

“This book thoughtfully and thoroughly encapsulates the remarkable history of early childhood research during the past 50 years, with special attention to the prominent contributions by researchers at the Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute.”

—Don Bailey, Ph.D., RTI International; FPG Institute Director, 1992–2006

Celebrating 50 Years of Child Development Research

*Past, Present, and
Future Perspectives*

Barbara Hanna Wasik

Samuel L. Odom

Foreword by James B. Hunt, Jr.



FRANK PORTER GRAHAM
CHILD DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE

BROOKES

FOR MORE, go to <http://www.bit.ly/FPG-50>

Celebrating 50 Years of Child Development Research

Past, Present, and Future Perspectives

edited by

Barbara Hanna Wasik, Ph.D.

William R. Kenan Distinguished Professor Emerita
Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

and

Samuel L. Odom, Ph.D.

Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

with invited contributors

· P A U L · H ·
BROOKES
PUBLISHING CO.®

Baltimore • London • Sydney

FOR MORE, go to <http://www.bit.ly/FPG-50>



Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Post Office Box 10624

Baltimore, Maryland 21285-0624

USA

www.brookespublishing.com

Copyright © 2019 by Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co., Inc

All rights reserved.

"Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co." is a registered trademark of Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co., Inc.



FRANK PORTER GRAHAM
CHILD DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE

Typeset by BMWW, Windsor Mill, Maryland.

Manufactured in the United States of America by

Sheridan Books, Chelsea, Michigan.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Wasik, Barbara Hanna, editor. | Odom, Samuel L., editor.

Title: Celebrating 50 years of child development research : past, present, and future perspectives / edited by Barbara Hanna Wasik and Samuel L. Odom; with invited contributors.

Other titles: Celebrating fifty years of child development research

Description: Baltimore : Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co., 2019. | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2018046631 (print) | LCCN 2018061134 (ebook) | ISBN 9781681252773 (epub) | ISBN 9781681252780 (pdf) | ISBN 9781681252766 (paperback)

Subjects: LCSH: Child development—History. | Child development—Research. | BISAC: EDUCATION / Preschool & Kindergarten. | EDUCATION / Special Education / General. | PSYCHOLOGY / Developmental / Child.

Classification: LCC HQ767.9 (ebook) | LCC HQ767.9 .C3924 2019 (print) | DDC 305.231—dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2018046631>

British Library Cataloguing in Publication data are available from the British Library.

2023 2022 2021 2020 2019

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Contents

About the Editors	vii
About the Contributors	ix
Foreword <i>Hon. James B. Hunt, Jr.</i>	xv
Preface	xvii
Dedication	xix
I Historical Overview and Contemporary Issues	1
1 Children and Families: Historical Trends in American Beliefs, Policies, and Practices	3
<i>Barbara Hanna Wasik and Donna M. Bryant</i>	
2 Early Childhood Research in a Globalized Society: Accounting for Demographic Shifts and Changes	27
<i>Iheoma U. Iruka</i>	
II THEME A: Race, Ethnicity, Linguistic, Cultural, and Socioeconomic Diversity	49
3 African American Boys in Early Childhood: Facing the Challenge of Diversity	53
<i>Oscar A. Barbarin</i>	
4 Linguistic and Cultural Diversity: Knowledge Utilization in Early Care and Education	75
<i>Linda M. Espinosa and Marlene Zepeda</i>	
5 Programs, Practices, and Policies Affecting Diverse Children and Families	93
<i>Barbara Bowman</i>	
6 Reflections on Racial, Ethnic, Linguistic, Cultural, and Socioeconomic Diversity	115
<i>Natasha J. Cabrera, Nicole Gardner-Neblett, and Iheoma U. Iruka</i>	
III THEME B: Early Care and Education	137
7 The Abecedarian Approach to Full Development in Early Childhood	141
<i>Craig T. Ramey</i>	

8	A Long and Winding Road: Using Knowledge to Inform and Improve Early Care and Education	163
	<i>Marilou Hyson</i>	
9	Stuck in Place: A Brief History of Early Childhood Education: Policy and Prospects for Expansion	185
	<i>Ron Haskins</i>	
10	From Research to Effective Policy and Practice in Early Care and Education: Lessons from Frank Porter Graham’s 50 Years of Research	209
	<i>W. S. Barnett</i>	
IV	THEME C: Children With Disabilities and Their Families	231
11	Fifty Years of Research on Children With Disabilities and Their Families: From Changing Behaviors to Transforming Lives	235
	<i>Judith Carta and Patricia Snyder</i>	
12	The Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education Workforce: Professional Development Issues and Future Directions	255
	<i>Pamela J. Winton</i>	
13	Disability Law and Policy: Core Concepts and the Ethical Principles of Family, Dignity, and Community	277
	<i>Rud Turnbull</i>	
14	Looking Forward: Research and Practice in Programs for Children and Youth With Disabilities and Their Families	301
	<i>Samuel L. Odom</i>	
V	Fifty Years of Progress and Future Directions	317
15	Fifty Years of Progress and Future Directions	319
	<i>Barbara Hanna Wasik and Mary Ruth B. Coleman</i>	
	Index	339

About the Editors

Barbara Hanna Wasik, Ph.D., Fellow, Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute, and Professor Emerita, School of Education, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Campus Box 8185, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-8185.

Barbara Hanna Wasik, Ph.D., William R. Kenan Distinguished Professor Emerita, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, is a clinical/school psychologist who has devoted her career to the study of children with social/emotional difficulties and language/literacy difficulties, as well as their families. A Ph.D. graduate of Florida State University in psychology, she completed a postdoctoral fellowship at Duke University. She then joined the faculty at the University of North Carolina (UNC), where she held a professorship in the School of Education as well as a research position with the Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute (FPG). She taught master's and doctoral students in the School Psychology Program and held administrative positions in the UNC Graduate School, the School of Education, and FPG. She was one of the directors of Project CARE, a randomized study of child care and home visiting and served as an investigator on the longitudinal outcomes of both Project CARE and the Abecedarian Project. She was co-director for curriculum in the national study for low birth weight infants, the Infant Health and Development Program. Bringing together her interests in children and families, she is the developer of a comprehensive preschool and home intervention for preschool children and their families.

She served as President of the North Carolina Psychological Association, a member of the APA Council of Representatives, Chair of the APA Board of Educational Affairs, and Chair of the APA Committee on Early Childhood Education. She was one of the three co-chairs of the National Forum on Home Visiting and has served on numerous national boards. She was an invited participant to the White House Conference on Child Care and served as a member of the Committee on Early Childhood Pedagogy of the National Academy of Sciences that produced the study *Eager to Learn—Educating Our Preschoolers*. Her professional interests include the observational study of children, social and emotional behaviors, problem solving, parenting, language and literacy, and home visiting. The author of over 100 publications and five books, she continues her professional involvement as a fellow of the FPG Institute.

Samuel L. Odom, Ph.D., Senior Research Scientist, Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute, and Research Professor, School of Education, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Campus Box 8040, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-8040.

Samuel L. Odom, Ph.D., is the former Director of the Frank Porter Graham (FPG) Child Development Institute, where he remains as a Senior Research Scientist. Prior to his work at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Dr. Odom served in faculty positions at Indiana University and Peabody College/Vanderbilt University. Dr. Odom received a master's degree in special education in 1976 and an educational specialist degree in educational psychology from the University of Tennessee at Knoxville in 1979. He earned his doctorate in 1982 in education and human development from the University of Washington.

Throughout his career, Dr. Odom has held positions as a preschool teacher, student teaching supervisor, program coordinator, teacher educator, and researcher. Dr. Odom's research interests include interventions and teaching approaches that promote social competence of young children, effective intervention approaches for children with autism, and early childhood curricula that promote children's school success. He is the author or co-author of over 175 journal articles and book chapters and has edited 10 books on early childhood intervention and developmental disabilities. His current research is addressing treatment efficacy for children and youth with autism spectrum disorders in elementary and high school grades. Also, he is the co-director of the National Clearinghouse on Autism Evidence and Practice at FPG. Dr. Odom is an associate editor for *Exceptional Children* and is on the editorial board of the *Journal of Early Intervention*, *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disabilities*, and *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*.

