he is in favor of organizing a group of supervisors into Child Study groups, if the superintendents in the counties are interested and will give their support to the study. I am planning to talk with a number of superintendents this month and get their reactions. I feel sure they will be interested and will help in any way they can to further the plan.

Dr. J. Floyd Cromwell, Supervisor of Educational and Vocational Guidance, is also very much interested and would like, if possible, to have some of the high school people included. This would make our already large group, larger, and I recall that you prefer only twenty-five or thirty people. 2

On March 22-24, 1945, about thirty-five county superintendents, elementary and high school supervisors, and staff members of the Tucson State Teachers College met with Dr. Prescott and made plans for organizing a few study groups. Early in April Dr. Pullen and Miss Alder met with all the county superintendents and presented the program to

---

1 Information obtained through interviews with Dr. Thomas G. Pullen, Jr., and with Grace L. Alder.

2 Quoted from a letter from Grace L. Alder to Dr. D. A. Prescott, January 6, 1945, in files of the office of the State Supervisor of Elementary Schools.
them. Miss Alder followed that oral presentation with a letter to the
separate counties explaining the nature of the proposed statewide Child
Study program, the plan for consultant service, the costs involved,
some possible means of meeting the costs, and the values expected.

Miss Alder was able to report to Dr. Prescott:

I have written and talked to the superintendents and
teachers college presidents in the state concerning a
statewide Child Study Program for next year. They have
expressed not only their willingness to participate, but
also a great deal of enthusiasm for the program.\(^3\)

That spring Miss Alder visited the Parker School District and ob-
served the Child Study groups in operation. During the summer she
attended the Human Development workshop at the University of Chicago,
and with Dr. Prescott and his staff made definite plans for the fol-
lowing year.\(^5\)

The plan was to hold three conferences in the course of the year
at each of the four state teachers colleges and for the supervisors in
those areas. The first set of conferences, each of two and a half days
duration, was held in October 1945, at the State Teachers Colleges at
Bowie, Frostburg, Towson, and Salisbury. Approximately forty element-
ary supervisors, high school supervisors, attendance supervisors, and
faculty members of the colleges attended at each center. Dr. Prescott
and Madalaine Mershon, a member of his staff, served as consultants.

---

\(^3\)April 19, 1945. Letter in the files of the office of the State
Supervisor of Elementary Schools.

\(^4\)May 26, 1945. Letter in the files of the office of the State
Supervisor of Elementary Schools.

\(^5\)Information obtained through interview with Grace Alder, May 8,
1950.
Following this conference each supervisor planned to organize and lead one or two study groups. A summary of these conferences was mimeographed and sent to the participants to aid them in starting their groups.6

The Steering Committee for Curriculum Reconstruction for the state held a meeting early in November in which they agreed that "the seventh and eighth grade teachers need a better understanding of adolescent children, and that understanding would make a great deal of difference in the type of curriculum and the procedures that they would use."7

Miss Alder wrote to Dr. Prescott:

The high school supervisors are basing their programs for the junior high school almost entirely upon the characteristics and needs of adolescent children. Yet they feel that unless something is done to help the teachers become better acquainted with these children, regardless of any help which the Steering Committee can give, the programs in the counties will become traditional and miss an opportunity to really meet the needs of these children. What can you do for us? Could you give us a few extra days in December or January?6

Dr. Prescott was able to return to help the high school supervisors for three days in December. Two representatives from each of nineteen counties were present. The counties not represented at this meeting had sent one or more high school people to the October meetings. Immediately following this conference Dr. Prescott met for two days with a group invited by the State Department. Included were representatives

6 Information obtained from the files in the office of the State Supervisor of Elementary Schools.

7 Letter from Grace Alder to Dr. D. A. Prescott, November 9, 1945, in the files in the office of the State Supervisor of Elementary Schools.

6 Ibid.
of the teacher-education departments of the liberal arts colleges, county superintendents, and state department staff members. This conference did much to spread understanding of the Child Study program and to accomplish the following purposes for which the conference was called:

The purpose of this meeting would be two-fold - to develop some of the generalizations you emphasized in the child study program and to explain how the program will evolve in the next several years in the State. All of us feel that a session like this would give a "lift" to the entire program.9

The second set of conferences was held in January and the third set in March. The plans for these were similar to those of the October meetings. All the high school supervisors joined the elementary supervisors at these conferences. About fifty people were present at each center. In January, Madelaine Marshon, assisted by two others of Dr. Prescott's staff, Columbia Winn and Lynn Shufelt, gave the leaders the help they needed to continue the program until the third set of conferences held in March. In March, Dr. Prescott and Madelaine Marshon assisted the participants. The first year the consultants met only with the leaders in the program sponsored by the State Department of Education.10

A mimeographed summary of all the conferences was made and sent out after each conference not only to the participants but also to the county superintendents. A special effort was made to keep the

---

9Letter from Earl T. Hawkins, State Director of Instruction, to Dr. D. A. Prescott, December 1, 1945, in files of the office of the State Supervisor of Elementary Schools.

10Information for this and the following three paragraphs obtained from the files in the office of the State Supervisor of Elementary Schools.
For each representative attending the conference,

- expenses, but the committee paid a par cabina bana, at the rate of $4.50 per day for a total of $22.50.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Expenditure</th>
<th>Consultant Expenses</th>
<th>Consultant Fees at $30 per day for 77 days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,260.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$917.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$715.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cost of transportation on the project for the first year amounted to

$2,104.00

These figures do not include the key groups attended in the stage.

In the next school there were twenty-one groups, with two hundred students represented, with a total of one thousand participants.

The student council of sixteen high school students led by Mr. School

In the first year of the program, 1945-1946, there were attended

the project.

A full account of how to choose the work for the year and how to submit

at information. The bulletin after the third set of conferences gave

scope of meetings, making hypotheses, and the need for more exhaustive

feed that had been made about educational conferences, preceding the

The informative booklet after the second set of conferences summarized.

Upper contingently informed of proposed plans and objectives repeated.
Early in February, 1946, attention was focused on the important problem of providing for the training of leaders. Two lines of action were initiated: 1) Leaders were being encouraged to attend the six-weeks Human Development workshop at Chicago, and 2) plans were being considered for two-weeks workshops to be held in Maryland.

As a first step, Miss Alder met with the high school supervisors and Dr. Pullen with the county superintendents, on the one hand informing them of the workshop at the University of Chicago and on the other hand presenting tentative proposals for the state workshops in Human Growth and Development to be held in May at the State Teachers Colleges at Bowie and Towson.  

Miss Alder communicated the results of these meetings to Dr. Prescott and received the following reply:

The spring workshop had three purposes: (1) to help leaders sharpen their interpretations of this year's records; (2) to build in leaders as rich as possible a knowledge of the principles that explain child growth, learning and behavior for transmission by them to study groups; (3) the developing of a plan of work for the groups for next year and the familiarizing of the leaders with it. Obviously all this simply cannot be done in one week - we had better have half the number of people for two weeks or still fewer at Chicago for six weeks. I'd rather have 10 people from Maryland at Chicago for 6 weeks than 60 at Towson and 25 at Bowie for one week - the value of trained leaders to the study would be greater. So please think this over and discuss it with Dr. Pullen. We can send 3 staff members to Towson and one to Bowie for two weeks beginning May 13. ...... I can't stress too much the importance of training the leaders. It is alright to start a program this year with us doing all the leading but it can't go on a second year because the group members have to feel themselves growing in power to interpret and

---

11 Information obtained from letters from Grace Alder to Dr. D. A. Prescott, February 14, 1946, and from Dr. T. G. Pullen to the county superintendents, February 14, 1946, in the files of the office of the State Supervisor of Elementary Schools.
this requires that group leaders must be ahead of the members in this power. It can’t be gained in a moment or without hard and continuing study. The workshop should be thought of definitely as leadership training and not as something that just anybody can attend to pick up something good for them.\textsuperscript{12}

Miss Alder therefore wrote to the superintendents and the supervisors, giving the details of participation in the Human Development workshop at the University of Chicago—housing, credits, expenses—and encouraging everyone to attend. Eight people, including Grace Alder, eventually went to the workshop, and some of the counties paid part of the expenses of those who attended. A special Maryland group was organized and Dr. Prescott met with them regularly to outline the work for the coming year, in addition to including them in the regular seminar and laboratory groups.

The spring workshop was postponed until October, and plans were made to use it to give the second year of the program a good start.

Miss Alder wrote from Chicago to Dr. Pullen:

I have had one or two conferences with Dr. Prescott concerning the work next year, and before I see him again, I’d like some advice from you. Our child study program is the largest these people have, in that we have 1000 teachers working in it, but it is also unique in that they work directly with the teachers in other places, while in Maryland they work with the leaders only, who in turn work with the teachers. Last year we had 75 leaders in the white schools and 23 leaders in the negro schools. These people will have to have some intensive training if they are to keep the study alive this year. That is the purpose of the October workshops. In addition we shall need two meetings during the year—one in January and one in March at each Teachers College to check the work and to give new direction.

The cost of consultants for the workshop you have provided for, but the living expenses will have to be supplied

\textsuperscript{12}February 19, 1946. Letter in files of the office of the State Supervisor of Elementary Schools.
Supplement of the elementary schools.

1944. I, 1945. Letter in the issue of the journal of the society

Each day's schedule at both workshops included one and a half

hours of the child study field program, Saturday, and supplemental

work, including observation, interaction, recording, and report. How

ever, there were many more people in attendance. The school

teachers, and the state department superintendent. They were

mentioned were those responsible for the school's teaching

staffs, teachers, and superintendents. Also in

these workshops were local superintendents, high school superintendents, etc.

For these workshops were those responsible for the city or state department.

On the other hand, this letter is sent every three people from the

colleagues of the board for the needs of teachers to be held from September

each year where they meet for a week of the state teachers, and one at the state level.

The workshops were finally organized - one at the department, a report

May 18, 1944.

Attended, Superintendent, Pacific Division, St. Louis, Mo.

This is to inform you that we have had the opportunity to

visit each of the schools in our division, and to see the

curriculum in action. This is the first of several tours

that we plan to make in our division, in order to get a

general idea of the programs that are being

offered.
hours of lecture on the synthesis of knowledge concerning human development and behavior, one and a half hours of seminar work dealing with various scientific areas of human development, and one and a half hours of laboratory practice in analyzing records of children. Each person did about two hours of additional reading. The participants worked intensively, but took time to participate in recreative activities also.

