

# CANADIAN CHILDREN



JOURNAL OF  
THE CANADIAN ASSOCIATION  
FOR YOUNG CHILDREN

Winter/Spring 1984-85

Volume 9, Number 2

THE CANADIAN ASSOCIATION  
FOR YOUNG CHILDREN

**What is the C.A.Y.C.?**

The Canadian Association for Young Children (C.A.Y.C.) grew out of the Council for Childhood Education and became officially recognized in 1974 by the granting of a Federal Charter. It is the only national Association specifically concerned with the well-being of children of pre-school and elementary school age. Members of the Association are from Canada, the U.S.A. and elsewhere. They include teachers, administrators, parents, students and other interested persons from a variety of professional disciplines who wish to share ideas and participate in activities related to the education and welfare of young children.

**THE AIMS OF THE CANADIAN  
ASSOCIATION FOR YOUNG CHILDREN**

- To work for the development and well-being of children.
- To foster desirable conditions, programmes and practices to meet the needs of children.
- To encourage continuous professional growth in accordance with knowledge of child development.
- To bring into active co-operation all groups concerned with children and child development.
- To disseminate information on child development.
- To promote the co-ordination of all organizations in Canada concerned with the welfare of children.

**Implementing the Aims of C.A.Y.C.**

1. *The Annual Conference/Symposium*

The Annual Conference/Symposium is a highlight of the C.A.Y.C. year. It is hosted in cities across Canada and usually lasts for three days. The program includes workshops, discussion groups, displays, demonstrations, school visits, tours, lectures by internationally renowned authorities on children as well as social events and opportunities to share common interests.

2. *Provincial and Local Meetings*

Provincial and local meetings are organized by representatives of C.A.Y.C. and by affiliated groups. These meetings may take the form of workshops, lectures and discussion groups.

3. *The Journal/The Newsletter*

Trends in early childhood education and child rearing practices are considered and articles are presented in *The Journal*. It is published twice yearly, in May and November. In *The Newsletter* topics of local and national interest are shared with members.

4. *Childfilm Festival*

A Childfilm Festival is organized to coincide with the Annual Conference. Awards are made at the Conference.

JOURNAL OF THE CANADIAN ASSOCIATION  
FOR YOUNG CHILDREN

Winter-Spring 1984-85

Volume 9, No. 2

Editor: Chris Bagley,  
Faculty of Social Welfare,  
University of Calgary,  
University Drive, N.W.,  
Calgary, Alberta, T2N 1N4  
Canada

*Editorial Committee:*

*Review Editor:* Dr. Kathleen Kufeldt,  
Faculty of Social Welfare,  
University of Calgary

*Editorial Advisors:* Doreen Cleave-Hogg,  
President,  
Canadian Association for Young Children

Professor Heather Trump,  
Faculty of Education,  
University of McGill

Professor Fred Morrison,  
Department of Family Studies,  
University of Alberta

Professor Richard Hirayabishi,  
Department of Early Childhood Education,  
University of Calgary

**Subscriptions:** \$25 per annum for two issues. Subscription correspondence to: C.A.Y.C., 50 Regan Crescent, Georgetown, Ontario, Canada, L7G 1B1. Institutional subscribers will receive the *Journal*, and individuals will in addition become members of C.A.Y.C.

**Submission of Materials:** Send articles, news, annotations and materials for review to the Editors, Faculty of Social Welfare, University of Calgary, University Dr., N.W., Calgary, T2N 1N4. References and general style should conform to the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*, Third Edition (1983). Each article should be preceded by an Abstract of not more than 200 words. Canadian or American spelling is acceptable provided the style is internally consistent. Articles in French may also be submitted, and translation, if necessary, will be undertaken by the *Journal*.

<b>CONTENTS</b>		Page:
<b><i>C.A.Y.C. President's Message</i></b>		iv
<b><i>Editorial Introduction:</i></b>		
Daycare in Canada: Major Issues and Problems		v
<b><i>Annotations:</i></b>		
The State of the World's Children — An Update		1
Infant Daycare and Child Development		3
Implications of The Badgley Report on Sexual Offences Against Children for Health Care and Medical Services in Manitoba		6
<b><i>Articles:</i></b>		
Providing Good Daycare: The Role of Employers, Unions and the Private Sector <i>Kathleen Mahoney</i>		11
Daycare in Canada and the Restructured Relationships of Family, Government, and Labour Force <i>Alan R. Pence</i>		27
The Psychological Consequences of Daycare <i>Fred Morrison</i>		43
Daycare: Developmental Effects and the Problem of Quality Care <i>Jay Belsky</i>		53
Consumerism, Arbitrary Male Dominance and Daycare <i>Elliott T. Barker</i>		75
Movement and the Developing Child: A Practical Re-Examination <i>David Bean</i>		85
<b><i>Research Notes and Conference Reports:</i></b>		
Father-Absence: A Summary of Some Recent Psychological Studies <i>P. S. Fry</i>		91
The Fifth International Congress on Child Abuse and Neglect, Montreal, September 1984		97
<b><i>Reviews and Notes</i></b>		103

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF C.A.Y.C.

In November 1974 Montreal staged a celebration for C.A.Y.C.'s first birthday. Ten years later the anniversary was celebrated in many locations throughout Canada, including Montreal, Regina, Toronto, Winnipeg and Fredericton. This expansion of C.A.Y.C. events establishes a foundation for further activities on behalf of young children in the next ten years: 1985 starts us on our second decade of involvement.

