DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 135 453 PS 008 979

AUTHOR Takanishi, Ruby
TITLE Early Childhood Education in Urban America. Part II: An Overview of Policy Issues.
PUB DATE 11 Oct 76
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the IMTEC/OECD Bicentennial Seminar on Managing Change in Urban Education (Cambridge, Massachusetts, October 11, 1976); For Part I, see PS 008 978

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Child Development Centers; Compensatory Education; Day Care Services; Delivery Systems; *Early Childhood Education; *Educational Change; *Educational Finance; *Educational Objectives; *Educational Policy; Evaluation Methods; Government Role; Parent Education; Performance Based Teacher Education; Program Evaluation; Teacher Education; Teaching Skills; *Urban Education

ABSTRACT

In this paper (Part II of a presentation titled "Early Childhood Education in Urban America") four broad questions are discussed: (1) What are the goals of early childhood education? Continuing dilemmas in compensatory early education are articulated, and the questions of how should resources be allocated and who should benefit are raised. (2) Who is responsible for early childhood education? Discussed are parents and parent education, teachers and professional competencies and government responsibility. (3) How should child development services be delivered? Problems related to the coordination of child care services are discussed, and criteria for an ideal delivery system are identified. The question of the role of public school systems in delivering child care services is raised. (4) How will the issues facing early education affect the goals and roles of American education? It is suggested that one way of answering this question is to examine existing early childhood programs in public school systems. (MS)

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION IN URBAN AMERICA

PART II

AN OVERVIEW OF POLICY ISSUES

Ruby Takanishi

Graduate School of Education

University of California, Los Angeles

Presented at the IMTEC/OECD Bicentennial Seminar on Managing Change in Urban Education, Harvard-Lesley College, October 11, 1976.

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION IN URBAN AMERICA[1]

PART II:

AN OVERVIEW OF POLICY ISSUES

Ruby Takanishi

University of California, Los Angeles

American early childhood education can be currently characterized as being in an uncertain, sober, and reflective mood. We have just been through a decade marked by intense activity, high expectations, and a major expansion and diversification of the field. Individuals from all sectors of the society--especially those from low income groups--and individuals from different disciplines and professions were engaged in problems of educating young children. Our experiences during this period, however, have left us with many more questions and unresolved problems than answers. For seven years (1969-1976) we have attempted to gain public support for a new national program of child development services, and have been notably unsuccessful. In this context, the task of searching for alternative directions for early childhood education remains an absorbing and difficult one. It is easy to describe our present situation as a "period of disillusionment,"[2] but those informed by historical perspectives realize we are back to basic and enduring issues.

The presentation today has two foci: first, I will describe some policy issues in American early childhood education as a means of providing the background for the second focus: the challenges of early childhood education for the goals and functions of American education. By policy issue, I mean consideration of alternative courses of action regarding an area in question. The purpose is a heuristic one. I can only begin to articulate these issues in today's presentation, and hopefully we will be engaged in further, in-depth discussions of these issues during the next month.

Before beginning, I would like to interject some qualifying statements: The United States, as you know, is comprised of 50 individual states, each with its own history and identity. Yet the issues described here are sketched in broad strokes. Different states within the United States may have similar issues facing them. However, the dynamics of policy making, the participants, and the programs which are implemented vary from state to state.[3] Thus the issues presented here take on different "faces" depending upon the state, if not local, situation.

An additional qualification is that the policy issues are presented within the context of the IMTEC/OECD Bicentennial Seminar theme: Managing Change in Urban Education. While this strategy is not the only one which should be used in a discussion of policy issues in early education,

it is helpful in delimiting the subject to a manageable level, and in focusing on early childhood education as it relates to the challenges of educational change.

POLICY ISSUES IN AMERICAN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

Debates surrounding early childhood education take place in the context of policy issues facing the early education and socialization of young children within American society. These issues include questions regarding the goals of early education, the individuals and institutions which will be responsible for early education, and how needed services can be delivered. Questions regarding the evaluation of programs and the role of research in the policy-making process underlie all of our discussions of early childhood programs in the post-Headstart era and will not be dealt with separately in this discussion.