The State Department of Education paid the consultant fees and expenses from funds voted by the legislature, while the counties paid the living expenses of the supervisors at both workshops. This had been the usual practice for supervisors conferences called by the State Department.

These workshops launched the second year of Child Study in Maryland. Immediately following the workshops Miss Alder sent to all the leaders an outline of the procedure for organizing the coming year, and of the steps in the second year of the Child Study program. She also met with the County superintendents to discuss with them the proposed plans for the Child Study program for 1946-1947, and received their support.

In 1946-1947, one hundred seventy seven leaders conducted study groups with a total of 2407 participants. (Table 1) Seventy three supervisors and eight teachers college people led second year groups. Teachers who had participated the previous year led first year groups. These leaders spent two and a half days at leaders' training meetings at one of the teachers colleges in January and again in March. Each time four members of the Child Study Field Program staff at the University of Chicago spent a week in Maryland providing the consultant help. These training meetings were organized and financed as they had
# Table 1: Report on the Child Study Program (1946-1947)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>1st yr.</th>
<th>2nd yr.</th>
<th>No. of Teachers</th>
<th>No. of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>in Child Study</td>
<td>in County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegany</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Arundel</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvert</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecil</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorchester</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harford</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George's</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Anne's</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talbot</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicomico</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Totals        | 135     | 1515    | 2314             | 6013            |

### State Teachers Colleges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>1st yr.</th>
<th>2nd yr.</th>
<th>No. of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bowie</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frostburg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Grand Totals | 140     | 1583    | 2407            |

Total number in Child Study groups: 2407

Data obtained from the files in the office of the State Supervisor of Elementary Schools.
been the first year.

Several problems in regard to the training of leaders arose at the beginning of the third year. The first was that a number of supervisors and teacher-leaders were working at the University of Maryland on programs leading to degrees and wanted to take courses that would be credited toward these rather than attend the Human Development workshop at the University of Chicago. Nevertheless, twenty leaders eventually did attend the Chicago workshop during the summer of 1947.

A second problem had to do with the training of the seventy-four new first year leaders, all of them teachers, who had previously participated in groups but who had had no contacts with the Child Study consultants. It seemed imperative to organize a two-weeks workshop for first year leaders to give them the confidence they needed. However, consultant service from the University of Chicago was not available during the summer of 1947 and it again became necessary to hold the second workshop in October. That necessity excluded the possibility of giving training to leaders of first year groups, for it seemed impossible to get substitutes to replace these teachers in their classrooms. Many superintendents voiced their disapproval of releasing the teachers from their duties to attend a workshop in the fall.

Consequently, the state workshops were organized for third year leaders of white groups and for second and third year leaders of the negro groups. The workshops were held at the Windeona Hotel in Braddock Heights and at the State Teachers College at Bowie. A total of one hundred twenty leaders participated, and Dr. Prescott with four of his staff provided the consultant help.

Meetings for training leaders on all levels of the program were
again held at the teachers colleges in January and March, 1948. That year those leaders guided three hundred sixty nine groups with 3753 participants. (Table 2)

The problem of training leaders was somewhat resolved after the Institute for Child Study had been established at the University of Maryland, and teachers were able to attend the six-weeks Child Study workshop conducted by the Institute.

The organization of the workshop on the Maryland campus is similar to that of the Human Development workshops at the University of Chicago and at the University of Texas. Lectures and seminars communicate needed scientific knowledge about human development and behavior. Laboratory sessions for each level in the program afford practice in analyzing and interpreting case records. The workshop also provides help to administrators, supervisors, and teachers in developing the curriculum implications of Child Study. Interest groups are formed after the opening of the workshop, providing opportunity for participants to work on specific problems they take to the workshop. In addition, participants are able to advise with the staff on individual problems. Six semester hours of graduate or undergraduate credit is granted for the work.

---

15. President H. C. Byrd and Dr. Harold Benjamin, Dean of the School of Education, invited Dr. Prescott to establish an Institute for Child Study at the University of Maryland, and to recruit a staff of sufficient size and competence to develop the Child Study program in Maryland and to serve as a training center for consultants who would carry on the work from other centers in all parts of the country. The Institute for Child Study was established in September, 1947. (From a reprint from "Maryland," the alumni publication of the University of Maryland, 1947. On file in the Institute for Child Study.)

16. See p. 113.
TABLE 2. REPORT ON THE CHILD STUDY PROGRAM
(1947-1948)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>1st yr.</th>
<th>2nd yr.</th>
<th>3rd yr.</th>
<th>No. of Teachers in Child Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>1st yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegany</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Arundel</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvert</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecil</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorchester</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harford</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George's</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Anne's</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talbot</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicomico</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number in Child Study groups: 3753

*participants

Data obtained from the files in the office of the State Supervisor of Elementary Schools.
There is also a carefully planned sequence of graduate courses offered leading to the doctorate in Human Development Education.\textsuperscript{17}

In 1948-1949, teachers in Maryland were able for the first time to receive academic credit for the work done throughout the year. Any individual participating in the Child Study program can apply for graduate credit in any institution in which he is working for a degree. The staff of the Institute for Child Study evaluates the work and submits the results of this evaluation to the institution in which the participant is registered. A maximum of two credit hours per year for a period of three years is given for this study in the field.\textsuperscript{18}

In 1948-1949 attendance at the fall workshops, held again at Betterton and at Bowie, and at the leaders' training meetings in January and March decreased considerably. There were several reasons for this. By the fall of 1948 seven counties\textsuperscript{19} were receiving some consultant service directly to groups. Fifty-three leaders and other teachers had attended the summer workshop at the University of Maryland. In addition many were engaged in course work during the school year in the Institute for Child Study.

The next two years, 1949-1950 and 1950-1951, saw some important

\textsuperscript{17}To make possible the expansion of staff and also to provide the services for which the Institute was established, the Institute is at present, 1949-1952, partially supported by a grant of $130,000 from the Grant Foundation, a philanthropic foundation organized by the Grant family for the purpose of furthering educational projects the Board of Directors deem worthy.

\textsuperscript{18}Information obtained from a letter from Dr. D. A. Prescott to Thomas C. Pullen, Jr., January 19, 1948, in the files of the office of the State Supervisor of Elementary Schools.

\textsuperscript{19} Allegany, Baltimore, Garrett, Montgomery, Prince George, Washington, Worcester.
changes in the development of the Child Study program in Maryland.\textsuperscript{20}  
One change was in the direction of increased responsibility of the counties for their own programs. For one more year, 1949-1950, the State Department of Education conducted the fall workshops and the leadership training meetings in the winter and spring, but the following year both were discontinued. It became State Department policy to encourage counties to conduct their own Child Study programs, applying to the State Department for financial assistance where needed. The State Department agreed to finance up to half the cost of the consultant service to the groups and of leadership training.\textsuperscript{21} The State Legislature renewed its support of the program and a budget of $5000 was approved.\textsuperscript{22}  

By 1950-1951, twelve counties\textsuperscript{23} were receiving consultant service directly to groups on the average of three times a year from the Institution for Child Study at the University of Maryland. Four of

\textsuperscript{20} Information for the following paragraphs was obtained from the files in the office of the State Supervisor of Elementary Schools.

\textsuperscript{21} Information obtained from a letter from Grace L. Alder to the County Superintendents and Supervisors of Schools, October 5, 1950, in the files of the office of the State Supervisor of Elementary Schools.

\textsuperscript{22} In 1949-1950, $300, and in 1950-1951, $1000 of the $5000 annual budget was set aside for furthering the training of parent groups engaged in Child Study.

In the latter year seventy two Parent Child-Study groups were in operation with approximately seven hundred participants. This figure does not include twenty four groups that operate in Baltimore County under the adult education program. (Information obtained from a letter from Dorothy W. Shires, State Supervisor of Elementary Schools in the Division of Certification and Accreditation, to the author, June 15, 1951.)

\textsuperscript{23} Allegany, Anne Arundel, Baltimore, Calvert, Charles, Garrett, Harford, Montgomery, Prince George, St. Mary's, Washington, Worcester.
these counties\textsuperscript{24} were financing the program themselves, while the others received some aid from the budget provided for this purpose by the State Department of Education. Almost all of these counties conducted leadership training sessions with consultant help from the Institute for Child Study. Eleven counties conducted study groups without outside consultant service, using trained leaders within the county for this purpose. In these eleven counties the number of participants was very small. (Table 3)

Some of the counties were encouraging leaders to attend the Child Study workshop at the University of Maryland, and were assuming some financial responsibility for their training. Sixty nine Maryland leaders and participants attended during the summer of 1949, and one hundred in the summer of 1950.\textsuperscript{25}

Another change occurring in 1949-1950 was in the direction of increased emphasis on curriculum development. In 1948-1949, though seven hundred teachers had completed the three-year study, there were 2885 teachers still participating, and Child Study was receiving major emphasis in the in-service education programs all over the state. But in 1949-1950 the number of participants decreased to 1919 (Table 3), and in 1950-1951 there was a further decrease to 1203 (Table 4). As large numbers of teachers completed three years of study the State Department and many of the counties began to direct their attention toward in-service programs dealing with the curricular implications

\textsuperscript{24}Allegany, Baltimore, Montgomery, Washington.

\textsuperscript{25}Information obtained from workshop records in the files of the Institute for Child Study, University of Maryland.
**TABLE 3.**

**REPORT ON THE CHILD STUDY PROGRAM**

(1949-1950)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>First Yr.</th>
<th>Second Yr.</th>
<th>Third Yr.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elem. H.S.</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Elem. H.S.</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegany</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Arundel</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvert</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecil</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorchester</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harford</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George's</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Anne's</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talbot</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicomico</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>371</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data obtained from the files in the office of the State Supervisor of Elementary Schools.
### Table 4: Report on the Child Study Program (1950-1951)

**Number of Participants in Child Study Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>First Year</th>
<th></th>
<th>Second Year</th>
<th></th>
<th>Third Year</th>
<th></th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>Part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegany</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Arundel</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvert</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecil</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorchester</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harford</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George's</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Anne's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talbot</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
<td><strong>476</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>335</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
<td><strong>392</strong></td>
<td><strong>160</strong></td>
<td><strong>1203</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number in Child Study groups ---------------------------------- 1203

Data obtained from the files in the office of the State Supervisor of Elementary Schools.
of Child Study.