The 1984/1985 Board of Directors met in Montreal on Saturday, 11th November 1984. It was agreed at that time that C.A.Y.C. will address two issues in the coming year: those of daycare; and of multiculturalism and young children. Many of you have considerable knowledge and experience in these areas and we urge you to share your ideas with others at C.A.Y.C. meetings and seminars, as well as contributions to the C.A.Y.C. newsletters and the journal *Canadian Children*. There are many interesting and exciting developments in child care and education taking place in Canada which should be shared for the benefit of all children. There are also many concerns which must be discussed and acted upon if we are to promote optimum physical, social and intellectual developmental opportunities for all young children.

Some regional events are already planned, or are in the planning stage, which will provide forums for exchange of information. Contact your provincial director; find out what C.A.Y.C. activities are taking place in your area. This issue of the journal although dated 1984, went to press early in 1985. The present issue will be followed by two more for 1985, issued at six month intervals. Thus, despite delays in production, subscribers will still receive two issues a year. The journal will focus on the selected issues of Daycare and Multiculturalism, and the topics will be addressed from several perspectives.

C.A.Y.C. is ready to affirm its commitment to work for the development and education of young children. Now is the time for you to demonstrate your support by joining us in that commitment to improve the quality of life for Canada's children as we enter the next decade of our association. Together we can enjoy the sharing and caring.

Doreen Cleave-Hogg

## Editorial

### DAYCARE IN CANADA: MAJOR ISSUES AND PROBLEMS

#### Introduction

Daycare is an important political issue in North America. It touches many areas - the rights of women, the ability of women to work, conditions of employment, and most important of all, the needs of children for healthy conditions of social, psychological and physical development.

In Canada, daycare is on the political agenda. It was an issue in the national elections of 1984, and in the speech from the throne in the Fall of 1984 further action to support the daycare arrangements of working women was promised, although no details were given. It is not too much to suggest however that there is a crisis in daycare, which is in urgent need of political recognition and government action. The Canadian Department of Health and Welfare, in a report issued in November, 1984 (Health and Welfare, 1984), indicated that the number of daycare spaces in Canada available for children under two is steadily decreasing, despite a considerable increase in the number of women in the work force with children of this age. In 1983 alone there was a 12 percent drop on places in recognized daycare facilities for the under twos. Of the 123,000 spaces in commercial and non-profit centres in 1983, less than 7 percent were for under twos, a decrease of 1,200 spaces from 1982, which was in turn a decrease in 400 spaces from 1979.

The reason for this decline lies, ironically, in increasing government regulations for daycare of infants, including the high staffing ratios and high standards of hygiene and care required. Meeting such standards is expensive, and commercial operators can make more profit from older children. Parents of young children who have to work have little alternative but to put their children in unregulated care which can be both unstable and of poor quality.

A recent report from the Social Planning Council of Greater Toronto (SPC, 1984) showed that the cost of raising a child had increased by 28 percent since 1981. Increased daycare costs were the chief cause of this increase. In Toronto, as in other large Canadian cities, daycare costs have risen some 40 percent in the past three years. These sharp cost increases have, inevitably but unfortunately, been accompanied by pressures to reduce the costs of care by reducing its quality. A number of commercial organizations have responded to this pressure. Unfortunately, profit-making daycare centres must, in order to maximize financial returns and minimize costs, provide a minimum service to children. The most depressing aspects of minimal cost service are a poor ratio of workers to children (often in contravention of provincial regulations); minimally trained workers (usually having no more than high school graduation or less); poor pay (often no better than minimum wage); and high levels of staff dissatisfaction and turnover.

Such staffing problems inevitably result in care that is lacking in both quality and continuity, and may well be harmful to children's development. Parents for their part often move children from one facility to another in the search for "good" care for their child. Floge (1983) in a survey of working mothers found, for example, that over a period of a year only a half of the working mothers in her sample had maintained the same placement for their child.

Another maternal reaction to poor quality daycare is to deny or ignore its potentially harmful effects, looking at the most superficial aspects of care. The need for and consequences of demanding quality care are not recognized by the majority of parents. Browne (1984) has shown that parental ratings of the six daycare centres she studied were "inattentive regarding the basic elements of care and overestimated the quality of care" in comparison with the ratings of the centres by a research team. Putting a child in alternative care is an anxious process for a working mother, and there is sometimes a desperate need to believe that the conditions in the care centre are better than they are.

The Canadian Federal Task Force report on daycare is awaited with interest, and it may give the present government some guidelines for action. Among the evidence the Task Force considered was the repeated accounts of the dearth of daycare places for young children in many areas. In Quebec, for example, there are some 30,000 places in centres of varying quality; but there is an established need for up to 210,000 places, since 40 percent of mothers of preschool children have a job outside the home.

Mothers who are single parents have a particularly pressing need to work, and quality daycare for their children should be an important aspect of social service support. Such supportive care can help prevent child abuse and neglect, and prevent too the removal of a child from parental care, with all the negative consequences which may follow. Unfortunately, such farsighted prevention work is not often engaged in by social service systems. In Alberta, for instance, a single mother can only receive social allowance to enable her to look after her child for a limited period. After this, she has to seek work and place her child in alternative care. Social workers are not usually concerned with the quality of that care. She will only receive allowance on a permanent basis if she has more than one child — a positive incentive to become pregnant again!

Daycare is both an important and a controversial area, as the papers in this issue of *Canadian Children* make clear. Daycare is important and necessary; yet it has costs as well as benefits, and for some children the longterm costs of unstable and poor quality daycare may be great.