Dr. Odom received the Special Education Outstanding Research Award from the American Educational Research Association Special Education Special Interest Group in 1999, the Merle Karnes Contribution to the Field Award from the Division for Early Childhood of the Council for Exceptional Children in 2001, and the Outstanding Special Education Research Award from CEC in 2007. In 2013, he received the Arnold Lucius Gesell Prize awarded for career achievement in research on social inclusion and child development from the Theodor Hellbrugge Foundation in Munich, Germany. In 2016, he received an honorary doctoral degree from Stockholm University. He is currently a visiting professor at Stockholm University and San Diego State University.

1

Children and Families

Historical Trends in American Beliefs, Policies, and Practices

Barbara Hanna Wasik and Donna M. Bryant

The 1960s heralded a dramatic expansion of interest in the education and development of young children and their families—from the work of politicians, educators, and researchers to the implementation of significant research projects and the passage of unprecedented legislation regarding children and families. Within these social and cultural events, the authorization for 12 mental retardation centers (in the language of the time; now called Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities Research Centers) was signed into law by President John F. Kennedy in 1963. Designed to advance practice and policy through research, these centers unfolded in multiple ways influenced by the goals of researchers and practitioners at their local university or organization, as well as by national priorities. Several of these centers have been at the vanguard of advances in practice, policy, and professional development for the past 50 years, including the Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute (FPG Institute) at The University of North Carolina. The celebration of the 50th anniversary of the FPG Institute became the impetus for this book, which was designed to provide an intensive review of the research, practice, and policy regarding children and their families over the past 50 years, as well as to present recommendations that challenge the field to be both thoughtful and bold in charting the next 50 years.

The FPG birth story began with the vision of several psychologists, educators, and pediatricians in Chapel Hill, North Carolina—all of whom were affiliated with the University of North Carolina. These visionaries were concerned with both the adverse consequences of poverty on the development of young children and the potential positive impact of early childhood care

and education to improve their educational trajectory and life outcomes (Shaw, 2016). Notable among these leaders were Harold (Hal) and Nancy Robinson, who became the first directors of the FPG Institute at its initiation in 1966. Through a serendipitous meeting on an airplane between Hal Robinson and U.S. Senator Frank Porter Graham (a former president of the university), Robinson learned of Graham's deep commitment to education and subsequently proposed that the university's new child development institute be named for Graham. Fifty years later, the FPG community gathered with many invited speakers in an academic symposium to address the domains that have been central to FPG since its inception—namely poverty, disabilities, and diversity (race, ethnicity, language, and culture). Within each of these themes, three topics—research, professional practice, and policy—were addressed during the symposium and now in this volume.

OVERVIEW

Almost three decades ago, Shonkoff and Meisels (1990, p. 3) described the fundamental purpose of early childhood intervention as the need “to merge the knowledge and insights of scholars and practitioners with the creative talents of those who design and implement social policy initiatives, and to invest the products of such an alliance in the future of our children.” Their cogent description remains highly pertinent to the central focus of this book—namely, to examine the knowledge base, practice issues, and policies in early childhood education. The authors in this volume examine these foci within the following content areas: 1) race, ethnicity, linguistic, cultural, and socioeconomic diversity; 2) early care and education primarily focused on children from low-income families; and 3) research and services for children with disabilities. The order of these topics recognizes different levels of influence, beginning with more macro-level influences in society (e.g., discrimination, segregation), followed by events in the child's more immediate environment (including home and child care), and ending with a focus on specific child characteristics (namely, children with disabilities). These three areas are not distinct areas of policy, research, and practice; rather, they have been intertwined throughout FPG's history, especially during periods when individuals with low socioeconomic status, individuals with disabilities, and individuals who were simply different from the majority culture were often grouped together by society. These areas form the basis of this book's organization across chapters and sections. Collectively, we hope they provide the reader with a thoughtful and provocative picture of the history of and advances in early childhood interventions.

In this first chapter, we examine the historical developments that have broadly influenced advances in early childhood education. Many recent developments had long roots in America and, even before that, in Europe, where beliefs about children's development arose from disparate philosophies. Our historical perspective begins in Colonial America by noting early

ideas about children and families, then moves through the centuries to the present; along the way, we identify many salient beliefs, educational and economic events, cultural changes, and legislative accomplishments. This overview lays the foundation for consideration of the research, practice, and policy affecting children and families for the past 50 years, while also prompting consideration of issues that need to be considered in the future. Chapter 2 by Iheoma Iruka further addresses contemporary social, cultural, and educational phenomena.

THE EARLY YEARS: COLONIAL AMERICA, 1600–1750

From the time of the earliest American settlers, the family was recognized as having authority and responsibility for child rearing. Many child-rearing practices that originated in religious beliefs in England were carried forward to Colonial America, including the authority of the father over the household and the need to teach children obedience. Throughout the 1600s, numerous records show a very strong interest in ensuring that children did not grow up to be disorderly or rebellious. For example, beginning in 1642, Massachusetts Bay passed a series of acts intended to compel parents to “train up” their children properly and also authorized magistrates to take children from parents who neglected their duties (Bremner, 1970, p. 39). Town records show that men were instructed to go to the houses of families suspected of not teaching their children literacy and catechism to give warnings to the parents. Failure to follow through on the warnings could result in children being removed from these “unsuitable homes.” Children were also “bound out” to other families when their own family could not provide for them, when their family neglected them, or when they became orphaned (Bremner, 1970).

In the early 17th century, families were also responsible for their children’s education and were expected to provide them with instruction in reading and writing (Bremner, 1970). By 1647, Massachusetts moved beyond the expectation that families were the main source of education and required towns of 50 households to maintain a schoolmaster for elementary skills and larger towns (greater than 100 households) to maintain a grammar schoolmaster to teach boys Latin and Greek in order to prepare them for college (Bremner, 1970). Many of the dominant religious beliefs influencing child rearing also became part of the early schools when religious content was taught to children as a regular part of the curriculum.

Because of the compact nature of New England towns, they were subject to more regulations regarding education. In Middle Atlantic colonies, churches with limited private assistance helped to maintain some elementary schools. In Southern colonies, the only elementary schools were charity schools for poor children; secondary education was even sparser than in the North, confined to a few expensive private schools. Higher education also reflected major regional distinctions. Massachusetts was the first colony to

establish a college. Land was secured for what became Harvard College in 1636, followed in 1701 by the founding of Yale College in Connecticut. Not until 1795 did any state-funded college enroll students. Our own University of North Carolina was the first public institution of higher learning to open its doors.

As the country matured and families became more settled, they could attend more to their children's education. Affluent families sometimes employed tutors for their children; some sent their children to Europe for further education. When more formal educational organizations were established, they were usually under the direction of religious denominations and often served to educate young men to become ministers (Bremner, 1970).

Throughout the 1600s and 1700s, many children had limited access to education because they were expected to help their family with household work or be part of the labor force. Children living on farms helped with farm work. Some were apprenticed to tradesmen to learn a skill for their future livelihood (Bremner, 1970). Others worked in mines and factories, often under dangerous circumstances. Families living on the edge of survival did not have the luxury of educating their children at home or sending them to school (Hansan, 2011).

Access to the types of education noted previously mainly applied to White children. When European settlers came to America, Native American tribes and nations occupied lands throughout the country, including the eastern seaboard. Native Americans had their own traditions and values; compared with families of European origin, they were more permissive in rearing their children. Spirituality and relationships were important concepts that influenced family life, and children were taught by their families to respect others and themselves (Horse, 1997). However, Native American children seldom had access to schooling. Black people were also part of America, albeit against their will, from the early 17th century when slaves first arrived from Africa. Their numbers increased dramatically in the 18th and 19th centuries. Although they had strong family values and traditions in their native countries, it was almost impossible to reestablish these values and traditions under their living conditions in America, where restrictive codes governed their lives. As Black individuals in the North gained freedom in the 1800s, opportunities opened for their education and employment; however, in the South, conditions remained harsh.