The Child Study program, however, will continue to be a part of the in-service education of teachers in Maryland. In a letter to the county superintendents and supervisors Miss Alder advised:

Although we are beginning a state-wide program in language arts, we should continue to emphasize our in-service program in child growth and development. New teachers especially need the information and techniques of child observation that this program gives. With teacher turnover as it is in many counties, you will no doubt be organizing first-year groups and continuing second- and third-year groups. Also, as the tables [Table 3] given you at the superintendents' meeting show, there is an increasing interest in high school groups. This should be encouraged, and plans should be made to carry out the program so that these teachers get procedures and information they need and want. The program in language arts will not be organized with study groups, and thus will not require the teacher to meet at regular intervals as in the child study program.26

Counties are beginning to conduct curriculum workshops with study groups centered around the major interests of the participants. Groups for Child Study will be included for those participants who are engaged in the program. A six-weeks curriculum-Child Study workshop is being conducted during the summer of 1951 in Garrett County in cooperation with the University of Maryland. The University is providing one consultant and is granting six semester hours of resident credit for the work. That is, the participants receive credit as though they were in attendance on the Maryland campus. Garrett County is financing the remaining consultant fees. The participants will pay the credit fees and other expenses of the workshop. Over a hundred persons have registered for this workshop, the first of its kind in

26 October 5, 1950. Letter in the files of the office of the State Supervisor of Elementary Schools.
Maryland.\textsuperscript{27}

Anne Arundel County also will conduct a curriculum workshop in the summer of 1951. This will be of four weeks duration, sponsored and financed entirely by the county, and without academic credit.

Other counties will hold workshops ranging from a few days duration to two weeks.

Development of the Child Study programs in Anne Arundel and Montgomery Counties. The Child Study program in two counties, Anne Arundel and Montgomery, will be described in more detail here. The development of the Child Study program in Anne Arundel county was fairly typical of the way the program developed over the state, while in Montgomery county it developed somewhat differently.

Anne Arundel County

During 1944-1945, three county supervisors attended the conferences called by the State Department of Education and were informed of the Child Study program. They became interested and decided to organize a few study groups on an experimental basis. The following year, 1945-1946, four groups were formed. One group, led by Ruth Bascom, the supervisor for the upper grades, was composed of ten principals from all parts of the county. It was hoped that these people could be trained as leaders. Another group, led by Evelyn Keller, supervisor for the primary grades, was composed of twelve primary teachers drawn from a number of schools in the county. A third group, led by Ruth Duddarar, supervisor for the intermediate grades, was organized from

\textsuperscript{27}Information obtained through interview on May 22, 1951, with Dr. Virginia Hufstedler, University of Maryland consultant for the Garrett County workshop.
a single school faculty. Twelve of the fourteen teachers in the
Linthicum Elementary School composed the study group. A fourth group,
led by Sarah Jones, the elementary supervisor, consisted of fourteen
teachers in one negro school. In each case the supervisor had talked
with teachers they knew well and invited them to participate in the
experiment. Most of the teachers were interested because they felt
they could get some help with the children in their classrooms who
presented problems.  

No consultant help was given directly to the groups that first
year. The supervisors attended the series of three leadership train-
ing meetings held by the State Department of Education at Bowie
and Towson State Teachers Colleges, for which consultant help was obtained
through the Committee on Human Development at the University of Chicago.

The results of the first year's work were not altogether satisfying
to the supervisors. The principals' study group disbanded early
in the year. The principals felt that it was inconvenient to travel
to a central meeting place, and that they were away from their schools
too much. They felt also that keeping records of one child took more
of their time than they were able to give it. A few primary teachers
also discontinued the study because of the inconvenience of traveling
to a central meeting place. Only the participants in the two groups
organized on a school faculty basis remained together for the entire
three years of the program.

---

26 Information for this and the following paragraphs was obtained
through interviews on March 2, 1951, with Sarah V. Jones, Supervisor of
Elementary Schools, and on June 7, 1951, with Ruth V. Dudderar,Supervi-
sor of Junior High Schools, and coordinator of the Child Study program.
In addition to the above problems, many of the participants were dissatisfied with their year’s accomplishments, for they had chosen to study children with such complex problems that they were frustrated in their attempts to learn the motivations for the children’s behavior.

Problems also arose in connection with the transition from the first to the second year of the program. A new superintendent of schools began his duties in September 1946. Two inexperienced general supervisors replaced two who left. Of those who were familiar with the Child Study program only Ruth Dudderar and Sarah Jones remained.

Nevertheless, Child Study was opened up to any who wished to participate, and in 1946-1947 there were in the white schools ten first-year groups with seventy-one participants and two second-year groups with twenty participants. Ruth Dudderar guided the work of the two second-year groups, while the first-year groups were led by Dorothy Siddons, one of the new general supervisors, by Eleanor Waring, the new supervisor of Pupil Personnel, and by Mildred Peterson, a teacher who had participated in the Linthicum School group the previous year and who also had attended the Human Development Workshop at the University of Chicago in the summer of 1946.

Sarah Jones organized eight first-year groups in the negro schools with about sixty participants. A member of each group assumed leadership in the group and Sarah Jones coordinated the program, meeting at frequent intervals with the leaders. She herself led the second-year group.

In preparation for her responsibilities Sarah Jones participated in the two-weeks Child Study workshop and also in the two leadership training meetings held that year. Several of the leaders also were
able to attend both these functions. Three of the other supervisors had attended the fall workshop for supervisors at Betterton, while one was unable to attend for she was working toward a degree to qualify for her new position. All four were present at the leadership training meetings later in the year.

Ruth Dudderar believed that the participants in the Child Study program needed more help and inspiration than the leaders with such limited training could give them. She talked with Grace Alder about the possibility of having some consultant service to the groups in the county. The county was able to afford one day of service in January, at which time Dr. Prescott met with all the participants in two groups and discussed their problems with them, and a week's service in March, during which Columbia Wian met with each study group. The county was unable again to finance consultant service to study groups until 1949-1950, when the State Department of Education set up its policy of aiding the counties by contributing one half the costs of the service. Since then each group has met with a consultant from the Institute for Child Study at the University of Maryland three times each year.

During the two years that the groups did not have consultant service, the supervisors and several interested teachers availed themselves of every opportunity to become adequately trained to guide study groups.29 One teacher took every course in Human Development offered at that time at the University of Maryland. Eight other teachers and two supervisors also registered for courses during the year and in addition attended the Child Study workshops in the summer.

---

29 Ibid.
About six teacher-leaders attended the two-weeks workshops at Bowie in the fall of each year, and a few of those also attended the summer workshop.

Approximately three hundred fifty participated in Child Study during 1947-1948 and during 1948-1949. In 1949-1950, as large numbers of teachers completed the three-year program, the number of participants decreased to one hundred twenty. The number remained about the same during 1950-1951. The senior supervisor noted that during those two years the groups were made up largely of teachers who were receiving academic credit from the University of Maryland to be applied toward a degree, or who were receiving credit from the State Department toward renewal of certificate.30

The teachers who have completed three years of Child Study are again turning their attention in their in-service education program to various aspects of the curriculum. A workshop for junior and senior high school teachers is planned for the summer of 1951. Two major interest groups will center around music and reporting to parents. A few other interests—physical education, science, and the core curriculum—will also be the subjects of study by some groups.

The choice of a large number of teachers to explore better ways of reporting to parents is definitely an outgrowth of experience in

30Expressed by Ruth Dudderar, June 7, 1951. She also stated that three years in Child Study would renew a teacher's certificate for six years. In Maryland teachers are required, after a certain apprentice period, to engage in formal study amounting to the equivalent of six credit hours in each six-year period.

31The core curriculum in Maryland is the curriculum for one half of each school day in the junior high schools and consists of a unit combining the social studies and the language arts.
could choose to be the volunteers, people who have a certain interest in the project. They were concerned with working out a way to make this project work. They were interested in the content of the core curriculum.

One group, composed of sixty junior and senior high school teachers and students, spent a year in our large schools to discuss with each other the realities of teaching two weeks every month. The teachers were some who have already taught in the project and were interested in working with their colleagues. They were concerned with working out a way to make this project work.

In 1990-1991, there were two large groups of volunteer teachers and students who were teaching in the small schools and they were eager to share their experiences. They visited the small schools and they were eager to share their experiences.

On the other hand, the teachers in the large schools who have spent these years teaching the students are also very important. They are concerned with what methods, however, they believe will work best in the other groups. They need to do their best to make changes in the other groups, as well as what methods, however, they believe will work best in the other groups. They need to do their best to make changes in the other groups.
The process of exploring the possibilities of parental involvement in a means of
beginning to explore the possibilities of parental involvement in a means of
the school and providing outside of school hours. The Grop also
Explore and provide outside of school hours. The Grop also
with community agencies to provide adequately resonation further for
out of the school. They were expected to consult with the
organization of the Grop. They were expected to consult with
within the community. The community group, and the school could work together in
schools in the northern section of the community was expected to work in
further Grop composed of thirty teachers from a number of school
most. Each teacher was able to make some concentration and the com-
availability of materials, in order to make possible each school’s best develop-
the development of the Grop. The development of the Grop, and
schools in and around Amherst, were experienced with various
teachers. In order to apply these in their own schools.
reporting to parents the school progress of each child.

A fourth group, composed of thirty rural teachers in the southern part of the county, was attempting to help with special problems of individual children by using techniques for gathering and analyzing data which they had learned in the three previous years. This group met with considerable frustration, for most of the children selected seemed to need more help than the teachers were qualified to give.

Although there had been difficulties to overcome in conducting a program of Child Study, the supervisory staff members gave the general impression that they believed Child Study is an effective and worthwhile program in Anne Arundel County. One supervisor remarked, "It is the best thing that ever happened to the county." Some of the favorable comments made were that teachers are more considerate of each child, that they understand better why children behave as they do and are not so greatly disturbed by the behavior, that teachers are more permissive, that teachers and children like each other better, that relationships have improved also between teachers and principals and between teachers and supervisors, that teachers feel less pressure from administrative sources. Some changes in classroom procedures and in the curriculum have been made as a result of Child Study. There is more questioning of current practices. Child Study is the essential factor behind the efforts to make changes in the system of marking.

---

56The evaluative statements in this and the following paragraphs were expressed in conference with the author on January 11, 1951. Those present were Leviah Daniels, Sarah V. Jones, Dorothy Siddons Kirkley, and Virginia D. Moore, all Supervisors of Elementary Schools, Ruth V. Dudderar, Supervisor of Junior High Schools, Mary J. Farrell, Supervisor of Curriculum, and Mary E. Moss, Supervisor of Pupil Personnel.
and reporting to parents. There is a much greater emphasis on co-
operation between parents and teachers in aiding the development of
children. The supervisors felt that the influence of Child Study has
permeated the whole school system and that many teachers who did not
undertake the study were affected by it and learned from it.