### The Benefits of Daycare

As Kathleen Mahoney points out in the longer document from which the article in the present issue is drawn, and elsewhere (Mahoney, 1984), daycare is an important aspect of both family support and the equalisation of opportunities between men and women. Alan Pence, in his article in this issue, makes it clear that conservative forces have prevented the realisation of this possibility. Daycare is too often seen as a second best option, an inferior alternative to staying home and looking after one's child or children. No one today offers the maxim of

"children, kitchen and church" as the proper role for women, but the sentiment lingers, and may well have inhibited governments and other agencies from monitoring or providing good daycare.

Daycare then, enables many women to work, which has advantages not only financially but also in terms of their own growth and psychological development (Brown and Harris, 1978). Moreover, the participation of women in the economy has advantages not only for individual employers (Zippo, 1980) but for the economy as a whole.

For the child too, there are demonstrated benefits in quality daycare. As Fred Morrison and Jay Belsky make clear in their review articles in this issue, there are definite types of cognitive and social skill which a child in quality daycare can acquire in the preschool years. At the very least, such quality care can provide a comfortable, pleasant and caring environment which has no adverse effect on children's intellectual and emotional development. Children, as Kagan (1979) has argued, are resilient, and can often survive both "good" and "bad" daycare experiences in early childhood: their basic integrity as persons can, under the best circumstances, be relatively untouched by the alternative care. However, poor quality or bad care may be negative to such a degree that long-term harm can result.

The clearest advantage of daycare is for children with special needs - children with some form of potential disability, or with some emotional or intellectual problem (Dyson and Dyson, 1981). Such programs need to employ highly skilled, experienced workers who can attend to the needs of the individual child (Wilkinson and Murphy, 1983; Richman et. al. 1983). Another particular advantage of daycare is its use as part of an integrated program for family support and education, especially where there is risk of child abuse or neglect (Crittenden, 1983). Daycare can also be integrated with more formal educational settings, with demonstrable benefits in children's educational progress (Ferri et. al. 1981). In Canada such integration can be particularly valuable in the provision of bilingual (French-English) education. Such integrated programs exist almost exclusively in Quebec and Ontario (LEA, 1983).

The most exciting and positive argument for the enduring, positive effects of quality daycare and associated preschool programs comes from the studies of the long-term effects of the U.S. head-start programs of the 1960s. Children enrolled in such programs are less likely to enter special education programs or drop out of high school. They are more likely to attend college or job training courses, and more likely to be employed and never to have applied for welfare (Breedlove and Schweinhart, 1982). For every \$1,000 invested in these preschool programs, the return over a 15-year period is \$4,130, after inflation.

The head-start programs promoted "social competence" rather than I.Q. gains per se (Zigler, and Trickett, 1978), and focussing on short-term cognitive gains (as the earlier evaluation studies did) was clearly an error. The associated health benefits from the head-start programs also enhanced the social skills and long-term adjustment of the children enrolled (Zigler, and Valentine, 1979). The head-start programs pioneered many practices which have become standard in daycare. The ubiquitous and highly enjoyable *Sesame Street* is but one of the by-products.

The majority of daycare in Canada is not in organised centres, but in the homes of individuals who look after a few children. Many of these homes are of excellent quality: some are not. Even some of the registered homes do not provide good or quality care. But the majority of homes are not registered for income tax purposes. The mothers who make such payments (which are often cut-price) are in consequence unable to obtain childcare expenses in their own tax returns.

In Britain, unsupervised "childminders" often provide the worst kind of care, with children emerging at age five who are cowed and mute, or alternatively aggressive and overactive (Jackson and Jackson, 1979). Such home daycare in Britain continues to be of low quality; because of racial discrimination in this field, mothers of ethnic minority children have to use the poorest quality care (Mayall and Petrie, 1984). In Canada, some progress has been made in assessing quality standards for home daycare (Stuart, 1983) but much work remains to be done.

The reviews by Fred Morrison and Jay Belsky in this issue suggest that poor quality daycare can indeed have some long-term adverse effects on the social and behavioural development of children. The description by Valerie Polakow-Suransky (1984), in a previous issue of *Canadian Children*, of the violation by some centres of young children's need for a sense of autonomy in play is a further evidence that daycare does not, in many circumstances, meet children's fundamental needs.

Elliott Barker, in his article in this issue of *Canadian Children* goes further: he argues that the kinds of social relationship fostered in some kinds of daycare actually influence the development in later life of "partial psychopathy," a condition involving superficiality in social interaction, and an indifference to the needs of others. Looked at in a broader sense, parents who indifferently place children in poor quality care are themselves "partial psychopath." Dr. Barker's view of daycare as a partial contributor to the development of psychopathy in some children might be considered as extreme, but his views, based on experience as a psychiatrist at the Penetanguishene Mental Health Centre, which contains some of the most serious criminal psychopaths in Canada, must be carefully considered. The most likely proposition is that poor quality daycare (like poor quality parenting) interacts with other factors in the child's environment to produce the syndrome of indifference to and exploitation of others which we term "partial psychopathy." It is unlikely, however, that poor quality daycare is the sole cause of such a condition.

In this respect it is worth quoting from the conclusions of Jay Belsky in this issue:

... it is not where the child is reared that is of principal importance but how she is cared for. One's social address does not determine development, be it home care, daycare, lower class, middle class; rather it is the day-to-day experience one has which shapes psychological growth. Social structure is influential because it probabilistically influences whether certain experiences will be experienced ...

It is likely indeed that in some cases poor quality care occurs both at home and in the daycare, and the effects of each reinforce the other in interacting with constitutional and other factors which influence the child's general personality development.