European Philosophical Underpinnings

Beliefs about rearing children in early America were not limited to religious tenets, physical necessity, or government policies; educators and philosophers also turned their attention to how children should be raised. Certain European philosophers were quite influential; among them was John Locke, an English philosopher who argued against the prevailing beliefs of

his time that children have innate knowledge and predetermined behavior. Locke proposed that children acquire knowledge and skills over their lifetimes, that at birth the mind is a blank slate or *tabula rasa*, and that knowledge is gained through experience rather than innate ideas (Locke, 1689). His ideas significantly influenced 18th- and 19th-century thought on knowledge acquisition.

Building on the work of Locke, the Frenchman Jean-Jacques Rousseau emphasized the importance of children's environments in their development. He recommended a *laissez-faire* approach to childhood and education based on the child's own nature. Rousseau saw the need to preserve children from the influence of society so that their natural talents could develop. He described three stages of children's natural development that foreshadowed modern ones. Although Rousseau published several major books and treatises that continue to influence modern political and social thought, he considered his best work to be *Emile, or On Education* (1762; Bloom's 1979 translation).

Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi was a Swiss educator and social reformer writing in the 18th century who was especially concerned about the plight of children with low socioeconomic status. He believed that education should be based on the interests and needs of the child and proposed specific educational practices that became widely adopted (<http://www.jhpestalozzi.org>). Later, Friedrich Froebel, a German educator writing in the 19th century, strongly influenced educational practices by encouraging play and activity for young children as well as the use of objects for learning (<http://www.froebelgifts.com/history.htm>). He founded a preschool program in 1837 that he later called *kindergarten*, an innovative early childhood program that eventually spread to the United States. Until the United States developed its own cadre of educational philosophers, these four European thinkers had a strong influence on the advancement of education in America.

A DEVELOPING COUNTRY: 1750–1900

One of the most dominant beliefs influencing how children were reared in the United States in the 1800s and much of the 1900s for those of European backgrounds was the primacy of maternal care for young children and the potential negative impact of out-of-home care on children's behavior. These beliefs not only influenced practices from the earliest years of the United States, but they also have been inextricably related to public policy up to the present. However, policies vacillated at times by supporting poor mothers to keep their children at home (and thus out of almshouses or orphanages), as well as by supporting the role of working mothers through child care support. These policies also were influenced by government and religious leaders who questioned the ability of families living in poverty to effectively rear their own children, including the family's ability to promote moral development.

Educating Children With Low Socioeconomic Status

Concerns about educating disadvantaged children existed in America and England as early as the beginning of the 19th century. In England, this concern led to the “charity school” movement throughout the 1800s as a way to address “the decay of religion and the rise of ignorance among the poor” (Cahan, 1989, p. 8). Established primarily for children ages 5 through 7 years and typically supported through individual parishes, these schools taught children from poor families to read and write and facilitated their movement into a trade or other services. During the industrial revolution in the 19th century, significant changes in family life occurred throughout England and the United States as many families moved from rural areas to urban settings searching for better work opportunities. As parents, especially women, went to work in factories, they could not also be at home to care for their children—a situation that influenced the development of “infant schools” in both Europe and America in the 1820s. Rather misnamed, these schools actually served children up to approximately age 6 or 7 years.

Robert Owen, a reformist factory owner, established the first infant school in 1816 in Scotland, with the goal of shielding children from the effects of poverty. His school was designed to provide children with a pleasant school environment where they could think about practical problems and experience little punishment. Teachers encouraged children to help each other, dance, sing, and play outside (http://robert-owen-museum.org.uk/Robert_Owen_1771_1858/school). Influenced by Pestalozzi and Owen, infant schools expanded throughout Europe with practices characterized as child focused and informal, emphasizing a pervasive theme that has continued as a dominant belief into the 21st century—namely, that education can be a means of overcoming poverty and its potential long-term negative social consequences.

The development of infant schools in the United States was built on needs and beliefs similar to those in Europe—the need to provide child care for working parents, a concern that low-income families might be unable to appropriately socialize their children, and an interest in preparing children for elementary school. Both educators and social reformers saw these schools as a means to provide academic instruction, moral training, and child care—that is, more than just custodial child care. Unlike in Europe, infant schools fell out of favor in America because U.S. primary schools began to serve younger children; furthermore, it was still widely believed that children were best raised at home and were the responsibility of the mother. A third factor was promoted by Amariah Brigham (a doctor, writer, and administrator of an asylum for individuals with mental illnesses) who believed that overstimulating a child’s mind would result in feeble-mindedness (Zigler & Styfco, 2010). Illustrating the fluctuating philosophies of education, the British infant school model experienced a revival of inter-

est in the United States in the 1960s and 1970s, influencing Head Start and other preschool and elementary programs.

In the latter part of the 19th century, almshouses became an acceptable means of providing care for orphans, abandoned children, and children from low-income families. Since colonial time, almshouses had existed in the United States to house people who were sick, elderly, or destitute and individuals with disabilities. Almshouses had also become an alternative for children with intellectual or developmental disabilities whose families could not care for them, setting a precedent for out-of-home care for these children. These institutions were usually poorly funded and conditions were often abysmal. Reformers spoke out, the public took note, and yet another shift in social beliefs and interest in children was about to take place.

THE PROGRESSIVE ERA: 1900–1920

The Progressive Era began in the late 1800s as rapid industrialization, urbanization, and immigration led to greater economic and social problems. Progressive reformers began to work for change. When large numbers of immigrant families settled in urban areas in the Northeast and Midwest early in the 20th century, both day nurseries and settlement houses were established to provide services to immigrant and low-income families and their children. Day care for poor children expanded slowly beyond basic care to include social and educational goals. Educators began to believe that day nurseries could provide mothers with information on the health of their young children (Tank, cited in Cahan, 1989). This innovation in addressing the needs of both mothers *and* their children was not broad based but did anticipate later efforts at two-generation programs in modern times. The U.S. settlement houses were modeled on those in England, where more privileged individuals provided services for less fortunate families to help them improve their circumstances. The expansion of these houses in the Northeast and Midwest beginning in the late 1880s and continuing into the 20th century fit within the goals of the Progressive Era to address the needs of both low-income and immigrant families.

Cahan observed that these efforts were early examples of beliefs in the “plasticity and educability” of the young child (1989, pp. 8–9) and as compensatory programs for children living in poverty. Cahan also drew attention to the fact that these were two-tier systems: For more affluent families, the nursery school and kindergarten provided opportunities for child enrichment and social interactions, whereas “childminding” or day care were the options for lower-income parents and working women. This two-tier system was prevalent not only during the Progressive Era, but also throughout the remainder of the 20th century.

Whether their children could attend a custodial childcare program or an educational one was a non-issue for low-income White families and

all Black families in the South, nor were these options relevant for Native American families. Most Black families at the turn of the century were living in the South, where resources in general were more limited and where the history of slavery still influenced society. As a result, Black families had considerably fewer educational opportunities than White families while also struggling with discrimination and racism. Native American families had lost most of their land over a period of two centuries through exchanges with the federal government and were living on isolated reservations in the West. It would be decades before early education opportunities came to these communities.

Home Visiting

Although placing children in almshouses lost favor in the early 20th century, home visiting enjoyed a resurgence of interest as the best way to provide services to children and families. Home visiting was not new; rather, it dated to Elizabethan England and was the dominant way to help individuals living in poverty in colonial America. Interest, however, waned in the 19th century as institutional care became more popular. Jane Addams and other social reformers in the early 20th century renewed interest in home visiting, coinciding with their beliefs that mothers could not manage employment outside the home along with caring for their children and household responsibilities. Subsequently, these beliefs became the prevailing position of efforts on behalf of families, influencing the development of settlement houses and home visiting to assist mothers in their own homes (Wasik & Bryant, 2001). Beginning in the late 19th century and continuing until the 1920s, home visiting was a prevalent means of reaching families and influenced the development of several professions, including social workers, visiting nurses, and visiting teachers.

Consistent with these social concerns of helping to keep children in their own homes rather than in institutions, in 1909 the U.S. government took a significant step toward organizing various efforts for children with the first White House Conference on the Care of Dependent Children. President Theodore Roosevelt initiated the conference and emphasized keeping children with their parents, prompted by the belief that “such aid being given as may be necessary to maintain suitable homes for the rearing of children” (Bremner, 1971, p. 364). This conference influenced the adoption of widows’ pension laws in 1911, making public money available to help widowed mothers care for their children in their own homes; it also led to the establishment of the Children’s Bureau. Begun under President Taft and becoming operational in 1913, the Children’s Bureau was and is the only federal agency focused exclusively on children and families. Today, it continues as part of the Administration on Children, Youth and Families. Once again, however, these new efforts on behalf of White families were rarely extended to African American or Native American families.