The supervisors were aware that not all teachers responded favor-
ably to Child Study. They estimated that perhaps between ten and
twenty per cent of the teachers remained at the level of verbaliza-
tion and did not seem to feel the importance of going to any depth in
their understanding of children.

Four suggestions for strengthening the program were offered by
the supervisors.

1) They believed that the organizing framework\textsuperscript{37} for analyzing
data should be adhered to less rigidly, and that a greater effort
should be made to help teachers go beyond the classifying procedures
and become more aware of the purposes behind them. There was general
agreement that the framework was a valuable aid in analyzing a record,
but some teachers seemed satisfied when they had merely classified the
data under the indicated headings.

2) Consultant help should be given directly to the participants
in the study groups as well as to the leaders. This practice lessens
the danger of merely going through the form of the program. It pro-
vides the teachers with a better understanding of the purposes and
procedures and increases morale.

3) The inclusion of seminar periods along with the laboratory

\textsuperscript{37} Described on pp. 75-76.
sessions throughout the year might stimulate teachers to read more and increase the scientific knowledge they would have to draw upon.

4) Many teachers feel that the third-year study is much like that of the second year and that they learn little that is new. Perhaps Child Study should be limited to two years so that teachers can deal with curriculum implications sooner.

Recently a formal study was made in Anne Arundel County that endeavored to show the relationship between the in-service Child Study program and the changes which have occurred in the schools.35 The possible relationship was briefly analyzed in a quantitative way through a discussion of the rate of change during the postwar period compared with that of the two preceding periods - the four war years and the four pre-war years. Some quantitative changes were identified also from case materials and written correspondence.

The quantitative analysis revealed 1) that there was an increase in the number of homes visited; 2) that while the expenditures for teaching materials in the postwar period approximately doubled that of the preceding period, the equivalent increase in textbook expenditures was only 25.2 per cent; 3) that the per cent of non-promotion has dropped considerably; and 4) that the number of suspension cases rapidly decreased. In all four cases a significant difference was found, but it was not possible to determine how much of this was due to teacher participation in Child Study.

The analysis of qualitative changes in letters of referral of

children to the Supervisor of Pupil Personnel revealed that there was an increased awareness of casual factors in behavior, growing reluctance to make conclusive statements, and expressed willingness to help the child. Case materials revealed a tremendous change in attitude toward discipline.

An evaluation of the Child Study program as it has operated in Anne Arundel County was also included in this study on the basis of interviews with the administrative staff, questionnaires to teachers and principals, a brief questionnaire to twenty-five local educational authorities, and two experiments.

The interviews revealed opinions that are essentially the same as those expressed by the supervisors to the author and already reported.

Of the seventy-five per cent of the teachers and principals who answered the questionnaire, ninety-five per cent responded favorably and felt that Child Study was beneficial to them. Five per cent reported they did not see any changes in their behavior and did not learn anything new.

The questionnaire to the twenty-five local educational authorities included fifteen identified changes in education in Anne Arundel county. The educators were asked to name one or more factors which they believed had been influential in the individual changes. Among fourteen factors that were mentioned, Child Study was the one that appeared most frequently. More than eighty per cent of the educators
give the Child Study program credit for eight of the changes.\textsuperscript{39} There was one hundred per cent agreement that Child Study was responsible for the increased acceptance of children by teachers.

In one of the experiments the annual reports of teachers who had participated in Child Study were compared with those of other teachers in an effort to discover whether Child Study affected any changes in pupil attendance, promotions, and teachers' home visits. There was a very significant increase in the number of home visits, but there was no significant difference in respect to the others.

The second experiment was made to ascertain if there were any difference in terms of attitudes toward children, between teachers who had participated in Child Study and those who had not. An instrument designed for the technique and developed by \textsuperscript{40}Eberman at the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{39}The eight changes are as follows:
\item \textsuperscript{39}1 The number of teachers' home visits have nearly doubled since the war.
\item \textsuperscript{39}2 Parent education has become an important feature of the educational picture, especially the work done through mothers' clubs.
\item \textsuperscript{39}3 In developing a curriculum teachers refer much more frequently to needs, maturity levels, and developmental tasks of pupils.
\item \textsuperscript{39}4 The greatest decrease in nonpromotion has occurred since 1945. The percentage has dropped to one-half in the white schools and two-thirds in the colored schools.
\item \textsuperscript{39}5 After the war the teachers have increasingly been checking the category "unfortunate home conditions" as a reason for nonpromotion.
\item \textsuperscript{39}6 In 1947 nearly all cases referred by teachers to the Department of Pupil Personnel were attendance cases. In 1950 this has dropped to 53\% while reasons such as "emotional welfare" more frequently were given as reasons.
\item \textsuperscript{39}7 Compared to some years back very few children are sent to the principal's office.
\item \textsuperscript{39}8 Interviews and reports seem to indicate that teachers in general are more understanding of behavior which, a few years back, would not have been excused.
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{40}Paul Eberman, "Q Technique Applied to Teaching Competency." Unpublished doctor of philosophy dissertation, University of Chicago, 1950.
University of Chicago was used for this purpose. Several appreciable differences were found.

1) Teachers who have participated in Child Study have learned to give consideration to the well-being of the individual child as well as to the group.

2) They realized the importance of the social and emotional adjustment of children.

3) Emphasis on competition seems to have decreased.

4) As a group, teachers participating in Child Study tend not to adhere to the policy of strict rules and rigid discipline, but express their belief in cooperation and joint responsibility as a basis for self discipline.

This study suggests that Child Study seems to have been a major influence in affecting changes in education in Anne Arundel County in three ways:

a) It is a causative factor, as illustrated by the increased home contacts.

b) It is an instrumental factor. This is exemplified by the emphasis on effective staff relationships and democratic procedure, which are general trends adopted by the superintendent and practiced in the teamwork of the child study groups.

c) It has a catalytic effect in the sense that it expedites already on-going changes and increases the rate of change. The promotion policy is an illustration of this.\textsuperscript{11}

Montgomery County

The Child Study program in Montgomery County will be described briefly here merely to point up how it differed from the way the program developed in other counties. Some evaluation also will be

\textsuperscript{11}Birger Kykavoll, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 252.
The first point of difference was that Montgomery County undertook the program on its own initiative. The personnel of the school system had been working for a number of years on planning an educational program based on the development of children, and the superintendent and supervisors were familiar with the work of the Committee on Human Development at the University of Chicago before they attended the conferences at Towson that launched the statewide study. Following the March conference Edwin W. Broome, Superintendent of Schools wrote to Dr. Prescott:

Will it be possible for you to arrange to work with a group of teachers in Montgomery County beginning next fall? Perhaps some time in October would be about the best time to begin work. The County will be responsible for financial obligations necessary to carry on the study. It is thought you may be able to combine this study with other work that you may have in process in this general area and work to the advantage of the University in making schedules.

Dr. Prescott replied:

It is a grand idea for us to work directly with a group of teachers in Montgomery County while we develop a program with the supervisors and teachers colleges of the state. I shall be glad to undertake it and will write you further about specific dates, costs and the like, when I work out my program for the year during the first week of May.

Arrangements were completed and in May Mr. Broome was able to inform

---

1 Information obtained through interview on June 9, 1951, with Edwin W. Broome, Superintendent of Schools.


Dr. Prescott:

The Board of Education has approved the program for your working with us in the county next year. It is a real satisfaction to know that you are going to be available to work with the teachers. 45

Plans were made also for five people to attend the Human Development workshop at the University of Chicago during the summer of 1945. Included in the group were a general supervisor, a guidance counselor, and four teachers. 46

In the fall of 1945 six groups were organized with a total of thirty nine participants. All the groups were led by people who had had six weeks training in the Human Development workshop. Here was a second point of difference. No other groups in Maryland undertook their study with guidance from leaders trained to that extent. The leaders in Montgomery County attended the leadership training conferences sponsored by the State Department of Education and met in addition with the consultants when they were in the county. Thus the Montgomery County leaders of Child Study groups were receiving considerably more training than any others in the state.

A third point of difference was that consultant help from the very beginning was given directly to the groups. Each group met with a consultant from the University of Chicago three times during the year.

In 1946-1947, the second year of the program, there were one hun-

45 May 9, 1945. Letter in the files of the Institute for Child Study, University of Maryland.

46 Information for this and the following paragraphs was obtained through interview with Edwin W. Broome, June 9, 1951.
dred eighty six participants led by fifteen trained leaders. A second group had been to the Human Development workshop at the University of Chicago, and most of the leaders had attended the two-weeks workshop at Sutton. The work that year was coordinated by two supervisors.

During the next three years the number of participants averaged a little over three hundred each year. T. H. Owen Knight, Supervisor of Pupil Personnel, coordinated the program.

In 1950-1951 Montgomery County reorganized somewhat its schedule for consultant service. Because of the proximity of the county to the Institute for Child Study it was possible to arrange the visits of the consultants to coincide with the regular meeting times and places of the groups. Each group worked with a consultant for two meetings during the year. In addition, each participant attended two overview lectures, experienced participants attending an advanced series and first-year participants a beginning series. Five leaders' meetings for each year-level was also held. Consultants were present at two of the five meetings.

The majority of teachers in Montgomery County, as in the other counties, are now receiving credit for Child Study either from the University of Maryland or for renewal of certificate from the State Department of Education.

One of the unique aspects of Child Study in Montgomery County was the development of the parallel Parent Child Study program. In 1945-

---

47 Information obtained from the files of T. H. Owen Knight, Supervisor of Pupil Personnel and Coordinator of the Child Study program.

48 Information obtained through interview with T. H. Owen Knight, February 6, 1950.
1946, when the first study groups for teachers were organized, parent study groups were already in existence in most of the Parent Teacher Associations in the county. When the parents learned of the program for teachers, they were eager to undertake similar activities and the county school authorities were approached for help.

In 1946-1947 there were eighteen organized Parent-Child Study groups with three hundred sixty participants - twice the number of teacher participants. Leaders of the groups met regularly for training with Lucille Johnson, Supervisor of Elementary Schools, who coordinated the program that year. The leaders had one meeting with Dr. Prescott as consultant. Dr. Prescott also gave one overview lecture to the participants that year.