Other potentially hazardous aspects of daycare must be considered, particularly health risks, and the risks of neglect and abuse. It is well known that infants in group care are more likely to acquire infections. However, whether these are serious in nature or simply help the child acquire a healthy immunity is not clearly established, and the task force on daycare infections headed by Dr. Barbara Yaffe for the City of Toronto should throw valuable light on this problem.

Older children in group daycare also run some health risks. A recent survey of 44,000 children aged five or younger in Monroe County, New York has indicated the risks in this respect (Redmond and Pichichero, 1984). The children in this survey who attended daycare centres were much more likely than those who stayed at home to contract a bacterial disease that is the leading cause of meningitis and causes significant neurological impairment in one-third of cases. The incidence of *hemophilus influenzae* type b disease was 12.3 times greater in daycare than in non daycare children younger than age 1 year, 7.2 times greater for those 1 to 2 years old, and 3.8 times greater for those 2 to 3 years old, and about 2 times greater for children aged older than 3 years. While the infection rate in the highest risk group — 1,700 cases per 100,000 at risk in the under one year group — is low enough to allow most centres not to have a case, the risk are real and substantial and make careful health controls of daycare centres an imperative.

The most serious problem of daycare centres involves the physical and sexual abuse of children. While minor cruelties, such as deprivation of food to assert discipline over a child are probably common, grosser forms of cruelty by harassed daycare workers almost certainly do occur. The most serious risks are probably in unlicensed home daycares, where there is little scrutiny or supervision.

Sexual abuse of daycare children can occur, usually at the hands of an untrained and unsupervised male worker, or by the husband of the proprietor in a profit-run centre. A number of such cases have come to prominence in Canada and the United States in the past year. Our work in Calgary on long-term mental health sequels of child sexual abuse (Sorrenti-Little et. al. 1984; Bagley, 1985) suggests that this is by no means a rare problem. In a random sample of 270 adult women in the community, two respondents recalled serious sexual abuse in daycare in their own childhood, or reported that it had occurred to their own children. One reported that some twenty years before the husband of the proprietor of a daycare sexually assaulted her (and other five year olds) at nap time. He would put a gun on the night table and tell the children they would die if they told anyone. In the other more recent case, a man sexually assaulted over twenty young children in the afterschool program run by his wife. The police did not prosecute because of the very young age of potential witnesses. It is believed that this couple now run a program in another Canadian city. Generalizing from our survey data, we suggest that at least one percent of privately run daycares sexually abuse children in some way.

## Conclusions

Daycare can be a rewarding and enriching experience for both children and their parents. It can be a liberating boon to working mothers, and it can pass to children social and cognitive skills which can enrich their whole childhood, even in the later years. Daycare can be specially helpful for children with special cognitive, emotional, social or sensory-motor needs.

But poor quality daycare can be disastrous for some children, and retard and impair their emotional and cognitive childhood for many years. Poor quality care can give children dysfunctional interaction styles, and may in combination with other factors, permanently impair the capacity to make relationships. Against this is the more hopeful evidence from Kagan's (1979) work, that the harms of daycare are relatively short-lived and that "simply growing older" assists the child's natural resilience.

Such optimism cannot be applied to the risk of infection however: children crippled by meningitis contracted in a daycare centre remain permanently impaired. The scars of sexual abuse also last long into adult life, and can permanently impair mental health.

The important and inescapable conclusion is that daycare, with so many implications for the health, well-being, and education of children is too important to be left to private enterprise and the profit motive. It is impossible to provide quality daycare and make a profit. Federal and Provincial governments *must* take more initiative in this area, both in funding and in the maintenance of good standards, including an insistence on high ratios of staff to children, maximum group sizes, and at least two years professional training for all staff. A major expense is the leasing of premises, and this is an area in which governments (through the Canada Housing and Mortgage Corporation for example) churches and school boards could take an important initiative. Our own experience, as the member of the board of a non-profit daycare centre, is that once the costs of premises are subsidized, and some subsidy is available from the provincial government for each child, then parents can be charged a reasonably low fee which can ensure trained staff, good equipment, quality care, a high staff:child ratio, and an individualized program for each child.

Christopher Bagley

## References

- Bagley, C. (1985). Child sexual abuse: A child welfare perspective. In B. Wharf and B. Levitt (Eds.), *Child Welfare in Canada*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Breedlove, C. and Schweinhart, L. (1982). *The Cost-Effectiveness of High Quality Early Childhood Programs*. Ypsilanti, Mich: Centre for the Study of Public Policies for Young Children.
- Brown, G. and Harris, T. (1978). *Social origins of depression*. London: Tavistock.
- Browne, A. (1984). The mixed economy of day care: Consumer versus professional assessments. *Journal of Social Policy*, 13, 321-331.