Preschool Education and the Preparation of Preschool Teachers

As a number of Progressive Era philosophers, educators, and psychologists were emphasizing the role of education in society, universities began to attend to the education of young children. Indeed, Teachers College at Columbia University had already established itself as a leader in preschool education by the 1880s. Growing from simple roots to teach low-income immigrant women, it evolved into a preparation program for teachers of young children. Its early philosophy emphasized the importance of the learners' backgrounds and how to present materials in relevant, meaningful ways. By 1892, it had reorganized under the name Teachers College and developed a broad-based vision that included education, psychology, and health (Teachers College, n.d.) Among its leaders was John Dewey, who had a significant influence on both educational practices for young children and teacher education. He viewed schools as settings where children could realize their own potential, not simply as a place where children learned a set of predetermined knowledge and skills (Dewey, 1915).

Another early influence on formal preschool education was Maria Montessori, whose work was guided by Pestalozzi, Rousseau, and Froebel, and who in turn had a considerable effect on educational theory and practice in early childhood education in the early 1900s. Drawing on her work for children with intellectual disabilities and in medicine, she employed both the scientific method and observations of children to influence her educational theory. Based on this work, she proposed a structured environment, a very specific set of materials and instruction, and close observation of children (Montessori, 1912). Initially, her work was not met with widespread acceptance in the United States; however, by the middle of the 20th century, her methods began to receive considerable support. More than 4,000 certified Montessori schools operate in the United States today.

The establishment of preschool centers continued to expand during the early 20th century at many university settings and were used to help prepare teachers of young children. Relatedly, both educators and psychologists began to focus on young children's needs and pedagogical practices for teaching them. Bank Street was an early leader, beginning in 1916 as the Bureau of Educational Experiments, with the goal of studying children "to find out what kind of environment is best suited to their learning and growth, to create that environment, and to train adults to maintain it" (Bank Street, n.d.). Also in 1916, the Merrill-Palmer School was founded, which was another institution focused on young children. Beginning operation with an innovative multidisciplinary model to serve children in the Detroit area, the school reached professionals, parents, and other caregivers (Merrill-Palmer School, n.d.).

The Yale Child Study Center also was established during the early part of the century through the efforts of Arnold Gesell (<http://childstudycenter.yale.edu/about/history.aspx>). Influenced by G. Stanley Hall, one of the earli-

est psychologists to study children's development, Gesell was an innovator in conducting intensive studies of a small number of children—work that led to the highly influential Gesell Developmental Schedules; the developmental quotients from these scales were used to determine children's intelligence. His theory of maturation (Gesell, 1928), which proposed that children's development was guided from within, influenced both child rearing and primary education. Although he was originally interested in children with disabilities, Gesell later shifted to study typically developing infants and children.

During this time of expanding interest in children's education in the early 20th century, the United States was making advances related to compulsory education for young children. By 1920, attendance at school for at least part of the year was required for all students between the ages of 8 to 14 years. Although the requirement was not strongly enforced in much of the country, it was evidence of the country's maturing views on children's education. The establishment of the National Association for the Education of Young Children in 1926, with its goal of improving children's well-being through quality educational services, was another positive step for the education of young children.

Children With Disabilities

Interest and research on children's developmental disabilities also increased in the early part of the 20th century. *The Century of the Child*, a book by Ellen Key published in 1900, called for making children the central concern of society. Indeed, advances did follow in the 20th century, including "improvements on measurement, advances on developmental psychology, the advent of psychoanalysis, and the mental hygiene and child guidance movements" (Rey et al., 2015, p. 5). By the 1920s, these developments were influencing the views of children with developmental disabilities and the interventions created for them.

Another significant advance was made in 1922 when Elizabeth Ferrell, a teacher of children with disabilities, founded the Council for Exceptional Children. At the initial meeting, the Council identified three goals: 1) to emphasize the educational needs of the child (rather than the child's classification); 2) to establish standards for special education teachers; and 3) to bring together professionals interested in the education of "special children" (Kode, 2017). These goals foreshadowed work later in the century and remain part of the Council's mission today.

The New "Science" of Assessment in the 20th Century

At the turn of the 20th century, two instruments were developed to assess intellectual and mental abilities. These intelligence tests would come to have a significant effect on many aspects of policy, practice, and research

with young children. The first was the Binet-Simon Scale, created in 1905 by Albert Binet and his co-worker, Theodore Simon, to address the French government's interest in identifying students who needed alternative educational experiences due to their lower intellectual skills. Lewis Terman at Stanford University standardized and renamed the Binet Scale in 1916; the resulting Stanford-Binet then became widely used as a measure of general intelligence for both adults and for children. Beginning in the 1960s, it also became a primary instrument for evaluating the outcomes of early intervention programs.

In the early 1900s, Henry Herbert Goddard, director of research at the Vineland Training School for Feeble-Minded Girls and Boys in New Jersey (Zenderland, 1998), translated Binet's intelligence test into English and used it with the Vineland School children as well as others in the public schools (<http://www.apa.org/monitor/2009/01/assessment.aspx>). Of considerable significance was his belief, building on his early research into heredity, that either isolation or sterilization of those with low intelligence was necessary for society. Although in later years Goddard reversed many of his early opinions and very publicly admitted his error, his work was unfortunately reprinted in German in the 1930s, significantly influencing the eugenics movement in Germany that led to tens of thousands of children being exterminated in the 1930s prior to World War II.

Other professionals concerned with children's development advanced the experimental study of children by creating research methods for the observational study of children's behavior. In particular, Mildred Parten introduced an observational study method to examine children's play (Parten, 1932). Current coding schemes are often quite similar to the methods Parten used to observe children's play behavior. Such efforts illustrated the strong professional interest in children's behavior and helped establish the experimental study of children as a serious scientific effort (Wasik, 1984).

MAJOR CHANGES: 1920–1960

During the first part of the 1920s, the relative prosperity of many Americans contrasted with the lives of a significant number of urban and rural low-income families. At the end of this decade, the stock market crash was followed by the Great Depression, which dramatically altered the economic situation of almost every American family. Millions of workers became unemployed and lost their financial savings, thrusting their families into poverty. Those who were already living in poverty suffered even more drastically; bread lines and soup kitchens were opened to provide for the poor and unemployed as the country fell deeper into the Depression. Under President Herbert Hoover, the U.S. government did not take a highly active role in addressing the national crises brought about by the Depression. However, when Franklin Roosevelt became president in 1933, the government moved quickly to stem the crisis with the banks and to initiate a host

of programs to put people back to work and provide support to families (Goodwin, 1995).

Recognizing the need for mothers to work when possible, one of the programs provided funds for day care, although the support was often not sufficient for a family's needs. Providing government resources to working mothers was viewed more favorably during this time. However, once the country began to pull out of the Depression, these views shifted; they did not match the prevailing social and political beliefs about the role of women in society. Consequently, another significant social policy was enacted in 1935—namely, the federal assistance program called Aid to Dependent Children, which was changed later to Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). This funding was designed to make it possible for low-income mothers to remain at home to care for their children. AFDC was intended for White widows and families in which the husband could not work. Most Black mothers had always been in the labor force and were considered ineligible for this benefit (Carten, 2016).

Numerous changes were made in the AFDC regulations over the next 60 years as beliefs about the best way to support children in low-income families fluctuated, especially as negative opinions developed about providing assistance to unmarried mothers or families perceived to be taking advantage of the system. Changing beliefs about the financial needs of families, maternal work outside the home, and the positive versus detrimental effects of day care on young children continued to influence policies (see Chapter 9 for a more detailed discussion of these policies).