A. GOALS OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

In the overview paper (Part I), the goals and purposes of early childhood education were described (I.C.1, pp. 9-11). As can be seen from that description, there is a multiplicity of goals centering on children, the needs of their parents, and societal priorities. As a result of our recent experiences with the compensatory early education programs of the '60s, new questions regarding goals have emerged.

1. Who shall be served? The question of goals is integrally related to the issue of which groups of children should be served by governmental or publically supported programs. This question assumes that resources for early education will always be limited. Hence, we must identify children who are "most needy," and target the programs towards them.

Prior to the '60s, it appears that there was no question that public programs would be exclusively for the "needy" or children from poverty groups. However, as a result of our experiences during that period, we learned that programs for special groups of children were politically vulnerable. We also realized that we created programs for young children which, for the most part, were socioeconomically, if not ethnically, segregated. And the evaluations indicated they did not have their intended outcome, i.e., equalizing educational opportunity for low-income children.

In the '70s, we struggle with the issue of widening the spectrum of income-eligible children and families who will be served by publically supported programs. There are still arguments to restrict programs to children of the most needy. On the other hand, there are forces to

include children of what is called "the working poor" or moderate income families. [4]

A solution frequently offered is that early childhood programs should be universally available for families based "on their ability to pay." Poverty and low-income families would be totally subsidized, while others above the poverty line would pay according to a sliding fee schedule. However, the historical association of governmentally supported programs with children of the poor has proved to be a powerful one, and very difficult to eradicate. There is also the fear that universally available programs will undermine the role of the family in child rearing. In summary, the dilemma we face is two systems of early childhood education in America--publically supported programs with comprehensive services for children from poverty and low-income backgrounds and a private, sometimes patchwork system of nursery schools and family-arranged systems for children of those families above the poverty line. It is not an adequate nor satisfactory system.

2. What functions should early childhood education serve? The historical perspectives which were presented in the overview paper (I.B., pp. 4-8) indicated that much more than the child's needs are addressed in programs of early education. From one perspective, early education could be viewed as a panacea for curing the ills of our country--equalizing educational opportunity, ameliorating poverty, providing the basis for educational reform, putting people to work and off public assistance, and providing health and nutritional programs for children who cannot receive them in other ways. Thus a point of view has emerged that early education programs have been used as substitute strategies for larger and needed structural reforms.

Thus, we face questions regarding the functions of early childhood education in American society. Is it necessary for programs to be based in the promises that future problems--low achievement of minority group children, poverty, crime, juvenile delinquency, welfare--will be lessened? Or can early childhood programs be based--as they are in some European countries--on the rationale that such programs are needed, desirable, and foster the development of the child "for now?"

Even if we were to agree that programs were desirable to support children's development, there is still the question: "What kind of program in terms of CONTENT and METHODOLOGY?" The history of American education in general can be viewed as attempts to develop programs to create desirable future citizens. The existence of many models of early education in our country is perhaps the best indicator of our uncertainty regarding the creation of "desirable American individuals." The fact that there is no consensus on the kind of society we are raising children for creates dilemmas which govern our considerations of what our programs should teach and how children should be taught.

3. Can we provide care without education? Policy makers and legislators often make a distinction between CARE and EDUCATION in considering goals for programs serving young children. The distinction

is based in an attempt to find less costly ways of providing programs, especially in the context of the assumed "failure" of the compensatory of early education programs. For example, national Title XX regulations for child care make "educational services" an optional component to be included at the individual state's discretion. While the care-education distinction may be a false one to those who understand that care--good or bad, custodial or developmental--has learning and hence educational consequences, it is nonetheless being raised, and in many situations, implemented as policy.

Related to the care versus education issue is the question of the necessity for comprehensive child development services. The concept originated with the compensatory early education programs. Education is seen as important but not sufficient. Low income children need a comprehensive service system, including nutritional programs to compensate for inadequate diets, dental and medical services to which they often do not have access, social services to support families in times of crises, and parent education and training programs to develop parent's knowledge about child development. These services add to the cost of programs, and since there is no systematic or "hard" evidence that they significantly affect children's development in measurable ways, there are questions regarding their continuing inclusion in governmentally supported programs.