- CEA (1983). *Day care and the Canadian school system*. Toronto: Canadian Education Association.
- Crittenden, P. (1983). The effect of mandatory protective daycare on mutual attachment in maltreating mother-infant dyads. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 7, 297-300.
- Dyson, L. and Dyson, W. (1981). Early intervention and handicapped children in regular preschools and daycare centres. *Canadian Journal of Public Health*, 72, 186-190.
- Ferri, E., Birchnall, D., Gingell, V. and Gipps, C. (1981). *Combined nursery centres: A new approach to education and daycare*. London: MacMillan.
- Floge, L. (1983). *The dynamics of child care use: Implications for mothers and children*. Paper given to Annual Meeting of the Society for the Study of Social Problems, Detroit, August, 1983.
- Health and Welfare (1984). *The status of day care in Canada*. Ottawa: Department of Health and Welfare.
- Jackson, B. and Jackson, S. (1979). *Childminder*. London: Routledge.
- Kagan, J. (1979). Issues and evidence in daycare. In W. Michelson (Ed.), *The Child in the City*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Mahoney, K. (1984). Supporting better day care: The role of government. *Journal of Child Care*, 2, 1-20.
- Mayall, B. and Petrie, P. (1984). *Childminding and day nurseries: What kind of care?* London: University of London Institute of Education.
- Polakow-Suransky, V. (1984). The missing voice: Rethinking early childhood education. *Canadian Children: Journal of the Canadian Association for Young Children*, 9, 22-34.
- Redican, P. (1979). Report from six provinces. In K. Ross (Ed.), *Good day care*. Toronto: Women's Educational Press.
- Redmond, S. and Pichichero, M. (1984). Hemophilus influenzae type b disease: An epidemiologic study with special reference to day-care centres. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 252, 2582-2584.
- Richman, N., Graham, P. and Stevenson, J. (1983). Long-term effects of treatment in a pre-school day centre. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 142, 71-77.
- Ross, K. (1979). *Good day care: Fighting for it, getting it, keeping it*. Toronto: Women's Educational Press.
- Sorrenti-Little, L., Bagley, C. and Robertson, S. (1984). An operational definition of the long-term harmfulness of sexual relations with peers and adults by young children. *Canadian Children: Journal of the Canadian Association for Young Children*, 9, 46-57.
- SPC (1984). *The costs of children*. Toronto: Social Planning Council of Metro Toronto.
- Stuart, B. (1983). What is quality in private home day care? *Canadian Children: Journal of the Canadian Association for Young Children*, 8, 18-28.
- Wilkinson, J. and Murphy, H. (1983). Fitting in nursery school children. *Child: Care, Health and Development*, 9, 19-28.
- Zippo, J. (1980). Employer-sponsored child care comes of age. *Personnel*, 57, 45-48.
- Zigler, E. and Trickett, P. (1978). IQ. Social competence and evaluation of early childhood intervention programs. *American Psychologist*, 33, 789-798.
- Zigler, E. and Valentine, J. (1979). *Project Head Start: A Legacy of the War on Poverty*. New York: Free Press.

In the issue of June, 1984, we reviewed the UNICEF report *The State of the World's Children 1982-1983*. This report pointed out that

The Third World's hunger is a hidden hunger. Visible malnutrition is rare. And it is time that the skin and bone image of the starving baby — an image which is too often used to represent the developing countries — was replaced by a greater international understanding of what child malnutrition actually means. Today, an invisible malnutrition touches the lives of approximately one quarter of the developing world's young children... (Grant, 1983).

It is both ironic and tragic that since we quoted the above paragraph, "the skin and bone image of the starving baby" has once again filled our TV screens, as we have become aware of the extent of the famine in Ethiopia and neighbouring Sudan. While such images are necessary in order to mobilize public generosity in a way which can mobilize immediate aid, it is ironic that because of this acute famine the other problem of nutrition — the sub-starvation of a quarter of the developing world's young children — is likely to continue unnoticed by the rich countries of Europe and North America. Nor is the more acute problem of visible starvation likely to diminish quickly. Besides Ethiopia, 23 African states need food aid (particularly those bordering on the Sahara) because of the combined effects of drought and economic recession. In the past year, five million children in Africa have died of malnutrition and disease.

The secretary of the U.N. Economic Commission for Africa described 1984 as a year of "unparalleled catastrophe" for Africa, the worst year since the 1930s (Adedeji, 1984). It is important to remember that the economic policies of the richer countries -including artificially high interest rates, high deficits related to huge expenditure on armaments, and tariffs against goods manufactured in poorer countries - all contribute to the poverty, sub-starvation and indeed the gross starvation of countries like Ethiopia. The price of the extreme prosperity of most Canadian children is the poverty, starvation and death of children elsewhere.

The U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization reported in November, 1984 that 150 million people in 23 African countries were "on the brink of starvation." Ethiopia is only a small part of this problem — here "only" 7 million people face death or permanent handicap through starvation (Twose, 1984).

Ethiopia is by no means unique in the world of hunger and starvation. The organization Earthscan (1984) observed that, "The basic cause of the famine in Ethiopia is the same as the cause of a recent famine in north-east Brazil, which threatened the lives of 24 million people and killed tens of thousands, but none in front of Western television cameras; and of famine which may overwhelm Bangladesh after the flood waters recede; and of the famine that threatens Sahei."

Oxfam, a major international charity, observes too that: "Something has gone terribly wrong with our world food system. More than enough food is being produced to feed the entire population of the planet, but the food is increasingly out of reach of the poor." The causes of famine, Oxfam argues, are fundamentally political and can be solved only through acts of political will in the developed nations (Twose, 1984).

The UNICEF annual survey (Grant, 1984) once again addresses the problem of sub-starvation and malnutrition which makes Third World children so vulnerable to diseases, much of it fatal. It is ironic, Grant says, that just as progress in techniques such as oral rehydration therapy (a simple combination of water, sugar and salt which saved the lives of half a million children in 1983) was beginning to take effect, a world recession has precipitated mass starvation when science is discovering how to strike a blow against the self-perpetuating cycle of poverty.