Since that time Parent Child Study groups have maintained a steady growth and have become a regular part of the Parent Teacher Association programs in most of the school systems. The Montgomery County Child Study Advisory Council sponsors the program. This is an organization of the leaders of all the parent study groups in the county. The Representative for Child Study in the County Council of Parents and Teachers is the general chairman. In addition there are three area chairmen, and chairmen for Group Dynamics, News Letter, Bibliography, and Film Resources. The program is coordinated by T. N. Owen Knight, Supervisor of Pupil Personnel, and consult service is given by various members of the staff of the school systems. Parent groups also receive the same consultant service from the Institute.

\(^{49}\) Information for this and the following paragraphs was obtained from the files in the office of the Supervisor of Pupil Personnel, Rockville.
for Child Study that the teacher study groups do.

An annual workshop is held in the county for a week in October to train leaders of parent groups. A nursery is set up along with the workshop to take care of the children. Consultants are obtained from the Institute for Child Study and from the county school personnel. The workshop is organized just as the teachers workshops are, with daily overview lectures, seminars for advanced and beginning study groups, and laboratory sessions in the afternoon for advanced and beginning groups.

There have been no formal evaluations of the Child Study program in Montgomery County, though informal ones through interviews and questionnaires are made frequently. Mr. E. W. Broome, Superintendent of Schools, believes that Child Study did three things in Montgomery County.

"1) Child Study stimulated teachers in the development of scientific concepts and understanding of children.

2) It furthered tendencies already in existence in the school program.

3) It affected overtones with the public in a way to create added understanding and recognition of the functions of education."50

Mr. Broome pointed out this "very serious shortage. The Child Study program fails to make functional adaptations in methods, in classroom management and organization, in materials of instruction, and in curriculum construction."

50 These statements and the comments in the next paragraph were made by Mr. E. W. Broome to the author in an interview, June 9, 1951.
In the fall of 1945 the teachers evaluated the program through the use of a questionnaire. Although participation was voluntary, almost every teacher responded. The questionnaire responses were analyzed and the results summarized by a committee made up of the faculty of one elementary school.

The analysis revealed that the teachers were more understanding of children, and more concerned about their welfare. They believed that their relations with parents and the community had considerably improved. They were looking at behavior problems differently: punishing less, looking for causes more, recognizing children's needs. They were more aware of the importance of experience and of its implications for learning in school. They knew more scientific concepts and principles and were making use of them to support their hypotheses.

The analysis revealed also that only six persons reported they had received no help from the program or that it had not changed their thinking in any way. It was evident in the statements made by third-year participants that they had been much more profoundly influenced by the Child Study program than those who had participated for only one year.

The hypotheses made on the basis of this informal evaluation were borne out by the findings of an objective statistical study made by Hugh V. Perkins with the help of some Montgomery County participants.52

51 This information was obtained from the summary of the questionnaire results in the files of the office of the Supervisor of Pupil Personnel, Rockville.

This investigation sought to examine group learning situations in order to determine the effects of social-emotional climate, previous experience in Child Study, and Child Study curriculum on three selected aspects of learning: knowledge of scientific concepts which assist in explaining behavior, changes in attitudes toward children, and mental processes used.

During the school year 1947-1948 recordings and transcriptions were made of the meetings of six Child Study groups whose membership consisted of professional personnel of school systems in Anne Arundel, Montgomery, and Prince George Counties, in Baltimore City, and in Washington, D. C. Two groups were engaged in each of the three years of the Child Study program. One group was selected at each year level near the extreme of group-centeredness and the other near the extreme of leader-centeredness through employing Withall's instrument for determining the social emotional climate of groups. Dr. Perkins developed an instrument for categorizing the statements of the participants in Child Study groups which he used in analyzing the data collected in the study.

The analysis revealed that there were significant differences in group learning and group interaction between the group-centered groups and the leader-centered groups. Group-centered groups expressed a significantly higher ratio of child development concepts to total responses. Group-centered groups also expressed a significantly higher proportion of warm attitudes toward children. Finally, in the mental processes

---

used they expressed a significantly higher proportion of responses including objective evidence in support of a statement.

The learnings expected on the basis of previous experience in Child Study and the Child Study curriculum did take place. Participants in second-year study groups revealed a significantly higher ratio of stated child development concepts to total responses than did participants in first-year groups. The difference was not so great between second- and third-year groups.

The largest evident changes in attitudes took place in the first-year groups, but the second-year groups were significantly superior in the greater proportion of warm attitudes and objective responses which participants expressed.

The investigator concluded that the climate in which learning occurs is a strong determinant of the quality and quantity of group learning, and that experience in Child Study results in learning that is significantly greater at each year level of the three-year program.

The Child Study program in the City of Baltimore. The City of Baltimore is an independent school system in Maryland. Child Study was organized there when the program sponsored by the State Department was a year old.

In the fall of 1945 several of the administrative staff members attended the conferences at Towson planned to acquaint the supervisors in the state with the Child Study program. The administrators were immediately enthusiastic.\(^5\) They had been through an era of rigid

\(^5\)Information obtained through interviews on May 9, 1950, with Mary A. Adams, Assistant Superintendent of Elementary Schools, and Evelyn R. Girardin, in charge of Elementary Schools in the Curriculum Bureau.
adherence to daily schedules and of curriculum revisions, and were looking for an in-service program that would begin to take children into account. In 1945-1946 Mary A. Adams, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, and Eva E. Gerstmyer, Director of Primary Grades in Kindergarten, were conducting an in-service education program for principals and vice-principals. This group was honestly facing what was happening to children in the classrooms. Miss Adams and Evelyn R. Girardin, who was Elementary Supervisor at that time, talked with the group about Child Study. The group was interested and about the middle of the school year began to study a case record in Helping Teachers Understand Children. Later each began to keep a record of one child.

Toward the end of the year the group began to talk about making the study available to all teachers. Dr. W. H. Lemmel, the Superintendent of Schools, was approached, and he wrote to Dr. Prescott to inquire about the program. Dr. Prescott replied with a long letter explaining the nature of the program in detail, including suggestions for its possible operation in Baltimore and the probable costs involved. Dr. Lemmel met with the Committee on Professional Development to study the suggestions. This committee, composed of members of the administrative staff in charge of the various divisions of the system, were favorably inclined toward the plans.

On October 21, 1946, Dr. Prescott met with the committee and the details for launching the project were worked out. In the next few


56 Information obtained from a letter from Dr. W. H. Lemmel to Dr. D. A. Prescott, September 11, 1946.
days the program was explained first to all principals and vice-
principals, and then to interested teachers. Forty three groups were
organized with five hundred sixty six participants. Evelyn Girardin,
recently put in charge of Elementary Schools in the Curriculum Bureau,
was made coordinator of the program. Ten of the leaders had been to
the two-weeks workshops sponsored by the State Department of Education
at Potterton and Bowie. The others were untrained.57

A plan was set up for the training of leaders. The leaders met
once a month for two hours and fifteen minutes with Dr. H. Gerthom
Morgan of the University of Delaware, who was thoroughly trained in
the program.58

Consultant help was given directly to the groups, though each
group was able to have the benefit of the service only once during
the year. This continues to be the case.

The second year of the program, 1947-1948, was launched with a
one-week workshop for group leaders and co-leaders. Each year's work
thereafter began with a week's workshop. In 1948-1949 there were one
hundred fifty-eight participants, including representatives from all
groups in addition to the leaders and co-leaders. In the next two
years an average of one hundred attended the workshop.

Leaders meetings were again held monthly in 1947-1948, but since
then they have been limited to three meetings for each year level

57 Information for this and following paragraphs was obtained
from the files in the Curriculum Bureau, Department of Education,
Baltimore.

58 Dr. H. Gerthom Morgan, now professor of Education in the Insti-
tute for Child Study, University of Maryland, became a member of the
Institute staff in September, 1947.
annually. Consultants from the Institute for Child Study meet with the leaders on their regular visits. About twenty leaders each year receive additional training in the summer workshops at the University of Maryland.

The program is financed by the City of Baltimore through the Professional Development Budget. The budget for the first year, 1946-1947, was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultant fees</td>
<td>$1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant expenses</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses for sending eight people to the Human Development workshop, University of Chicago</td>
<td>2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop in Baltimore</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$4993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The budget remained about the same for the following two years but was cut in 1949-1950 to $2500.60 This meant that the consultant service had to be reduced from three to two visits annually.

Participation in the Child Study program has remained consistently high. In 1947-1948 there were four hundred seventy five participants. The number rose the following year to six hundred seventy five. Since then, with large groups completing the three years of the study the number of participants has averaged about three hundred fifty. In another year or two most teachers in the elementary schools will have participated in the program. The high schools have hardly been touched, however. New teachers in the city are strongly counseled to

59Information obtained through interview with Evelyn R. Girardin, May 9, 1950.

60In these first three years some of the money came from a small fund that had not been earmarked for any special purpose. That source is now exhausted.
participate in Child Study, particularly since many of them are liberal arts graduates who have had no courses in education. The holding power of the program is good. Although anyone can drop out at any time, most teachers complete the three-year study.61

There is no fourth year of Child Study. Teachers who complete three years may select from the catalog of Professional Study Activities offered by the Department of Education of Baltimore City, one of the other in-service training programs. For participation in one of these activities teachers receive from the Board of Education the equivalent of one semester hour credit toward salary increases. One of the activities offered is Community Study. This and Child Study are the only two that cut across department lines. Most teachers alternate three years of Child Study with three years of Community Study. The two together give teachers in Baltimore City a good background for guiding the children in their schools.

No objective means of evaluating the effectiveness of the Child Study program in Baltimore City have as yet been evolved. There have been many verbal expressions of opinion that may be summarized as follows:62

Several principals have observed increased ability of some teachers in the Child Study program to work with parents on a high professional level.

Participants in the program have indicated greater pleasure and satisfaction in working with children when

---

61 Information for this and the following paragraphs was obtained through interview with Evelyn R. Girardin, May 9, 1950.

62 These were culled from a mimeographed bulletin, "Review of Professional Development Activity - Child Growth and Development," (1950) in the files of the office of the Curriculum Bureau, Department of Education, Baltimore.
increased insight into their behavior has been achieved. Many teachers have commented on decreased tension and anxiety felt with increased understanding of the causes of behavior. Hence, teaching becomes a more satisfying vocation for such teachers.

School principals have indicated that some teachers in the Child Study program seem to be able to work more effectively with children and that fewer children are sent from such classes to the principal for disciplinary purposes.

Some school principals have commented on the change that has been evident in the ability of some Child Study participants to work satisfactorily with their colleagues. It seems also that through the program some teachers have gained status with their co-workers which has contributed to better adjustment.