Thus, controversies regarding the different models of early education--many which were based on psychological theories of development--seems to have waned. We are back to basic issues:

-- WHO SHALL BE SERVED IN PROGRAMS OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION?

-- WHAT FUNCTIONS SHOULD EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PLAY IN AMERICAN SOCIETY?

-- WHAT CONSTITUTES "QUALITY" PROGRAMS FOR YOUNG CHILDREN? WITHIN THE SEARCH FOR DEFINING "QUALITY," HOW DOES ONE SPECIFY EDUCATIONAL SERVICES?

B. WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION?

Very much related to the question of goals are the individuals and institutions who will be responsible for early childhood education. Involved are issues of parental roles and responsibility in the child-rearing process and of the qualifications and training of those who care for children outside the family setting. A broader social issue is the role of the government at the federal and state levels to provide programs for young children. Each will be discussed briefly.

1. The role of the family. A number of factors have thrust the focus of early childhood education back on the family unit. During the '60s, compensatory early education was delivered through two categories of programs--center-based, serving groups of children and home-based,

including family intervention programs. As the evaluation data came in, there was a trend--not firmly supported--that family intervention programs appeared to have beneficial outcomes, especially in maintaining IQ gains, diffusion to younger siblings, and possible motivational efforts on low-income parents. The evaluations of center programs, however, indicated mixed findings depending upon the program structure and content.[5] Although the evaluations were narrowly conceived given the multiple aims of the programs, a public attitude developed that "the programs do not work." About this time, there was increasing concern about the decline of "the American family" which was documented in the overview paper (Part I).

It is significant, then, that a 1975 U.S. Office of Education conference was called Parent/Early Childhood Education, an indicator that a major thrust of early childhood education in the '70s will be in the area of parent education, and training, and a movement to balance the past expansion of center-based programs with home-based ones (family day care, parent training networks linked with centers). This movement is highly consistent with the ideology that parents should have the primary responsibility for their children until they enter compulsory level schooling. However, it does not seriously consider the steadily rising increase of female participation in the labor force, including women with preschool children. Since parent training and education programs deal almost exclusively with mothers, questions are legitimately raised regarding how and when parent training programs can take place and how programs can be developed to take into consideration changing and diversified family structures in America.

Another concern is the increasing "professionalization" of parenting. As more knowledge in parenting is generated by researchers, there is a tendency to view parenting as something which experts know best. A number of factors have led to the increased need for knowledge about child development among young parents. First, with the decline in family size, many individuals have grown up without much knowledge about young children. With housing patterns (e.g., in many cities, children are not welcome or not allowed to certain apartment or condominium complexes), there is age segregation so that individuals who do not have children are not in contact with children on a daily basis. There is no dispute about the <u>need</u> for information but about what kinds of information are transmitted to parents and by whom. Questions are being raised about the kinds of values, assumptions, and practices which are being promulgated to parents by many individuals through the media and educational programs.

In summary, programs of parent training and involvement assume that parents want and should be "educational" agents in their children's lives. This very strongly held assumption has blocked us from asking the question of what <u>parents</u>--given the diversity of the group--want or prefer to be their <u>role(s)</u> within the context of early childhood programs.

A little historical background might help put this issue into perspective. The desirable intensity of the mother-child bond is of

recent historical vintage. In this century, analysis of the American bibles of child rearing--Spock's Baby and Child Care and U. S. Children's Bureau's Infant Care--have steadily intensified the role and responsibility of the mother in the upbringing of her children. At the same time, institutional and community support for her responsibilities have eroded.

Thus, there is a critical need to re-examine and redefine the role of parent involvement in early childhood education in the context of changing American family structures, changing role of women, questions regarding the value of children, ideas about responsibility for the child-rearing process, and re-conceptualizations of the family as educator. Implementation of parent involvement programs will not reverse these trends. The problem is how we can design programs to match changing needs.