Indicators of the increasing world poverty are the 5 million children who died for want of a \$5.00 course of immunization against measles, diphtheria, whooping cough, tetanus, tuberculosis, and polio. The UNICEF report gives a number of examples of the increase in poverty, such as the decline in the average age-for-height ratio in areas of Zambia; the increase in low birthweights in Brazil; and the threefold increase in severe malnutrition among children in Costa Rica. Costa Rica is one of the most developed nations in Central America, and the increase in malnutrition is significantly greater in extremely poor countries in this region such as Haiti.

Solutions to these problems lie in large part with rich countries like Canada, which can work towards lower deficits, lower interest rates, equitable distribution of food resources, and a free trade system which allows developing countries full access to markets in developed countries. Canadian tariffs on goods such as clothing and footwear manufactured in Third World countries are, in our judgement, direct contributors to poverty and malnutrition in those countries.

In a previous annotation (Bagley, 1984) we pointed to an irony of developing such policies in Canada when a sector of the Canadian population — the aboriginal people — endure conditions of poverty, disease, malnutrition and early death which are similar to those in many Third World countries.

If Canada is to address the poverty of Third World children, it must address the poverty of some of its own children. The startling parallels with the South African situation are brought out in a recent article by Moosa (1984) on the health of children in South Africa. In that country there are large differences in health and mortality rates between white and black populations; the differences are uncomfortably similar to those reported in a comparison of white and aboriginal populations in Canada (DIAND, 1979). The problems of early death and child nutrition exist in Canada: yet we ignore this problem and focus, however imperfectly, outwards.

Christopher Bagley

## References

- Adedeji, A. (1984). Executive secretary of the U.N. Economic Commission for Africa, reported by Reuter, December 28, 1984.
- Bagley, C. (1984). State of the world's children. *Canadian Children: Journal of the Canadian Association for Young Children*, 9, 1-5.
- DIAND (1979). *Indian conditions: a survey*. Ottawa: Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.
- Earthscan (1984). *Famine in Africa and in the world*. London: Earthscan.
- Grant, J. (1983). *The state of the world's children 1982-1983*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Grant, J. (1984). *The state of the world's children 1984*. New York: United Nations International Children's Fund.
- Moosa, A. (1984, April 7). The health of children in South Africa: some food for thought. *The Lancet*, 779-782.
- Twose, N. (1984). *Cultivating hunger: An Oxfam study of food, power and poverty*. Oxford: Oxfam Publications.

## INFANT DAYCARE AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT

### Introduction

This annotation is based on testimony by Dr. Jay Belsky submitted on behalf of the American Psychological Association and the Association for the Advancement of Psychology to the United States House of Representatives Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, September 5, 1984, and reviews work to the present time on the psychological effects of daycare in the United States.

### Preamble

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, it is an honour and a pleasure to be invited to testify on behalf of the American Psychological Association and the Association for the Advancement of Psychology on the subject of infant daycare and child development. I would like to take this opportunity to commend the Select Committee for its commitment to improve the delivery of services to children in this country. While the professional associations I represent here today wholeheartedly endorse your ongoing child care initiative which involves conducting hearings to examine child care services and developing policy recommendations to Congress, the views expressed to this statement are my own.

I have conducted research and published numerous articles on infant social and emotional development. While I have not carried out my own research specifically on the effects of daycare on infant and early childhood development, I am a

recognized scholar of the daycare literature who has read and digested numerous studies conducted by my colleagues around the nation.

In 1978, and again in 1982 and 1984, I conducted an exhaustive review of the research on the effects of daycare on infant and early childhood development. I am pleased to report that over the course of this period two important changes took place in the research literature. First, the focus of research changed from university-based, high quality daycare to the kind of centre and home-based extrafamilial care typically available to families in communities throughout the nation. Second, increased attention was devoted to variation in daycare quality and to the conditions that characterize, and the consequences of, high and low quality care.

### Effects of Daycare

When we consider the effects of daycare, the research evidence is *compellingly consistent* in demonstrating that there is absolutely no adverse effect of out-of-home care, be it in centres or in families, on children's intellectual functioning. On the contrary, there is evidence which indicates that daycare, both during the infant and preschool years, is beneficial, particularly in the case of children from economically disadvantaged households.

When we turn our attention to emotional development, typically defined by the quality of the infant's emotional bond with his or her mother, the picture is somewhat different. Today I cannot conclude, as I did in 1978 and again in 1982, that the data show no apparent adverse effects of infant daycare. While it remains true that the majority of studies reveal only similarities between daycare and home-reared children, it is also true that a sufficient number of investigations have discerned differences to cause this reviewer some concern. Typically what is found is that daycare and home-reared infants greet their mother in the same manner following a brief, but often stressful, separation. When differences do emerge, however, between daycare and home-reared infants, they tend to indicate that the daycare infants are more likely to avoid contact with their mothers as compared to the home-reared infants who are more likely to greet and approach them.

While some interpret failure to approach and greet the mother as evidence of an insecure relationship, others contend that it merely reflects an alternate style of coping with this situation. Unfortunately, there is not consensus in my field as to whether such avoidance of the mother reflects some deficit or merely a difference in the nature of the child's relationship with his or her mother. Worth noting, however, is the fact that there are several other studies not focussed on attachment behaviour which suggest that daycare in the first or even second year of life may be related to later maladjustment on the part of the child during the preschool years.

In considering the select findings I have just summarized, it is absolutely imperative that we not lose sight of the fact that the results which distinguish daycare from home-reared children represent more the exception than the rule. Nevertheless, the fact that differences have emerged in a handful of studies requires that they not be completely overlooked at these hearings. While it would

be totally inappropriate for my words to be taken out of context so as to suggest that we ought to be alarmed about the effects of infant daycare or gravely fear what it is doing to our nation's children, it is important that the evidence presented be taken into careful consideration in discussions of infant daycare.