The Social Security Act of 1935, also signed into law by President Roosevelt, was a landmark action. We know it best as a pension program for adults over 65 years of age, but the Act was also the beginning of a long process to obtain financial support from the government for adults with disabilities, and later for children with disabilities. During the 1920s and 1930s, other shifts were occurring in social services. Services provided by clinics and hospitals came to be viewed more favorably than home services, while institutional care for children with disabilities increased. Once again, support for institutional care caused home visiting to recede as a major means of reaching families; it would not have another resurgence until the 1960s (Wasik & Bryant, 2001). By contrast, home visiting continued throughout Europe as a desirable means of providing family services. It received additional support from the writings of John Bowlby, who emphasized the importance of the relationship between maternal care and child health, resulting in a focus on keeping children in their own homes (Bowlby, 1952, 1969).

The War Years and the Recovery: 1940–1960

World War II, the dominant event of the 1940s, touched almost all facets of home and family life. The United States had not fully recovered from the Depression when it was pulled into international conflicts. President

Roosevelt committed national resources to help the war efforts in Europe while also beginning to prepare for the possibility of defending the country against an invasion (Goodwin, 1995). These efforts changed the national economy as tens of thousands of individuals were employed in war-related efforts. Both men and women responded to the call for service. As women, including those with children, moved into the workforce in record numbers during the war, filling positions previously held by men or in new war-related efforts, work by women came to be seen as patriotic and the government began providing day care support to families with lower incomes. Once the war was over, however, women were expected to return to the home; thus, financial support for mothers of young children in the workforce was dramatically reduced. However, because women had experienced more independence and acquired more workplace skills during the war, their own views about employment outside the home began to change. This shift in attitudes continued over the next half-century as women began to work outside the home in record numbers—a shift that altered the dynamics of family relationships and the responsibilities for child care. This trend of increasing numbers of women in the workforce has continued unabated into the 21st century, as documented in Chapters 2 and 9.

Other developments in the 1940s also significantly influenced political, social, and educational events, including segregation. Racial unrest was becoming an increasing concern, leading to a planned march on Washington in 1941 to protest the lack of opportunities for Black Americans resulting from the New Deal. This march, however, did not take place because President Roosevelt promised that opportunities would be made available, although few new opportunities materialized. Racial concerns also influenced Kenneth and Mamie Clark's doll studies on the perceptions of how White and Black children who attended either segregated or nonsegregated schools viewed dolls of different races (Clark & Clark, 1947). When asked about their preference for a White or Black doll, even the Black children showed a preference for White dolls—a striking finding used later (1954) in arguments before the U.S. Supreme Court in the case of *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* to support the detrimental effects of segregated schools.

Children With Intellectual or Developmental Disabilities

Historically, in the United States, little attention was given to children and adults with disabilities. Beginning in the 19th century, society began to differentiate between intellectual disability and developmental disability. By the mid-1800s, people working in the United States to reform the treatment of individuals with limited cognitive functioning became aware of Edouard Seguin's work in France and later in the United States, where he was implementing procedures to educate children who had severe disabilities (Seguin, 1856). Intellectual disability was beginning to be conceptualized along a continuum and viewed as a developmental phenomenon. As a

result, reformers began to propose education for these children and worked to create schools where such education was possible. Part of the motivation for such schools was to remove these children from what was viewed as a detrimental home life. These beliefs about the family were consistent with Goddard's early studies (later refuted) that traced the intellectual performance of children over time. Reformers pushed states to create separate institutions for children, leading to increased efforts for the identification and classification of children with disabilities.

Along with the increased use of intelligence tests with children was the development of several mental ability tests to determine role assignments for recruits during World War I. Robert Yerkes, the president of the American Psychological Association, led a team that had tested almost 2 million soldiers by the end of the war. The results of this extensive testing revealed ethnic and racial differences among the men being evaluated. Although these results were criticized as being clearly related to acculturation (the test scores correlated highly with duration in the United States), the findings led to increased xenophobia and anti-immigrant feelings in the population (DuBois, 1970).

The adult testing results also led to an interest in studying differences among children from different races. Concerned with the absence of normative data for African American children, Kennedy, van de Riet, and Wilson (1963) conducted a detailed review of the research, finding that White children almost always outperformed Black children on measures of intelligence (e.g., Peterson, 1923). However, the reasons for the differences varied across studies, with some researchers attributing the differences to inferior home, school, and cultural environments (Garth, 1931; Peterson, 1923), whereas others thought race also played a role. (See Chapters 3, 4, 5, and 6 for more nuanced, strengths-based approaches to understanding minority children.)

Mid-century, several researchers contributed to the knowledge base of children with intellectual and developmental disabilities. In 1943, the psychiatrist Leo Kanner published his influential paper "Autistic Disturbances of Affective Contact," in which he described the symptoms of 11 children with a distinct syndrome characterized by deficits in normal social interactions (Kanner, 1943). One year later, Hans Asperger also referred to a group of children as autistic, noting similarities in behavior but reporting that the children he observed had scored high in intelligence and had large vocabularies (Asperger, 1944). His findings have gained considerable significance in the understanding of autism.

Other major advances were taking place for children with disabilities. In 1950, parents of children with disabilities established the Association for Retarded Citizens (ARC), working toward equal services for their children. Between 1950 and 1980, the efforts of parents and professionals led to many advances in deinstitutionalization and normalization efforts (Wehmeyer, 2013). Also during this time, several well-known parents of children with

disabilities significantly influenced a shift in people's thinking. Pearl Buck's writings about her daughter with mental disabilities and Dale Evans Rogers' *Angel Unaware* about her daughter with Down syndrome helped to alter parents' acceptance of their children with disabilities. Also influential was Eunice Kennedy Shriver's story about her sister's intellectual disability in a 1962 article in the *Saturday Evening Post*.

As noted previously, questions were being asked about the immutability of intelligence in young children, including those with intellectual disabilities and those from poverty backgrounds. Dreger and Miller (1960) conducted a major review of testing outcomes and concluded that significant social and environmental variables had to be taken into account in interpreting test data because Black children did not have the social and cultural advantages of White children. About the same time, intelligence tests began to be seen as a valid instrument to determine the effects of environmental interventions on children's intellectual abilities. Several pioneering researchers began to ask if changes in the home or school environment could change the trajectory for these children, thus shifting the focus from the immutability of intelligence to the potential of increasing children's cognitive abilities through environmental changes.

Other researchers were concerned with mental retardation and became captivated by questions on the malleability of intellectual abilities. They began to ask if educational programs could make a difference in the development of children with disabilities—questions not unlike those being raised about children from minority backgrounds on the role of heredity and the environment on development. To explore this possibility, Kirk (1958) conducted a study that examined whether a preschool intervention for children with intellectual disabilities could change their developmental outcomes. In one of the earliest experimental studies on the positive benefits of preschool, Kirk compared children in preschool with those who remained at home, finding that those who attended preschool made major gains in IQ scores and social development (Kirk & Johnson, 1951). This work built on the efforts of earlier theorists about environmental factors as important determinants of children's development. For example, it was consistent with the findings of Skeels and Dye (1939) and Skeels (1966), who compared the effects of children in an orphanage with those who were removed from the orphanage and placed with families, finding that children who were placed with families outperformed those who remained in the orphanage. Although this research was criticized for its methodology, it was part of the early efforts to examine if intelligence could be modified by environmental factors.

POLITICAL, SOCIAL, AND CULTURAL ISSUES: The 1960s

Although the prevailing view at mid-century was that intelligence was immutable, events in the 1960s continued to call that belief into question. Other pioneering researchers were also asking if changes in the home or

school environment could positively influence the projected outcome for these children. Susan Gray and Rupert Klaus at George Peabody College for Teachers developed an early childhood intervention program for children from low-income families. In a randomly assigned study of children to four treatment conditions, children in the treated groups scored higher on IQ tests after their first summer of participation (Gray & Klaus, 1970). Martin and Cynthia Deutsch at the Institute for Developmental Studies of New York University (Jordan, Grallo, Deutsch, & Deutsch, 1985) developed an early enrichment program designed to last 5 years for each child. Compared with children who did not attend the program, children in the treatment group made significant gains on a number of cognitive and language tests. The results of both studies captured the attention of several influential individuals, further stimulating interest in establishing a national early childhood program (Zigler & Styfco, 2010).