Participants in the Child Study program have made contributions to city-wide committee activity as well as to local school programs. In some cases, a few teachers in a school have aroused enough interest among their colleagues in the study of children to organize total faculty study groups. In other cases, teachers have reported to faculty groups and have participated on committees concerned with problems of discipline, parent interviews, reporting to parents, record keeping, and related topics.

Members of Child Study groups have also made important contributions to such city-wide committees as Child Guidance and Adjustment, Cumulative Records, Design for Education in the Elementary Grades, and many others.

One formal study was conducted in the schools of Baltimore to determine the influence of teacher participation in three years of an in-service program of Child Study upon certain pupil achievements. Since teachers working in Child Study programs are likely to give increased attention to individual children and to be more flexible in their demands on children, many superintendents had been concerned with the question whether the children would continue to learn fundamental skills as well after their teachers had Child Study experience.

---

The investigator made a comparison between an experimental group of nine classes of fifth grade children taught by teachers who had three years of participation in Child Study and a control group of nine other fifth grade children equated with the first group on the basis of intelligence and socio-economic background and taught by teachers who had not participated in Child Study. The experimental and control groups were statistically compared on the basis of achievement shown on standardized tests in reading and arithmetic, and on the basis of changes in intelligence quotients, during the experimental period.

The findings showed that there was no significant difference between the two groups, and sustained the following hypotheses:

1. There is no difference in reading and arithmetic achievement of experimental and control group pupils from three intelligence quotient groups resulting from teacher participation in child study.

2. There is no difference in reading and arithmetic achievement or changes in I. Q. of experimental and control group pupils from selected sub-cultural groups because of teacher participation in the child study program.

3. There is no difference in reading and arithmetic achievement or changes in I. Q. of experimental and control group pupils from the various social classes resulting from teacher participation in child study.

4. Child study teachers have not affected the level of experimental group achievement (as determined by mental age) in reading and arithmetic any more than non-child study teachers have affected the level of control group achievement.

5. There is no difference in the attendance of experimental and control pupils during the experimental period.64

The investigator concluded that teacher participation in an in-

---

64Ibid., abstract.
service program of Child Study neither increased nor decreased the group
level of achievement. In other words, increased attention to the whole
gamut of children's needs by teachers and increased flexibility in the
timing of demands for learning made upon different children, in no way
decreased this actual learning of fundamental skills in arithmetic and
reading as proven by objective test results.

It is interesting to note that in all the evaluative opinions ex-
pressed to the author by teachers and administrators in Maryland, not
one referred to achievement in school subjects in any way. Even in
discussions of reporting to parents the emphasis was on other aspects
of a child's development. This does not mean that subject matter and
skill learning are played down by the Child Study program but rather
that other aspects of a child's development are given equal weighing.

Summary. In Maryland interest in the Child Study program devel-
oped in the State Teachers College at Towson through a desire of a few
of the personnel to become acquainted with the work of the Commission
on Teacher Education. This led to a series of conferences in December,
1944, and in March, 1945, attended by teachers college faculty members,
county superintendents, supervisors, and staff members of the State De-
partment. Out of these conferences emerged a plan for a statewide pro-
gram under the sponsorship of the State Department of Education.

Simultaneously with the planning for a statewide program one
county, Montgomery, undertook the program on its own initiative. A
year after the inception of the State Department program, the city of
Baltimore, which is an independent school district in the state of
Maryland, also started a program of its own.

Perhaps the factor most influential in interesting administrators
and teachers in Maryland in a program of Child Study was the readiness there to examine school policies and practices in terms of children. There existed a restlessness, a dissatisfaction about current conditions and a desire for a new orientation toward them. Some counties, like Montgomery County, were already planning an educational program based on the development of children.

The State Department, in 1945-1946, brought the program to the attention of all the county supervisors in a series of three conferences at each of the four state teachers colleges. At these conferences the supervisors received sufficient training to organize and lead one or two study groups on an experimental basis in their own counties that year.

During the second year, Child Study was opened up to all who desired to undertake the study and in most counties the number of participants was high. In each case one or two of the supervisors coordinated the program. Supervisors led the second-year groups while teachers who had participated in the program the previous year led the first-year groups.

The greatest problem faced had to do with the training of leaders. The second year's work and that of the two following years were started with a two-weeks workshop for leaders of groups. Two other training meetings, one in the winter and one in the spring were held annually. These were always followed up with mimeographed aids to guide the leaders. In addition, several leaders, especially from Montgomery County, attended the Human Development workshop at the University of Chicago in the summers of 1946 and 1947. In 1947 Baltimore City also sent a group of leaders to the University of Chicago for training.
Since 1947-1948 when the Institute for Child Study was established at the University of Maryland, courses on campus and the six-weeks summer workshop also were available to leaders and participants for additional training.

Consultant service was obtained by the State Department of Education from the University of Chicago but until the fall of 1947 it was available only to leaders. Montgomery County was the one exception, having consultant help directly to groups two or three times a year from the beginning. Baltimore City also had consultant service directly to groups, but it amounted to only one visit for each group. In 1947-1948 several other counties began to invite consultants from the Institute for Child Study established that year at the University of Maryland to visit groups two or three times annually and to conduct leaders meetings. It became the policy of the State Department of Education in 1950 to encourage the counties to direct their own programs of Child Study.

Several of the counties are also beginning to develop parallel Parent Child-Study programs. In Montgomery County the parent groups are well organized and there are a greater number of participants engaged in it than there are teachers in the program.

During the first two years the expenses of the consultant service for the leadership training meetings were shared by the four teachers colleges and the twenty-three counties. Consultant service for the workshop was financed by the State Department of Education from a budget voted by the State Legislature for this purpose, and the counties paid the other expenses of the supervisors. Since 1950 it has been the policy of the State Department to encourage counties
to direct their own Child Study programs. When this happens, the State
Department finances one half the cost of the consultant service to that
county. Montgomery County had supported its own program from the be-
inning.

Baltimore City financed its program from the budget for profession-
al development.

Since 1948 participants in the Child Study program have been able
to receive graduate or undergraduate credit from the University of
Maryland and also credit from the State Department of Education, or,
in the case of Baltimore, from the City Department of Education, for
renewal of certificate and for salary increases.

In the various counties evaluation of the outcomes of the Child
Study program have been informal and consisted mainly of verbal ex-
pressions of opinion. For the most part the impression is received
that Child Study is favorably accepted. In Anne Arundel and Montgom-
ery Counties and in the City of Baltimore administrators and teachers
seem to feel that as a result of the Child Study program there is
greater understanding and consideration of children, there is greater
knowledge of human growth and development, relationships among teach-
ers and between teachers and administrators have become more relaxed
and they are more accepting of each other, relationships with parents
and the community have improved and become more professional, and
changes have taken place in various aspects of the curriculum.

Some suggestions for strengthening the program were made by the
administrative staff of Anne Arundel County: that teachers be helped
to understand more clearly the use of the framework for organizing
and analyzing data, that consultant help be given directly to groups,
that reading and seminar sessions be included in the program during the year along with the laboratory sessions, and that the program be limited to two years.

In Montgomery County the lack in Child Study noted was that it fails to make functional adaptations in various aspects of the school's program. Now that a great number of teachers are completing three years of Child Study, the counties are beginning to turn their attention to curricular implications.

A few studies have been made of the Child Study program using Maryland counties as laboratories. Birger Myksevoll found that Child Study seems to have exerted certain constructive influences in Anne Arundel County. Hugh Perkins found that the quality and quantity of learning in group-centered groups was superior to that in leader-centered groups and that experience in Child Study does result in learning that is significantly greater at each year level of the three-year program. Walter Wastjen found that teacher participation in Child Study does not decrease nor does it increase the group level of achievement of pupils in reading and arithmetic, nor the intelligence quotient.
CHAPTER VIII

AN ANALYSIS OF THE CHILD STUDY PROGRAMS IN TEXAS AND MARYLAND

Purpose of the chapter. This chapter proposes to analyze the Child Study programs in Texas and Maryland and seeks to identify

1. factors which have been common in the success of these programs,

2. processes that were common to all the programs and that seem essential to the development of a program,

3. factors and processes which were peculiar to particular situations or which were experimental and later found to be unnecessary or undesirable.

Factors which have been common in the success of the Child Study programs. There are at least nine factors common to the successful programs in Texas and Maryland.

1) Probably the greatest factor was the readiness on the part of teachers and administrators to learn more about children, to re-examine the goals of education in relation to the developing personalities of children and the demands of a democratic society, and to learn to use democratic processes in achieving democratic aims.¹

This readiness had been built up in large measure by the genuine concern of the school personnel over some educational problems. The realization that Child Study seemed to offer a means for arriving at some solutions to these problems was a strong force in the acceptance

¹See Chapter II.
and successful development of the Child Study programs.

a) Guidance counselors saw in it opportunities for cooperative endeavor with teachers in understanding children and in dealing wisely with them.

b) Teachers for a long time had been repeating and were earnestly trying to implement some concepts related to human growth and development, such as "The child reacts as a whole to a situation," or "Every child is different." Child Study seemed to give them new insight into the meaning of these concepts.

c) Administrators and teachers had been through a period of writing curriculum revisions. There seemed to be a great deal of dissatisfaction with the process and with the results. They found repeatedly that they could not make valid decisions about the curriculum because they did not know enough about the way children grow and develop and learn. Teachers who had been struggling with these matters recognized in Child Study a way to lay a foundation for future curricular changes.

d) When curriculum revisions were completed it was found that new teachers entering the system had difficulty understanding and using them. During the war, and especially afterwards, because of the shortage of teaching personnel, there was an influx into the school systems of teachers who had not taught for a number of years, many of them unqualified according to present standards of certification. To many of these teachers who had to engage in formal study to become qualified for their new positions, Child Study seemed to make sense. It dealt with a subject they could understand and learn from, and the methods used were not as threatening as those in an academic course might have
e) Administrators were faced with the problem of making available in-service education that would be satisfying and provide opportunities for growth for teachers who had long years of successful teaching experience, for new young teachers entering the system, as well as for teachers who were returning to teaching after a period of absence. It seemed essential to provide the kind of in-service education that would weld these groups into one and so unify the school system, rather than to have separate programs for each. Child Study seemed admirably effective in accomplishing these purposes.