When we examine the effects of daycare on preschool children's social development, that is, their relations with peers and nonparental adults, the picture that emerges is complex. The data continue to indicate that preschoolers reared in daycare are more likely to engage in both positive and negative interactions with others than are their home-reared counterparts. That is, preschool children reared in daycare tend to be more cooperative and empathic, but at the same time they also tend to engage in more aggressive and disobedient behaviour. They simply seem more skilled at getting along in the social world, using both positive and negative strategies.

Whatever the effects of daycare may be, one thing is absolutely certain which we all must recognize — Daycare is here to stay. With more women in the work force than ever before, either for reasons of economic necessity or personal fulfillment, we must realize that supplementary child care, even in the opening years of life, is a necessity in the contemporary United States. Thus, the critical issue that confronts this nation's children and families, and thus this committee and the Congress at large charged with enacting legislation, is not should we support daycare but, rather, what kind of daycare will we have.

### Conditions of Quality

As I turn now to conditions of quality care, let me begin by pointing out that, like care in the family, all daycare is not alike. As a result, the effects of daycare, like family rearing, are not the same for all children. The effects of daycare, which I have just broadly summarized, actually depend on the quality of daycare. The data show very clearly that in centre and family daycare settings in which caregivers are affectionate, talkative, intellectually challenging, and emotionally responsive, children tend to develop well. These children are more intellectually engage, cooperate better with others, and are more persistent at tasks than those whose caregivers provide poorer quality care. The children receiving quality care also perform well on all sorts of evaluations of child functioning.

In view of these findings, we need to ensure that children receive quality care in centre and family daycare settings to promote their social, emotional, and cognitive development. According to the research literature, it is also clear that the beneficial consequences of daycare emerge when daycare groups are small to modest in size, when caregivers have specialized training in child care and child development and, in the care of infants, when staff-child ratios are not in excess of 1:4. These structural, easily regulated aspects of daycare tend to foster growth-promoting interactions between children and their caregivers on a day-to-day basis and, thereby, promote the long-term developmental best interests of children in daycare, their families and communities, and our society at large.

Jay Belsky,  
Department of Human Development,  
Pennsylvania State University

## IMPLICATIONS OF THE BADGLEY REPORT ON SEXUAL OFFENCES AGAINST CHILDREN FOR HEALTH CARE AND MEDICAL SERVICES IN MANITOBA

### Introduction

I am a family physician from Dauphin, Manitoba. Dauphin is a town of 9,000 people in the Parkland Region. My daily work brings me in contact with the Department of Health as I work part-time as a Medical Officer of Health for the province. I am a member of our community SCAN Team - S.C.A.N., meaning suspect child abuse and neglect. In the last few years I have been a member of the Provincial Advisory Committee on child abuse and participated in research on prevention of sexual abuse of children. The following observations are thus based on my experience, over the last ten years, as a physician working in the emergency department of Dauphin General Hospital, in the Dauphin Medical Clinic, and as a member of a team of community people working together to investigate and follow up abuse of children.

The Report on Sexual Offences against Children has important implications for health services in Manitoba. The areas of concern include: professional training, team work, sharing information, underreporting, self protection of children, and rural needs.

### Professional Training

There is a widely expressed need for an improvement in the content and quality of training programs for health workers in professional schools and on the job. Nurses, social workers, physicians (that is the field staff) are asking for further training in the area of sexual abuse and normal sexuality. This training should include the recognition of the signs and symptoms of sexual abuse, the use of protocols for investigation, the management of cases, awareness of community support systems, and long term therapy.

Established teams have difficulty working with physicians who have difficulty being an equal partner, rather than being in charge. Doctors face roadblocks that impede their full participation — this includes lack of training, fear of lawsuits, frustration with the inefficiency of court process.

We should co-ordinate health and social services, in such areas as sexually transmitted diseases of children. Issues of confidentiality will need to be carefully examined. Various government departments that have had different statistics for the same problem of sexual abuse, are beginning to look at a common definition of abuse and a unified reporting system.

We need to help children protect themselves. Family life classes in school are but one way of doing that. Awareness and self protection strategies need to be examined. There is a growing library of resource material for this purpose (films, video, plays, colouring books, booklets).

Cases of sexual abuse are frequently brought to physicians first. Yet this is where it is perceived that underreporting often occurs. The causes of this should

be examined. What are the reasons? How can it be overcome? How can early identification be improved?

Professionals working in rural areas outside of Winnipeg have repeatedly commented on the problems that further complicate their work. Rural difficulties include a wide geographical area, isolation, the dual involvement of provincial and federal workers in many cases, the closely knit fabric of many rural communities making confidential investigation difficult, cultural differences between clients and workers.

There has been an important shift in the role of doctors who are involved with child abuse protection teams or groups. This applies to doctors working in large teaching hospitals or small community hospitals. These physicians are seeing their areas of unique contribution or expertise narrow as more and more members of protection teams become skilled in various aspects of investigating and treating abuse. By this I mean that each team member becomes better able to perform many of the functions of other professionals. This loss of uniqueness can be very threatening to physicians. Working as a team member does not come easy for most doctors whose role traditionally is to be in charge. Recently there have been important changes in medical colleges; these students are learning more about the team role for physicians.

Another thing that is threatening to health professionals is lack of knowledge. Many front line physicians and nurses did not have the opportunity to learn, at medical or nursing school, the skills of investigating sexual assault. Almost none received preparation for taking evidence to court.