In the early 1960s, Bettye Caldwell and Julius Richmond developed a preschool program in Syracuse, New York, which broke new ground by going against the prevailing views on home care for young children and enrolling children as young as 6 months of age. Other innovative elements included a focus on health care and implementing a curriculum that included cognitive and socioemotional development as well as social services for the families. Their goal was to prevent the kinds of verbal and motivational deficiencies often observed when children from low-income families entered school (Caldwell & Richmond, 1968). All three of these programs were highly influential in the development of the new federal program that was to be called Head Start (Zigler & Styfco, 2010).

Two researcher theorists active in the 1950s and 1960s, B.F. Skinner and Jean Piaget, had an outsized influence on these new programs for children and on research in the field of child development. Skinner's research and writings were significant in bringing about a focus on a child's actual behavior and the role of immediate consequences in changing behavior (Skinner, 1953, 1968). His work and that of others influenced the development of applied behavior analysis as a clinical approach to understand and treat a large range of problematic child behaviors (Ullmann & Krasner, 1965; Baer, Wolf, & Risley, 1968). This work contrasted with the prevailing views in clinical psychology regarding disorders in children and adults that conceptualized maladaptive behavior as resulting from underlying causes, such as neurosis and psychosis (Skinner, 1953, 1968; Ullmann & Krasner, 1965). Jean Piaget was a Swiss psychologist who posited that all children went through universal stages of cognitive development and biological maturation. Although he did not specifically relate his theory to education, his theory has had enormous influence as, for example, his beliefs that children learn through discovery and by actively exploring rather than through social interactions (Piaget & Inhelder, 1969).

When John Kennedy assumed the presidency in 1961, the country was in a depression. Much of Kennedy's attention was focused on ways

to improve the economy, but he could not ignore the growing civil unrest against racism. This unrest required attention to many of the struggles taking place in the country, especially in the South. Illustrative of this unrest was the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom in the summer of 1963—a highly significant event that brought national attention to the concerns of African Americans. Spurred in part by the failure of Congress to pass the Civil Rights Act, the march attracted 250,000 people, Black and White, marching for more rights for Blacks. Remembered especially for the “I have a dream” speech by Martin Luther King, Jr., the march also facilitated the passage of the Civil Rights Act in 1964 and brought to national attention numerous other grievances of African Americans, including unemployment and segregated schools.

Kennedy was also cognizant of the debilitating consequences for children with intellectual and developmental disabilities—referred to at the time as “mentally retarded” and “mentally ill” children. Influenced by the realities of life for his sister with disabilities, in October 1963 President Kennedy signed two significant legislation acts. First was the Maternal and Child Health and Mental Retardation Planning Amendments of 1963 (PL 88-156), which specifically addressed mental retardation and mental illness. This action was the first large-scale public action recognizing the needs of children with disabilities. Kennedy (1963) noted, “We as a nation have long neglected the mentally ill and the mentally retarded. This neglect must end if our nation is to live up to its own standards of compassion and dignity.” The following week, he signed a bill to fund construction of 12 mental retardation research centers to study the causes of intellectual disabilities, diagnostic treatment clinics, and community-based centers for the care of people with intellectual disabilities—the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 (PL 88-164). The significance of these national acts cannot be overestimated. Among the very last legislative actions of President Kennedy, they fostered considerable professional interest in children with disabilities and prompted the initiation of significant research efforts focused on children with intellectual disabilities. Kennedy had previously signed into law another highly significant legislation for children that created the National Institute for Child Health and Development.

Although President Kennedy did not live to implement many of his plans to address social issues, his interest in the debilitating effects of children growing up in poverty was shared by President Johnson and became part of the impetus for the War on Poverty. President Johnson’s initiatives resulted in the largest number of new federal programs since Franklin D. Roosevelt—many of which had a strong and positive bearing on the lives of low-income families. These included the Social Security Amendments of 1965 (Medicare and Medicaid; PL 89-97), the Food Stamp Act of 1964 (PL 88-525), the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (PL 89-117), the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (PL 89-110), and federal support for the Ele-

mentary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10), which provided significant funding for schools. Among its entitlement programs was Title I, which provided funding to schools and school districts with a high percentage of students from low-income families. Several of Johnson's Great Society efforts continued to expand under both Presidents Nixon and Ford. President Nixon, however, vetoed the Comprehensive Child Development Act of 1971, limiting federal support for child care and negatively influencing low-income families. By contrast, middle-income families were able to use child care costs to reduce their taxes.

One of the most enduring actions under President Johnson was the initiation of Head Start, which was a nationwide effort to provide educational and health resources for children living in poverty. Started as an 8-week summer program in 1965, Head Start provided a preschool setting for children or parenting education through home visiting to help alleviate the negative educational consequences of growing up in poverty. During this time, minority children were often described as "culturally deprived" or "disadvantaged," implying they were not receiving the early home experiences necessary to succeed in mainstream society (Reissman, 1962). Head Start was seen as a way to break the "cycle of poverty" by providing children from low-income families with a comprehensive preschool program that could address not only their educational needs but also their social, health, and nutritional needs and positively influence parents' child-rearing practices.

A number of events converged to provide the foundation for the creation of Head Start. President Kennedy's brother-in-law, Sargent Shriver, visited Gray and Klaus's early intervention projects at Peabody College and learned about the positive outcomes for children from attendance at a summer program combined with home visits to the parents during the school year (Zigler & Styfco, 2010). Shriver called on other professionals, including Edward Zigler and Urie Bronfenbrenner, to help design these Head Start programs (Zigler & Styfco, 2010), thus sparking considerable interest among psychologists and educators in Head Start (Zigler & Valentine, 1997) and in research examining the potential benefits of early childhood education.

FIFTY YEARS OF ADVANCES: 1966–2016

The social and political climates in the 1960s were ripe for researchers to ask how children's environments influenced their development and if educational experiences during the preschool years could change their developmental trajectory. Early empirical studies provided encouragement for the potential positive benefits of environmental changes on children's development. Many well-known researchers had been raising questions about whether retardation was primarily a hereditary phenomenon or if intellectual abilities could be modified through the environment. Others were examining the positive effects of early intervention on children growing up

in poverty. Among the pioneers in the early intervention studies were the already mentioned work from the 1960s by Gray and Klaus, Deutsch and Deutsch, and Caldwell and Richmond, as well as the well-known study by David Weikart who initiated the High/Scope Perry Preschool Program in 1962 to examine the effects of a high-quality preschool program for children from low-income families with both center and home-based interventions (Schweinhart & Weikart, 1980). The teachers in the Perry Preschool Program made home visits every Friday; home visiting was increasingly being employed in early childhood as a way to enhance development for children growing up in poverty. Ira Gordon's Florida Parent Education Program made home visits with parents of preschool children and held backyard play groups (Gordon, Guinagh, & Jester, 1977). Data from these and other early studies were collected as part of the Cornell Consortium and report by Lazar and his colleagues (Lazar et al., 1982). Almost all these early researchers assessed the intellectual performance of children rather than measures of social behaviors or academic performance, thus underscoring the interest in intellectual malleability. Most programs enrolled children from families in poverty; however, because of the preponderance of minority families in many low-income communities, many of the research populations were predominantly minority.

In the 1970s, other researchers initiated well-designed studies on the effects of early childhood education. Influenced by research and theories in the 1960s about the malleability of children's intellectual performance, the Abecedarian Project of the FPG Institute was launched in 1972 by Craig Ramey and his colleagues, becoming one of the most significant longitudinal studies of early childhood intervention. This study and subsequent replications, described in Chapter 7, examined the effects of a quality child care program initiated in infancy on the intellectual outcomes of children from low-income families. Other early interventions studies proliferated—some spurred by the funding of Project Head Start. The Perry Preschool Study continued to follow the young children enrolled in the late 1960s. A renewed focus in the 1960s on home visiting as a strategy for reaching parents of young children influenced several programs in the 1970s and 1980s, which developed into model national programs (Wasik & Bryant, 2001).

When the Bureau for the Education of the Handicapped was established in 1967 as part of the U.S. Office of Education, James J. Gallagher served as its first chief and promoted legislation supporting children with disabilities. (Of note, Gallagher later served as the director of the FPG Institute from 1970 to 1987.) In 1975, Congress passed the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (PL 94-142), later known as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1990 (PL 101-476), which guaranteed a free, appropriate, public education for all children with mental and physical disabilities. This highly significant and far-reaching act mandated that public schools evaluate disabled children and create an educational plan with input from parents. It also mandated that students be served in the

least restrictive environment and allowed maximum opportunity to interact with nonimpaired students. These federal policies, described in Chapter 13, spurred both research with children with disabilities as well as attention to professional development (see Chapters 8 and 12).