Reforms in American education tend to focus on a single aspect instead of a comprehensive analysis of a problem. In the '60s we focused on curricula for early education and in the '70s on parents of children. We must ask ourselves whether in doing this we avoid enduring issues or whether we can conceptualize parent involvement in the context of broader social reform that affect their lives as people with their own interests, needs, and status, rather than only as socializing agents in their children's lives. By focusing on parents we only intensify on an already overintensified role; we must begin to think in terms of systems which support parents both as adults and people as well as parents of children.

2. Staff training and competencies. As nonfamilial individuals have entered into the early socialization of children, questions have been raised regarding their training and competencies. In Part I (Section C.5.), a national overview of staff preparation and certification was presented. Despite the availability of postsecondary education programs in child development, requirements for teaching in childhood education programs below the primary level are frequently minimal. This situation is partially due to low salaries which early education teachers have traditionally received.

The decline in student enrollment and the surplus of certificated teachers are contributing factors in educational groups' support of delivering child development services through the public school system. Already in some school systems, certificated elementary school teachers are replacing child development staff in programs serving preschool children. There is great concern among individuals in the early education ranks--who have not been part of the public school system in large numbers--that elementary and secondary education training does not necessarily prepare individuals for working with children below the compulsory schooling level.

Thus the question is what characteristics do qualify an individual to work with young children? The competency-based movement in early education has led to a virtual proliferation of competencies in an attempt to provide answers to this question. While some clarification of competencies may contribute to a better understanding of desirable

characteristics for individuals who work with children, the outlook is ambiguous. Many more years of research on teaching at the elementary and secondary school levels has not resulted in the identification of discrete, measurable behaviors or competencies which can be linked to desired outcomes in students.[8] In the meantime, school systems will have to deal with--research evidence not immediately forthcoming--with setting qualifications and identifying competencies for teachers in early childhoud education programs within the district. Teacher unions and education associations will play an influential role in setting these standards.

At the same time that we are stuggling with a clearer articulation of staff competencies, there is another set of forces which promises to have significant impact on early educators as a group. The beginning unionization of child care staff as the preschool level is very likely to change the character of a staff force which has not traditionally been characterized by self-interest, but high values on the uniqueness of each child, sensitivity to emotional and social development, and the concept of "sharing" the child's development along with parents.[9]

It is unclear at present just what impact unionization will have on early education. According to sociological theory, criteria of a profession include professional knowledge and the performance of a specific function, both of which are unique to the group. The professional provides services on the basis of her expertise and according to protective standards developed within the group. The early educator, however, has traditionally seen her priorities in the nees of individual children and their families rather than to her professional group. Millie Almy, in writing about the role of early educators, notes that the nursery school teacher has resisted the exclusivity inherent in the notion of professionalism.[10]

Unionization, on the other hand, appears to create categories of staff, e.g., "management and workers." It has, in the past, tended to focus on renumeration and benefits, including working conditions for its members. In general, unions protect the interests of their members, not necessarily the interests of the people the members serve. Both these aspects tend to be in direct opposition to the goals of early childhood education as it has traditionally operated.

In summary, some of the major issues immediately before us include:

-- WHOM SHOULD BE INVOLVED IN THE EDUCATION AND CARE OF CHILDREN?

-- WHAT SHOULD BE THEIR CHARACTERISTICS AND COMPETENCIES?

-- HOW SHOULD THESE INDIVIDUALS BE TRAINED?

There is the beginnings of a major struggle between organized teacher unions and educational associations in the early childhood field. What could conceivably occur is the gradual demise of early childhood education as an area of education marked by diversity in individuals, delivery systems, programs, professions, and disciplines--and its incorporation into the public school system.

3. Governmental responsibility. There is increased pressure for an expanded federal role in early childhood education. However, the nature of this federal role is the subject of debate.[11] There are those who argue for direct funding and expansion of existing programs, while others argue for noninstitutional alternatives--including reforming tax structure so that child care costs are deductible, a guaranteed family income, direct subsidies to low-income individuals to purchase services of their own choosing, and expansion of "noninstitutional" forms of child care--family day care, family intervention and training programs. While the debates tend to be cast in "either-or" terms, it is clear that the implementation of either course of action will be ineffective without the other.