2) Another factor in the success of the programs was that they were carried on by local school systems as a part of a continuous program of in-service professional education. This had two important implications.

a) The teachers had a laboratory there on the spot that could not be duplicated in any other situation. In addition, in the local situations the program could be modified in keeping with the needs, resources, philosophy, and practical problems existing there, and consequently could give the participants a realization of worthwhile accomplishment.

b) For the most part there was a recognition of the importance for local school boards to maintain a budget for the purposes of Child Study. Budgetary provisions needed to be made for local coordinating leadership, for release of teachers' time for study groups and leadership training, for books, for employment of consultant service, for operation of local workshops and conferences, for sending teachers to colleges and universities for special training.
3) Coordinators of the local programs were for the most part central office representatives, supervisors of curriculum and directors of instruction, principals, and guidance counselors. There were a few teacher coordinators. The fact that the studies received administrative leadership, and therefore strong administrative support, gave them a chance to be successful.

Every effort was made in Texas actively to involve the principals, and in Maryland the supervisors, in Child Study. These were the people most closely concerned with directing the work of the teachers. It seemed essential that the administrators be actively interested in Child Study in order to clear the way for its successful development.

4) The nature and quality of the local leadership was another important factor. Coordinators came to be coimportant with the consultants in the success of the programs. Wherever the coordinator was wholeheartedly involved in the program, the program was successful. Wherever the coordinator assumed merely a clerical role or where there was no coordination the program failed.

a) Much emphasis had been placed on the thorough training of coordinators and leaders. This seemed essential in order that they have the long range view necessary for wise planning and for giving direction to the groups.

b) Emphasis had been placed also on democratic leadership. Objective evidence has shown that where leadership was democratic, participants significantly deepened their understanding of children.2 Wherever leaders made it possible for teachers to think things through

---

together, the maximum inner resources of each person seemed to be developed.

Coordinators and leaders such as these had the respect and confidence of group members and resistances to the program were at a minimum.

5) For the most part it was self-motivated interest that seemed to hold the membership of the study groups together. Participation was voluntary and anyone could drop out of the program at any time if it were not satisfying to him. Pressure of any kind to induce teachers to undertake Child Study was, in general, carefully avoided, and wherever used had a detrimental effect on the program.

6) Another factor in the success of the programs was the cooperation established between the colleges and universities and the school systems in the state. Child Study programs conducted locally within the school systems, coordinated by the local personnel, could depend on universities and colleges for valuable assistance as sponsoring agencies, as sources of consultant help, as resources for scientific information, and as a base for the training of coordinators, leaders, and participants. Several colleges and universities offered undergraduate and graduate credit for work accomplished in the local study groups as well as in the course work during the school year and in the six-weeks summer workshops. This made it possible for teachers to pursue Child Study and still meet the requirements for formal study imposed by their school systems.

7) The fact that the Child Study program was well planned had a great deal to do with its successful development. For example, it seems likely that if it had not been organized in sequential steps it could not have developed in Maryland by the method there used of giving
(1) The study of child study procedures is a critical component of the broader process of understanding and improving student development. It involves observing and analyzing the interactions between students and their environment, with the aim of identifying patterns and areas for improvement.

(2) A key factor in the development of a child study is the identification of common processes that are essential to the educational process. These processes must be understood to ensure that they are adequately addressed in educational programs.

(3) The study of child study procedures is also essential for the development of effective educational strategies. By understanding the common processes involved, educators can develop more effective methods of instruction and assessment.

(4) Human development is a complex process, and understanding the interactions between different factors is essential for creating effective educational programs. The study of child study procedures can help educators identify the key factors that contribute to student success.

(5) There are several factors that are critical to the success of a child study program. These factors include:

   - Education and training of educational leaders
   - Support from community organizations
   - Participation in the community
   - Planning and implementation of effective educational programs

(6) The study of child study procedures was an integral part of the American Council on Education's planning process, as evidenced by the reports from the Council on Teacher Education.
seems required if the aims of Child Study are to be realized. Objective studies have revealed that the quantity and quality of teachers' learning significantly increases and improves with each year of participation in the program.3

There has been some question regarding the length of time that is essential for an adequate Child Study program. In Anne Arundel County the teachers and administrative staff have suggested that the program be limited to two years. There is the feeling that the third year is repetitive of the second, with little additional learning taking place. This is not borne out by the objective studies, which show that learning is greater in the second year than in the first year, and greater in the third than in the second year.4 Perhaps this condition in Anne Arundel and in some other counties in Maryland might be accounted for by the fact that for the first three years of the program participants had no contact with consultants. They were getting help second-hand from the leaders. In the second year of the program some who had participated the previous year became leaders of first-year groups, so that for a while there were participants in the program thrice removed from consultant service. It seems inevitable that there would be less depth to the study and more of simply going through the formal steps of the program. As a matter of fact the supervisors in Anne Arundel County did point out that to some teachers the classifying procedure using the framework for organizing and analyzing data had become an end in itself.5

3P  179.
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On the other hand, in Corpus Christi, in the Rio Grande Valley, and in a few other places in Texas there have been some teachers who did not undertake the third year of the program because the depth and breadth of its scope seemed so great as to intimidate them. In these places consultants had visited groups from the very beginning. The question might be raised: Could there have been too much consultant service or too close coordination of the program in some instances so that groups were not allowed to proceed in their own way and at their own rate and felt pressure to go more deeply into the study before they were ready?

The evidence in the record seems to be clear that the formulation of meaningful concepts in the minds of human beings takes time and cannot be hurried. No program is less than three years in duration and a good number continue beyond that.

2) Studying a limited number of children over a period of a year seems an effective way of seeing behavior in enough detail through time to become sensitive to its meaning.

3) Keeping a written record of a child is essential to learning the skills in the scientific method: data gathering, analyzing the data, and coming to valid conclusions on the basis of the data. It is equally essential for developing scientific attitudes. Some teachers feel that keeping a record is burdensome. Deliberate care must be taken to help teachers appreciate its vital significance. Skill in the method of science and understanding of children based on valid hypotheses do not come simply by talking over the problems of children,

---
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The difficulties in understanding about children,

The secret to success in understanding each other in the educational method

and support each other, and

levels, though they keep records of only one child, they serve as a

growth of several children, stemming from different development.

from experience. They help each other in the conduct of
discipline and support, each other's knowledge and

accurate and understanding their records. Parents' patience seems to deter themachine longer.

The progress is involved in groups and do not give up.

lose interest.

ager that teachers can give the same about the instructional method

and work of the school. These hold only once a month as far as

in the discipline. Meetings held every week are so productive

and a half to not allow time for each member to see their help and to

sessions have been found beneficial. Meetings of these than an hour

and a half to two hours each week for about thirty to sixty

attainments they need for understanding children. Meetings for the

of the background of information, the concept, the eliciting, and the

or s to discover their records in order to build strengths and continue-

is it essential for parents to meet regularly in small

as some teachers seem to want to do.
individuals, and also the teachers. Emphasis needs to be placed upon informality, on taking time to think about each other. Often refreshments are served. Groups arrange themselves, usually in a circle, so they can have a face-to-face relationship with all the participants. Effort should be made to remove all barriers of rank or position. The group leader is a member of the group participating in all the activities. Various members of the group assume leadership during meetings whenever it is appropriate for them to assume this role.

The relaxed way of working, the support each member feels from all the others, is one reason why the holding power of the program is so good.

6) The study groups have two main sources of outside stimulation and help: a) consultants, b) workshops. Both seem essential to the development of a Child Study program.

a) Consultants serve a variety of purposes. They help groups in planning, in carrying the study forward, and in evaluating. They raise morale and build self-confidence in the participants.

It seems important that participants meet with the consultants frequently enough to accomplish the above purposes, but not so frequently that they become dependent on the authority of the consultant. Three or four consultant visits to a group each year seem appropriate. Unless there are trained people in the local system to serve the function of a consultant, one or two meetings a year are not adequate.

Consultants should be persons who have acquired a rich body of scientific knowledge and who know the nature of the problems involved in communicating this scientific knowledge. They should be persons who have been sufficiently trained to be able to size up the situation and
The workshop planned for the students and implemented a variety of activities for the students, aimed at improving their reading skills. They included a variety of reading exercises and activities that were designed to improve the students' reading comprehension and overall reading ability. The workshop also provided opportunities for students to practice and develop their reading skills in a supportive environment.

(1) The workshop experience can be regarded as essential in

(p) Providing extensive in-school education for teachers.

School syllabus and methods where teachers in the local area are involved in planning and executing the curriculum. The teachers-two consultants are needed by teachers, the consultants can

Education in the kind of summer sessions, extension courses, and workshops offered by the consultants.

Note: In keeping them in touch with the teachers of the educational

These types of study groups are of benefit to the consultants.

A consultant's and the work can have a different role. A consultant can provide guidance, counseling, and the help needed to develop their reading abilities. Many students seem to prefer to

Discussions and examinations in a relaxed, comfortable setting. When the time to become acquainted with the group and to help one, the

understanding at the time needed, and when the consultant in this group

sessions are most helpful when the group knows what they want, when they

ask for emphasis on the reading, at the reading, to support understanding. To

and asked their own thinking to the reading.
consultant service to Child Study groups. Both have their special advantages. In the local workshop there is large teacher participation and plans are made to fit their needs and particular problems. It is necessary to the depth of the program that many teachers participate in a two-weeks local workshop. The campus workshop, on the other hand, makes it possible for participants to have contact with representatives of other school systems and teacher training institutions. Campus workshops, however, reach a relatively small percentage of teachers. They are attended mainly by coordinators and leaders of groups. Attendance at a six-weeks Child Study workshop seems imperative for them if they are to be adequately trained.

7) When a program begins to be structured and the accumulated experience of the participants in the past is handed on to those in the present, evaluation of goals, reference to philosophy, evaluation of processes must go on continually, and groups must be free to modify their direction and their practices in the light of the evaluation, lest too much emphasis be placed on technique and a dynamic program become traditional and static.

Factors and processes which were peculiar to particular situations or which were experimental and later found to be unnecessary or undesirable. The similarities in the programs were far greater than any differences, and it shows the degree to which Child Study has become a program having structure and design. However, there were and are some individual developments.

1) The programs sponsored by the State Department of Education in Maryland were unique in that for the first three years they were dependent for leadership and coordination on the county supervisors, who
were the only ones receiving leadership training. Local groups had no contact with consultants from outside. This was found to be unwise. The programs had a tendency to become structured; that is, more attention was being paid to going through procedures than to probing deeply into substance. Learning did take place, however, as objective studies have indicated. The State Department of Education, recognizing the shortcomings, has encouraged the counties to conduct their own programs. Since 1947 about half the counties have obtained consultant service for the study groups.