Another influential event in understanding children's learning and development was the pioneering publication by Hart and Risley (1995), which dramatically illustrated differences in the home environments of children in professional, working-class, and low-income families. These data also illustrated the relation of the home environments with children's language skills and later school performance. Interest in preschool education for children from low-income families also was increasing, especially at the state level, with numerous pre-K programs initiated across the country. The significant increase in the number of immigrant families with young children, particularly Spanish-speaking families, prompted a major focus on English-language learners, dual-language learners, and concerns with how best to facilitate language development among non-English-speaking children. In contrast to the "assimilation" views in the early part of the 20th century, a growing number of educators were calling for new views on educating children from non-English-speaking households (see Chapter 4). Others raised concerns with theories that did not take into consideration race, gender, and ethnicity. Of special note was the integrative conceptual framework for understanding the development of minority children proposed by Garcia-Coll and her colleagues, who called out critical variables often neglected in the study of minority children's development, including racism, prejudice, discrimination, oppression, and segregation (Garcia-Coll et al., 1996). Other advances made in research, policy, and practice served as a lens for examining issues of race, ethnicity, language, and economic diversity, as well as the needs of and services for children with disabilities and children growing up in poverty. These issues are addressed in depth by the authors in this volume. The final chapter uses the refined process-person-context-time model of Bronfenbrenner (1979) to reflect on the lessons we have learned over the last 50 years and to consider the unresolved challenges to be faced in the future.

SUMMARY

The United States has a long history of addressing the role of children in society, from their education and upbringing in the home to when and whether government should provide support to families with young children. Numerous philosophical, social, professional, and religious beliefs and attitudes as well as research findings influenced many of the policies and practices. As a result, disparate ways to address the educational, developmental, economic, and social needs of families and children have emerged over time, leading at times to inequities in policies and services. In Sections II, III, and IV of this volume, the authors address many of these phenomena.

Throughout much of the history of the United States, child and family services were provided primarily to White families. When changes were brought about related to desegregation in the 1950s and 1960s, the needs of minority children and their families became more salient, especially those of African American children and families. As immigration patterns changed in the 1980s and 1990s, bringing many non-English-speaking families with children, another set of events began to influence educational practices. These changes have influenced policy and practice throughout the past 50 years and are captured in the chapters presented in Section II on race, ethnicity, linguistic, and cultural diversity. This section begins with a consideration of the special needs of African American boys, followed by an examination of cultural and linguistic changes in the demographics of the country and how these have influenced the need for services. Then, a consideration of policies regarding children of color and minority children is presented, followed by a concluding chapter that reviews the current status of research and practice for these minority children and their families and makes recommendations for future directions.

The 1960s saw a significant increase in concerns with children growing up in poverty. It is not, however, always easy to separate services that came about related to race and ethnicity from those that developed out of social concerns for those living in poverty. Consequently, many of the initiatives that began in the 1960s and 1970s to address children from low-income families enrolled a majority of families from minority backgrounds. Nevertheless, concerns with children living in poverty, regardless of race or cultural status, has driven many of the initiatives designed to ameliorate the educational and social disadvantages of growing up in low-income families. In Section III, the authors present information on some of the most significant early childhood interventions that addressed children from low-income families. Also addressed in Section III are issues in the professional preparation of educators and other specialists who work with these children. A detailed presentation of federal policies and funding regarding early childhood programs over the past 50 years is presented. This section concludes with a detailed reflection on the research, practice, and policy advances of the past 50 years.

Section IV addresses the third theme of this volume—namely, children with disabilities and their families. Historically, children with disabilities were rarely provided services—a situation that did not change significantly in the United States until the 1960s, when the legislation initiated by President John Kennedy (discussed previously in this chapter) called for establishing research centers to address the needs of developmentally and intellectually disabled children. FPG (one of the originally funded research centers), along with other research centers, began to examine the needs of children with disabilities and their families. The outcomes of this ongoing work have contributed significantly to interventions for these individuals. The review of these advances is followed by a review of professional

practice concerns, which is especially focused on preparation of the work force. Detailed information is then presented on the major policy advances of the past 50 years for services for children with disabilities. This section concludes with a review of the research, practice, and policy advances and makes recommendations for future directions.

The accomplishments reported over the past 50 years give us reason for celebration because much has been accomplished. However, the findings are tempered by observations of unresolved needs and challenges still faced when translating research findings into effective policy and practice (see especially Chapters 10 and 15). Nevertheless, when considered together, the findings from the past 50 years create an informative but complicated tapestry that can be used to help understand the advances across research, practice, and policy. The dilemmas, challenges, and progress identified by authors in this volume allow reflection on the past 50 years and provide an essential foundation for ensuring advances for the next 50 years.

REFERENCES

- Asperger, H. (1944, June). Die "Autistischen Psychopathen" im Kindesalter [Autistic psychopaths in childhood]. *Archiv für Psychiatrie und Nervenkrankheiten*, *117*, 76–136.
- Baer, D. M., Wolf, M. M., & Risley, T. R. (1968). Some current dimensions of applied behavior analysis. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, *1*, 91–97.
- Bank Street. (n.d.). History. Retrieved from <https://www.bankstreet.edu/discover-bankstreet/what-we-do/history>
- Blank, S. W., & Blum, B. B. (1997). A brief history of work expectations for welfare mothers. *The Future of Children*, *7*(1), 28–38.
- Bowlby, J. (1952). *Maternal care and mental health*. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss* (Vol. 1). New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Bremner, R. H. (1970). *Children and youth in America: A documentary history, Vol. 1: 1600–1865*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bremner, R. H. (1971). *Children and youth in America: A documentary history, Vol. II: 1866–1932*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cahan, E. D. (1989). *Past caring: A history of U.S. preschool care and education for the poor, 1820–1965*. New York, NY: National Center for Children in Poverty, Columbia University.
- Caldwell, B. M., & Richmond, J. B. (1968). The Children's Center in Syracuse, New York. In L. L. Dittmann (Ed.), *Early child care: The new perspectives* (pp. 326–358). New York, NY: Atherton Press.
- Carten, A. (2016). *How racism has shaped welfare policy in America*. Retrieved from <https://the-conversation.com/how-racism-has-shaped-welfare-policy-in-america-since-1935-63574>
- Clark, K. B., & Clark, M. P. (1947). Racial identification and preference among Negro children. In E. L. Hartley (Ed.), *Readings in social psychology*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Dewey, J. (1915). *Schools of tomorrow*. New York, NY: Dutton.
- Dreger, R. M., & Miller, K. S. (1960). Comparative psychological studies of Negroes and whites in the United States. *Psychological Bulletin*, *57*, 361–402.
- DuBois, P. H. (1970). *A history of psychological testing*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, PL 94-142, 20 U.S.C. §§ 1400 *et seq.*
- Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, PL 89-10, 20 U.S.C. §§ 241.
- Food Stamp Act of 1964, PL 88-525, 7 U.S.C. §§ 2011 *et seq.*