Another issue is whether child development services should be delivered through federal or state governments as the primary delivery system. An argument for the development of state capacities is that they are more likely to develop programs that are responsive to the individual state's needs and priorities. Since states vary in the provision of early education programs, as well as in their capacity to deliver programs, the argument is made that each state should be allowed to develop its own programs. State control, however, has also typically meant that minority and low-income groups may be excluded or not equitably treated.

C. HOW SHOULD CHILD DEVELOPMENT SERVICES BE DELIVERED?

The delivery of child development services is one of the most important issues facing early education today and includes the role which public school systems could play. In the distributed paper (Part I) an overview of delivery systems of childhood programs was presented. Issues of coordination remain the most troublesome at all levels. The federal War on Poverty spawned an organizational chaos in early education programs from which we are still attempting to recover. One suggestion has been that state and federal levels of government become coordinating agencies for early education. While this is very much needed, there is a real turfdom or territoriality problem--which is descriptive of competing agencies and professional groups regarding areas of operation which have been historically and/or established by the nature of categorically funded programs. It is a difficult matter to get these individuals to work together, giving up the autonomy and professional expertise and domains to which they have become accustomed. Yet the ideal remains comprehensive child development services, which rests on a nonexistent, coordinated delivery system (See the overview paper, I.C.2). Services for children remain a nightmare of fragmentation, overlaps, and gaps. In the end, it is not what the needs of children are, but what the present balance of power is among the various agencies and groups involved that forms the delivery system.

1. Characteristics of a desirable delivery system. The American system of public education is based on local control and autonomy.

There is a high value placed on programs which are based on the assessment of community needs, and which are designed to meet these needs at the local level. In considering delivery systems, it is necessary to identify some criteria which such systems should meet.

At the 1975 U.S. Office of Education conference on Parent/Early Childhood Education, the following criteria for a delivery system were identified:[12]

1. Flexibility
2. Lack of constraint by law, by history, or by attitudes
3. Capacity to hire people with differing backgrounds
4. Capacity to conduct programs in different kinds of facilities
5. Capacity to operate during hours which are appropriate to families and children who need services
6. Capacity to work with parents and children together or with each separately as needed
7. Capacity for engendering enthusiasm and commitment among staff and clients
8. Capacity for securing community involvement and support
9. Capacity for providing alternative solutions for a wide variety of identified needs and permitting community and parent choice of options
10. Capacity for involving parents directly in the decision-making relative to planning and implementation of programs
11. Capacity for meeting multiple social and economic needs when appropriate, e.g., providing employment for trained and trainable people and using under-utilized facilities
12. Capacity for being imaginative, creative, and innovative
13. Capacity for clear definition of purposes, objectives, and procedures
14. Capacity for drawing upon the resources of several agencies when appropriate
15. Capacity for involving the private sector in planning and implementation
16. Capacity for involving women and minorities as practitioners, professionals, and program administrators

17. Capacity for self-renewal and adaptability to respond to changing needs

18. Accountability

19. Capacity for involving and drawing upon the resources of all levels of government

20. Capacity for a comprehensive range of services to be delivered as individuals require them, e.g., nutrition; health care; recreation; psychological and social services; education in cognitive, psychomotor, and affective areas

21. Capacity for maximum utilization of media and materials for both programming and dissemination purposes

22. Capacity for making services available to all parents of all young children

What we have heard is an almost impossible grab-bag of virtues for early childhood education programs, which they were to achieve all of them would suffer from a massive coordination problem within the program itself! Less facetiously, these criteria indicate that early childhood education programs seem to be the focus of multiple goals and demands, some of which may not necessarily be supportive of each other. Any delivery system which will be actually implemented will be a compromise or a balancing of these criteria in response to community conditions, and the skills of local administrators.