2) A basic factor in the success of the programs in Maryland was a strong and forward looking State Department of Education. State Departments are in a strategic position for exercising leadership and for providing budgetary appropriations. Experience in Maryland invites the conclusion that in-service education projects are likely to succeed when they are sponsored by an agency such as a well organized State Department that has influence and the respect of groups within the state. In Maryland teachers and administrators already had a pattern of looking to the State Department for guidance and direction in in-service education.

The State Superintendent of Schools did more than authorize a program of Child Study. He held the conviction that it was a vital need of the teachers and consequently stimulated the members of the state office and the county superintendents to take it seriously rather than to regard it as another routine task. He brought it into focus in the minds of these people as something significant.

The work of coordinating a statewide program is demanding and it is advantageous to have at least one person who can devote all or a
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philosophy and purposes of the Child Study program have to be used as consultants there has developed a danger that the program may revert to the very processes it was designed to avoid, and that it may lose sight of the teachings of accumulated experience and repeat some of the errors made in the past. On the other hand, some experiments are going on in relation to helping teachers with implications of Child Study that may significantly increase the effectiveness of the Child Study program.

b) The teacher-training institutions are gradually becoming a kind of service agency. The method of financing the program by having the school system pay a lump sum annually has been a contributing factor to this development. Instead of paying a specific fee for each consultant visit, the base fee makes it possible for the school system to call upon the institution for services it needs when it needs them. Also, in addition to providing consultant services to groups, staff members visiting in school systems are helping in other ways. This movement toward a more functional relationship between the school system and the local teacher training institution seems to be a highly desirable one.

2) Another trend in both Maryland and Texas is the attention being paid to curriculum implications. Again, it is in the workshops that the trend is revealed. One kind of workshop is organised on the basis of interest groups, mainly around subject matter topics. Here the emphasis seems to be on what to teach and what procedures to use. There is no doubt that the outcomes are greatly influenced by the fact that most of the teachers have participated in Child Study.7 The curriculum planned is much more realistic in terms of developing children, though

---

7See pp. 163-164.
there is still a tendency to think of Child Study and curriculum development as two separate processes. The methods used are similar to those which teachers have used before they engaged in a scientific study of a child. They speak of "going back" to curriculum development.

This type of curriculum development seems to be the trend in Maryland in the county workshops and also in the statewide program of language arts sponsored by the State Department of Education.

There are some evidences in Texas of a similar tendency, but due to the efforts of the University of Texas, the trend in curriculum implications appears to be taking another direction. Effort is being exerted to make curriculum development an extension of Child Study, to carry on the two simultaneously and synchronously. Attention is being directed toward utilizing the same scientific processes for studying the curriculum as were used for studying the child. The prospect is that growth in curriculum would be as unhurried, as steady, and as solid as growth in understanding children through the Child Study program seems to be.

Summary. Certain factors have been common in the success of the programs in Texas and Maryland.

1. There was a readiness for Child Study on the part of teachers and administrators because they were already aware of their need to know more about children, and because a need existed for a single, unifying in-service program that would stimulate the growth of all the teachers in the school system.

2. The activities were carried on locally by school systems as part of a continuous program of in-service professional education and a budget was maintained for its purposes.
3. In most places the programs received administrative leadership and strong administrative support.

4. Wherever the local leaders - most especially the coordinator - were well-trained, and democratic as well, the understanding of the teachers reached considerable depth.

5. Participation in the program was entirely voluntary.

6. Colleges and universities cooperated with the school systems and contributed certain necessary supporting experiences to the programs.

7. The definiteness of the program with its carefully planned steps was a factor in its success.

8. Certain factors within the program - that it is based on a synthesis of scientific knowledge about human development, and that teachers are trained to use the scientific method in arriving at valid judgments about children - contributed to its successful development.

9. Programs seemed to have more than the usual vitality wherever a warm mutual valuing of each other and a sense of common purpose permeated the program.

Certain processes common to the programs in both Texas and Maryland seem essential to the development of Child Study.

1. A long-term, well-planned program of direct study of children seems required to realize the objectives of Child Study.

2. Studying a small number of children over a period of a year seems necessary for seeing behavior in enough detail to understand its significance.

3. Keeping a written record of a child appears to promote
necessary skill in scientific method.

4. It seems essential for participants to meet in small groups, usually for about an hour and a half every other week.

5. The processes involved in group study by eight or twelve participants seem to promote maximum learning from analysis and interpretation of records.

6. Stimulation and guidance from both consultants and workshops seem essential to the depth of the program.

7. Continual evaluation and modification seems indispensable.

Certain factors and processes were peculiar to particular situations.

1. The organization in Maryland was unique in that for the first three years only the leaders of groups met with outside consultants for training. This practice was found to be unwise and counties were encouraged to develop their own programs and to secure consultants for the study groups.

2. The fostering of the program by a forward looking State Department of Education undoubtedly influenced its successful development locally.

3. Some areas of Texas are in danger of curtailing consultant services to groups because programs are expanding so rapidly that the training of personnel cannot keep pace with it.

4. In some Texas areas, if a program was organized and sustained by one dynamic school administrator it was likely to be discontinued if that administrator moved to another school district.

Certain trends are recognizably emerging in Texas and Maryland.
It is too soon, however, to know whether they are desirable or undesirable.

1. In Texas there is a tendency to rely almost entirely on personnel in the region for consultant help, with very little help from outside. This seems to be resulting in a changing Child Study program and also in a more functional relationship between the school system and the local teacher-training institution.

2. There is a strong trend toward consideration of curriculum implications. This has taken two different directions. Some experiments deal with curriculum implications as a study to follow the completion of the Child Study program; others are attempting to work out some way of treating Child Study and its curriculum implications as one unit.
CHAPTER IX

CONCLUSION

The problem restated. This investigation has been concerned with discovering how the Child Study program — a program of in-service education of teachers in the understanding of children — originated, what was responsible for its widespread development, what is involved in the development of statewide Child Study programs, and finally, in what ways it is feasible to develop a program in states where it is not now operating.

Findings. Concern over the problems of teacher education led the American Council on Education to create in June, 1935, the Commission on Teacher Education to guide the development of a five-year study leading to the improvement of teacher education. One of the first steps the Commission took was to establish a Division on Child Development and Teacher Personnel, for the evidence was abundant that teachers were interested in children and needed help in understanding them.

The Division on Child Development and Teacher Personnel undertook a two-fold task. 1) It set up a Collaboration Center where it gathered together a mass of research materials from the various sciences dealing with human development and behavior and invited a number of scientists to collaborate in studying these materials, to synthesise them, to develop sets of scientific principles to describe and explain human behavior and to draw out the implications of these materials for teacher education. 2) The Division also began a field program of consultant service to certain centers among the universities and colleges,
school systems, and state systems engaged in the Commission's studies.

In one of these systems, the Parker School District, South Carolina, the teachers grew from a level of limited insight to one of much greater understanding. The successful experience in this school system led the Division on Child Development and Teacher Personnel to continue to improve the procedures and to develop from the Parker School District program a definite program of Child Study that could be followed, with local modifications, by any group of in-service teachers.

The Child Study program that resulted is a three-year program with a series of sequential experiences through which the participants, working together regularly in small study groups, learn at increasingly complex levels how, and from what sources, to gather the necessary data about individual children, how to build objective, comprehensive records of significant information, how to interpret the information in the light of their expanding body of scientific knowledge of human growth and behavior, and how to come to some valid conclusions on which they can act.

Since its inception the Child Study program here described has gradually spread into fifteen states and Washington, D. C. There are probably three major factors responsible for its widespread development. 1) There seemed to be a readiness on the part of administrators and teachers who were already looking for ways of learning more about children. 2) The program itself seemed to have great effectiveness and participants communicated this to others. 3) Individuals, convinced of the worth of the program, strongly influenced its spread.

In two states, Texas and Maryland, the Child Study programs developed on a statewide basis. In Texas, Child Study programs, beginning
in Corpus Christi, soon spread to four Rio Grande Valley communities
and later involved two more. In the meantime some of the staff of the
University of Texas and of other colleges and universities in Texas
became interested, and came to sponsor Child Study programs in more
than twenty-seven school systems.

In Maryland, on the other hand, the Child Study programs were
sponsored by the State Department of Education. The State Department
trained the county supervisors to carry on the programs, and eventu-
ally the counties came to take over the responsibility for conducting
them. Montgomery County and the city of Baltimore established inde-
dependent programs of their own.

A concise and careful analysis of these two statewide programs
was made in Chapter VIII, pointing out the factors and processes that
seem essential to the development of a statewide Child Study program.

Recommendations. On the strength of the analysis in Chapter VIII
these suggestions are offered for consideration in planning and develop-
ing a program in states where it is not now operating.

1. Child Study may be undertaken at any administrative level in
a state — in a single school, on a statewide, county or statewide
basis — wherever there is already a recognition of the need for a
fuller and deeper understanding of children.

2. An essential part of the thinking and planning of those in-
terested in developing a statewide program of Child Study needs to be
directed toward creating a readiness to undertake a study of children
intensively.

3. Participation in Child Study must remain voluntary and self-
motivating. It cannot be successfully imposed by administrative fiat.
10. Teacher training institutes in a stage can give valuable

5. Child study groups require much experience and effective training

4. Special committees should be formed in the theorathory of

3. Development of workshops in which they are needed.

2. The committee should be given to help the teachers to

1. Organize committees and consult with local workshops

by the teachers and local education and training organizations

and resources for scientific information.

Cooperation between the teachers and the new school

who in the work for child study program in a city area. Child study work

enough to staff the cooperatives, and hence for some teachers in each

the cooperative. The most important of the theories have been

the methods. The use of the cooperative method has been given to

be understood and the purposes should be understood. The core

new problems are begun, these educational processes within the

contribution to the success of the problem of the teacher's workplane.

have become well established and which can be drawn to

the children's work has been in extensive and systematic

is the work

in the community in the case of local school

integral part of the community in the case of local school

the responsibility for the in-service education of teachers.

more interested, and necessary field support of administration and others.

Keep effort needs to make to outline the understandin
systems seems highly desirable.

11. The development of a statewide program of Child Study is greatly facilitated when it is made the major responsibility of some one person in the State Department of Education or in one of the teacher training institutions.

12. Child Study is a young, developing, dynamic program. As such it appears to require a) constant and careful evaluation, and b) research of an experimental nature.
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