- Garcia-Coll, C., Lamberty, G., Jenkins, R., McAdoo, H. P., Crnic, K., Wasik, B. H., et al. (1996). Toward an integrative theoretical model for the study of developmental competencies in minority children. *Child Development, 67*, 1891–1914.
- Garth, T. A. (1931). *Race psychology: A study of racial mental differences*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Gesell, A. (1928). *Infancy and human growth*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Goodwin, D. K. (1995). *No ordinary time*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Gordon, I. J., Guinagh, B. J., & Jester, R. E. (1977). The Florida Parent Education Infant and Toddler Program. In M. C. Day & R. K. Parker (Eds.), *The preschool in action: Exploring early childhood programs* (pp. 95–127). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Gray, S. W., & Klaus, R. A. (1970). The Early Training Project: A seventh year report. *Child Development, 41*, 909–924.
- Gray, S. W., & Ruttle, K. (1980). The Family-Oriented Home Visiting Program: A longitudinal study. *Genetic Psychology Monographs, 102*, 299–316.
- Hansan, J. (2011). The American era of child labor. *Social Welfare History Project*. Retrieved from <http://socialwelfare.library.vcu.edu/programs/child-welfarechild-labor/child-labor>
- Hansan, J. E. (2011). Settlement houses: An introduction. *Social Welfare History Project*. Retrieved from <http://socialwelfare.library.vcu.edu/settlement-houses/settlement-houses>
- Hart, B., & Risley, T. (1995). *Meaningful differences in the everyday experience of American children*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.
- Horse, J. R. (1997). Traditional American Indian family systems. *Families, Systems, & Health 15*(3), 243–250.
- Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, PL 89-117.
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 1990, PL 101-476, 20 U.S.C. §§ 1400 *et seq.*
- Institute of Medicine. (2000). *From neurons to neighborhoods: The science of early childhood development*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- Jordan, T. J., Grallo, R., Deutsch, M., & Deutsch, C. P. (1985). Long-term effects of early enrichment: A 20-year perspective on persistence and change. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 13*, 393–415.
- Kanner, L. (1943). Autistic disturbances of affective contact. *Nervous Child, 2*, 217–250.
- Kennedy, J. F. (1963). *Special message to the Congress on Mental Illness and Mental Retardation*. Retrieved from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=9546>
- Kennedy, W. A., van de Riet, V., & Wilson, J. (1963). A normative sample of intelligence and achievement of Negro elementary school children in the southeastern United States. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 28*(6), 1–112.
- Kirk, S. A. (1958). *Early education of the mentally retarded: An experimental study*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Kirk, S., & Johnson, G. (1951). *Educating the retarded child*. Cambridge, MA: Riverside Press.
- Kode, K. (2017). *Elizabeth Farrell and the history of special education* (2nd ed.). Arlington, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.
- Lazar, I., Darlington, R., Murray, H., Royce, J., Snipper, A., & Ramey, C. T. (1982). The lasting effects of early education: A report from the consortium for longitudinal studies. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 47*(2–3), 1–151.
- Locke, J. (1689). *An essay concerning human understanding*. Retrieved from <http://socialwelfare.library.vcu.edu/programs/child-care-the-american-history>
- Maternal and Child Health and Mental Retardation Planning Amendments of 1963, PL 88-156, 42 U.S.C. §§ 1305 *et seq.*
- Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963, PL 88-164, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2670 *et seq.*
- Merrill-Palmer School. (n.d.). *Our history*. Retrieved from <http://mpsi.wayne.edu/about/history.php>
- Montessori, M. (1912). *The Montessori method* (A. E. George, Trans.). New York, NY: Frederick A. Stokes. Retrieved from <http://digital.library.upenn.edu/women/montessori/method/method.html>
- Parten, M. (1932). Social participation among preschool children. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 27*(3), 243–269.

- Peterson, J. (1923). The comparative abilities of white and Negro children. *Comparative Psychology Monographs*, 5, 1–141.
- Piaget, J., & Inhelder, B. (1969). *The psychology of the child*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Pintner, R. (1931). *Intelligence testing: Methods and results*. New York, NY: Holt.
- Reissman, F. (1962). *The culturally deprived child*. New York, NY: Harper.
- Rey, J. M., Assumpção, F. B., Bernad, C. A., Çuhadaroglu, F. C., Evans, B., Fung, D., et al. (2015). *History of child and adolescent psychiatry*. In J. M., Rey (Ed.), *IACAPAP e-textbook of child and adolescent mental health*. Geneva, Switzerland: International Association for Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Allied Professions.
- Rousseau, J. (1979). *Emile, or On education* (A. Bloom, Trans.). New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Schweinhart, L. J., & Weikart, D. P. (1980). *Young children grow up: The effects of the Perry Preschool Program on youths through age 15*. Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Foundation.
- Seguin, E. (1856). Origin of the treatment and training of idiots. *American Journal of Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.disabilitymuseum.org/dhm/lib/detail.html?id=1437&page=all>.
- Shaw, D. (2016). *The promise of the premise: The first 50 years of the Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina, FPG Child Development Institute.
- Shonkoff, J. P., & Meisels, S. J. (1990). Early childhood intervention: The evolution of a concept. In J. P. Shonkoff & S. J. Meisels (Eds.), *Handbook of early childhood intervention* (pp. 3–31). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Skeels, H. (1966). Adult status of children with contrasting early life experiences. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 31(3), 1–65.
- Skeels, H. M., & Dye, H. B. (1939). A study of the effects of differential stimulation on mentally retarded children. *Proceedings and Address of the American Association on Mental Deficiency*, 4, 114–136.
- Skinner, B. F. (1953). *Science and human behavior*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Skinner, B. F. (1968). *The technology of teaching*. New York, NY: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Social Security Amendments of 1965, PL 89-97, 42 U.S.C. §§ 401 *et seq.*
- Tank, R. M. (1980). *Young children, families, and society in America since the 1820s: The evolution of health, education, and child care programs for preschool children* (Doctoral dissertation). Department of History, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. Retrieved from University Microfilms International (No. 8106233).
- Teachers College. (n.d.). *About Teachers College*. Retrieved from <http://www.tc.columbia.edu/abouttc/timeline>
- Ullmann, L. P., & Krasner, L. (1965). *Case studies in behavior modification*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Voting Rights Act of 1965, PL 89-110), 42 U.S.C. §§ 1973 *et seq.*
- Wasik, B. H. (1984). Clinical applications of direct behavior observation: A look at the past and the future. In B. B. Lahey & A. E. Kazdin (Eds.), *Advances in clinical child psychology* (pp. 153–193). New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- Wasik, B. H., & Bryant, D. (2001). *Home visiting: Procedures for helping families*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Wehmeyer, M. L. (Ed.) (2013). *The story of intellectual disability*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.
- Yarrow, A. L. (2009). *History of U.S. children's policy, 1900–Present*. Washington, DC: First Focus.
- Zenderland, L. (1998). *Measuring minds: Henry Herbert Goddard and the origins of American intelligence testing*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Zigler, E., & Styfco, S. J. (2010). *The hidden history of Head Start*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Zigler, E., & Valentine, J. (Eds.). (1997). *Project Head Start: A legacy of the War on Poverty* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: National Head Start Association.

“Demonstrates how FPG’s growth and development contributed to and influenced the field’s advances for the past half century by suggesting new horizons, identifying new areas for potential impact, and creating new knowledge.”

—Samuel J. Meisels, Ed.D., University of Nebraska

“With an extraordinary group of authors, this volume on early childhood research traces our past, takes a hard look at where we are, and poses challenges for the future.”

—Jacqueline Jones, Ph.D., President/CEO, Foundation for Child Development

“Should be seminal reading for all early childhood practitioners, family members, researchers, and policy makers for years to come.”

—Mary Louise Hemmeter, Ph.D., Vanderbilt University

For more than fifty years, the Frank Porter Graham (FPG) Child Development Institute has conducted groundbreaking research that has revolutionized the field of early childhood care and education. Based on presentations made at FPG’s 50th anniversary symposium, this essential reference looks back on the Institute’s trailblazing history, analyzes contemporary issues in child development, and recommends critical new research directions.

More than a dozen high-profile contributors examine the three themes of the anniversary symposium: **early care and education**, **diversity**, and **children with disabilities and their families**. Readers will learn from in-depth chapters on

- understanding the social, cultural, educational, and political forces that affect children’s outcomes
- meeting the challenge of serving diverse populations as U.S. demographics shift
- improving connections between the knowledge base and professional practice
- strengthening the early childhood workforce
- examining ways to support continuous improvement

A celebration of progress and a compelling call to action for the next generation of professionals, this important volume will help shape the future of the early childhood field—and improve outcomes for tomorrow’s young children and families.

ABOUT THE EDITORS: **Barbara Hanna Wasik, Ph.D.**, is a clinical/school psychologist and William R. Kenan Distinguished Professor Emerita whose research has focused on interventions for children with social, developmental, and academic difficulties in school and home settings. **Samuel L. Odom, Ph.D.**, is former Director of the Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute where he remains as Senior Research Scientist. His current research focuses on school-based intervention programs for children and youth with autism spectrum disorder.