2. The role of public school systems. In the time remaining, I will briefly outline questions regarding the role of public school systems in the delivery of child development services. A major policy and political struggle is centering on the role of public school systems in the delivery of child development services. For reasons already presented, major educational associations have publically supported an expanded school[13] system role and constitute a formidable, organized lobby.

Arguments for and against the primary sponsorship role for the public schools will be briefly summarized. A primary thrust of the argument for a prime sponsorship role for public schools is that placement in one institution would eliminate the fragmentation of effort and duplication of services which now characterizes a system based on diversity of sponsoring agencies. Since schools are universally available in all parts of the country with existing facilities and administrative structures, they are the natural basis for growth toward a universally available system. Based on the assumption that a major goal of preschool education would be the stimulation of cognitive development, the existing school system would be a better place in terms of trained personnel than existing nursery schools for such stimulation to take place.

Proponents also argue that if preschool programs were administered

through the public schools, there would be a better chance of coordinating and providing continuity between preschool and primary level programs, which according to the longitudinal evaluations of early intervention programs, is seen as highly desirable.[14] Finally, the school system is capable of providing comprehensive child development services by functioning as community centers.

There are, on the other hand, serious challenges to the proposed role of public schools. Briefly, the arguments include the claim that schools have not yet met the needs of children legally under their jurisdiction--handicapped, poor, and those with behavior problems. Under these circumstances, it does not seem wise to expand their responsibilities. There is also a question as to whether schools have the flexibility and sensitivity to implement a comprehensive child development program which is responsive to family and community needs, especially in ethnic and low income communities. Public school systems are not flexible enough to implement a needed diversified system of child development programs--ranging from family day care homes, parent training, center-based and work-based programs, and hours to accommodate night, holiday, and part-time working hours. It is likely that schools will focus on education in a narrow sense--academic preparation, readiness, and cognitive development.

Finally, opponents argue that public school systems have not historically been involved in the struggle to develop and house child development programs in the past. Although the needs have been present, schools have not been responsive.

SOME QUESTIONS FOR AMERICAN EDUCATION

How will the issues facing early education affect the goals and roles of American education? One way of answering this question is to examine existing early childhood education programs in public schools systems where they have come to be known as reforms in primary education through individualized programs, parent involvement, and less structured classrooms. Thus, some selected aspects of early education have been incorporated into existing elementary education.

The historical record indicates this is essentially what occurred when kindergartens became part of the public school system. Many distinguishing features of the kindergarten--regular parent visitation programs, provision of social welfare services, a conceptualization of the teacher's role to support the family unit--were lost as teachers became more concerned with justifying their place in the schools.[15] The kindergartens evolved into a downward extension of the elementary school. Thus it appears likely that should early childhood education become part of the public schools, their programs will become "elementarized" rather than affecting changes in elementary education itself.

In summary I would like to leave you with some questions regarding early education in the context of American education.

1. What should be the goals of early education programs in public schools?

   a. What should be taught? What are some alternatives to the downward extension of elementary education?

   b. How should children be educated in these programs?

2. What should be the articulation between early education programs below the compulsory schooling level and the elementary school? There is no good reason to assume that because early education programs are administered by school districts and/or housed in school facilities that articulation is achieved.

3. Can schools become centers where a wide range of child development and family support services can be delivered? Or will education continue to be defined as that which largely occurs in classrooms with professionally trained teachers for certain hours of the day focusing on skill areas?

4. Who should be involved in early childhood education programs in schools? The field of early education has rested upon the contributions of many disciplines, professional and paraprofessional groups. What will be the role they will play in early education programs in public schools?

Early childhood education has functioned apart from the school system--and in this way has remained relatively untouched by afflictions of existing public schools--bureaucratization, professionalism, and specialization. But it has also remained a sector relatively unchanged even by events in the last decade.[16] It too has strongly held beliefs regarding children and their development, but there is a sense that there will be a change--change in which early education's encounter with the public school will very well change the face of early education in America.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Policy and educational change in early childhood education will re . on a society's images of childhood and of the early socialization process.[17] While research and evaluation may inform policy and provide data on its effects on children's lives, decisions regarding childhood education evolve out of complex political processes. The study of policy formation processes and program planning and implementation within early education remains a largely unexplored, yet most critical

area for inquiry, both within our country and from cross-national perspectives. I hope we will begin to build the foundations for this inquiry during the next month.

RT:14

FOOTNOTES

1 I am grateful to the following individuals who provided me with critical feedback regarding this presentation: Norma Deitch Feshbach, Laurie Garduque, Maryalice Jordan-Marsh, Louis L. Knowles, Louise L. Tyler, and Docia Zavitkovsky.

2 I. Sigel. Where is preschool education going or are we en route without a road map? Assessment in a pluralistic society. Proceedings of the 1972 Invitational Conference on Testing Problems. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1973, pp. 99-116.

3 See A. Hugh Livingston, Management and Governance of Urban School Systems, Part II, IMTEC/OECD Bicentennial Seminar, October 1976: "To speak of the American educational system is to try to describe what seems to be the most prevalent activity at a given time. To generalize about common practice within a single state is hazardous. To generalize about educational practice among 50 states is sheer folly" (p. 1).

4 Family income within the "moderate-income" range varies from state to state. The national "poverty line" is defined as an annual income of approximately $5,500 for an urban family of four people. Families above the poverty line and below the median family income of the state (e.g., approximately $15,000 in California) are considered in the moderate income category.

5 Louise B. Miller and Jean L. Dryer. Four Preschool Programs. Their Dimensions and Effects. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 1975, 40 (7-8).

6 Nancy Pottishman Weiss, The Dyad Revisited: Mothers and Children in the 20th Century, unpublished paper.

7 Typically, it costs less to hire individuals without postsecondary education degrees to staff centers which are financed from limited budgets.

8 Competency-based teacher education (CBTE) lacks a research base. For a critique of CBTE, see Hazel Whitman Hertzerg. Competence-based Teacher Education: Does It Have a Past or a Future? Teachers College Record, 1976, 78, 1-21.

9 Lillian G. Katz. Sentimentality in Preschool Teachers: Some Possible Interpretations. Peabody Journal of Education, 1971, 48, 96-105.

10 Millie Almy, The Early Educator at Work, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975, 29-32. One of the major organizations of early education, the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), opens its membership to individuals who "serve and act on the behalf of young

children with a primary focus on the provision of educational services and resources." Thus NAEYC is composed of professors, researchers, teachers, aides, parents, and others, including child-related professionals who are not early educators. Consistent with this nonexclusive orientation, NAEYC has been a staunch supporter of the Child Development Associate (CDA) Program, in which individuals, often without formal academic training, are able to be "certified" as a result of demonstrating competency on the job.

[11]See volumes 1-9 of the Joint Hearings before the Subcommitte on Children and Youths and the Subcommittee on Employment, Poverty, and Migratory Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, and the Subcommittee on Select Education, House of Representatives, Ninety-fourth Congress, First Session on S. 62C and H.R. 2966. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976.

[12]U.S. Office of Education, National Conference on Parent/Early Childhood Education. Denver: U.S. Office of Education, 1975, 22-23.

[13]In January 1976, eight major educational associations representing teachers, administrators, school board members, and parents issued a joint statement urging that public schools be given a primary role in federally-funded programs of child development. The organizations included American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, American Association of School Administrators, American Federation of Teachers, Council of Chief State School Officers, National Association of State Boards of Education, National Congress of Parents and Teachers, National Education Association, National School Boards Association.

[14]U. Bronfenbrenner. Is Early Intervention Effective? Washington D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1974.

[15]W. Norton Grubb and M. Lazerson. Public School Control of Child Care: Lessons from the California Children's Centers. Unpublished paper, 1975.

[16]John I. Goodlad, M. Frances Klein, J. M. Novotney, and associates. Early Schooling in the United States. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973, Chapter 6.

[17]Lilian G. Katz. Early Childhood Programs and Ideological Disputes. The Educational Forum, 1975, 267-271.

RT:14