Yet, along with the police, physicians are seen by victims as the people to turn to for help. The Badgley Report has found evidence that "few of the child victims had been examined medically. None voluntarily sought out social workers, teachers, the clergy or community agencies immediately following the assaults. The victims either did not know about these services, or their personnel were not sufficiently trusted by children to confide their experiences to them." Thus at present only a small fraction of sexually abused children tell their story to someone who can help.

As the community will always need the help of doctors in investigating abuse of children, how can we increase the involvement of physicians who are needed but not available to communities? Another question I would like you to consider is, "How can we help doctors to participate as a team member?"

I would remind you of incidents that concern me greatly and highlight the need for physician involvement. In the recent past, youngsters who may have been sexually assaulted have arrived at community or regional hospitals to be told that the service of examination and investigation of rape or sexual assault is not done in that clinic or hospital. Society expects doctors to provide examination and care of these children.

These unfortunate injured children have been referred to other hospitals that have responded in the same way. The child is sent down the road to yet another hospital, and eventually help. And so I would repeat the question: how can we increase the involvement of physicians who are needed but not available to communities? We need centres of expertise — as many as possible — but not

just in large cities. These centres would be people and program based, rather than more buildings. The network exists now, it should be strengthened.

The Badgley Report is an outstanding document. It is child centred throughout. It has a very important overall conclusion: the problem of sexual abuse of children is extensive, there is inadequate protection. Let me expand on that.

I am very proud of the work of the Province of Manitoba in the areas of child protection. The field or line workers are supported by government. The protection teams in small and large communities are supported by government. But, even in this milieu of concern we find sexually transmitted disease statistics not synchronized with child protection reports. As an example: in 1981 the Department of Health received over 400 reports of gonorrhoea in children. That same year child protection services for the Province reported about 100 cases of child sexual abuse. What does this mean? Perhaps you could consider the following two questions — what has happened to those 300 cases of gonorrhoea in children that have not come to the attention of child protection services? What are other provinces, facing the same problem, doing about it? The rights of children for protection against abuse should be the norm. What are we doing to promote this?

The Badgley Report cites the need for minimal standards of investigation across Canada. This is vital. We will need interprovincial co-operation, something we have here today. I would like to return to an earlier statement I made.

We need centres of expertise — as many as possible — but not just in large cities. Before we do that let us look at the issue of child protection in rural town, remote communities, and native communities. There are many issues here that are different. Let us learn about this and then ask ourselves, how can we help these communities to develop the skills and resources to protect children? Let us keep in mind the mental health issues as we discuss these topics. Help for the victim and offender are offered in a society that looks to the future and the well-being of the next generation. Urban centres, with considerably more resources, are beginning to offer therapy for the victim and offender. Very few resources exist for the same problem in rural communities. We need to strengthen our rural mental health resources.

Lastly, I would like to speak about the issue of family life classes, or as some would call them “family planning.” There is a willingness now to discuss sexual abuse of children. More and more communities are using educational resources to discuss this topic with parents, school boards, teachers, and school children. Surprisingly we are reluctant to discuss as openly, normal family life matters. This has been expressed by one school board member who said “I’m relieved to hear you have come to talk about sexual abuse. I was worried you were going to talk about family life classes.” As a community, how can we promote normal relationships in families, and in effect, promote primary prevention of sexual abuse of children?

In summary, Manitoba has taken the lead in many areas of this investigation and treatment of sexual abuse of children. Yet much remains to be done or improved. Within this room is the energy, the knowledge, and skills to move mountains. We have that mountain of child abuse in front of us.

Let us work together.

(Based on an address to a one-day conference on the implications of the Badgley Report, held in Winnipeg, in October, 1984.)

Eric Sigurdson,  
Medical Officer of Health,  
Dauphin, Manitoba.

## Articles

### **PROVIDING GOOD DAYCARE: THE ROLE OF EMPLOYERS, UNIONS AND THE PRIVATE SECTOR**

Kathleen Mahoney,  
Faculty of Law,  
University of Calgary

#### **ABSTRACT**

In this paper various aspects of daycare policy are documented, including daycare related to employment, workplace daycare, employer provisions for daycare, union involvement in daycare, and the costs and quality of daycare for both private and profit-run centres. It is concluded that the need for subsidized, quality daycare greatly outstrips the demand; the provision of profit-run centres is not the answer to this problem. The diverse needs of working parents and their children must be met by a multi-faceted approach that emphasizes a flexible approach, including employer and union subsidized daycare, and government subsidy and tax support for much-needed quality daycares.

#### **Introduction**

In this paper, which is condensed from a much longer document on "Daycare and Equality in Canada" (Mahoney, 1984a), we examine the involvement of employers, unions and the commercial sector in daycare for the children of working women in relation to overall government policy on day care. We have argued that daycare involves three very important, interlocking functions: social service, educational and economic. When one or more of these functions is ignored, any daycare service is seriously deficient. Daycare can and should be a social service for working parents; at the same time, that care should be of high quality, and meet the cognitive and emotional needs of children. Daycare has economic value for both employers and government, and adequate subsidy for good daycare, accessible to all, should be provided (Mahoney, 1984b).

#### **Employer Involvement in Daycare**

Employers are also beneficiaries of the efforts of working women. The Ontario Advisory Council on Daycare recommended that employers in Ontario be encouraged and stimulated to become involved in the provision of daycare. The Council stated that contributions toward daycare costs by business and industry have

not been forthcoming, yet it is they who benefit most from having daycare available to their employees (Ontario Council, 1976).

### *Work Related Daycare*

The definition of work related daycare varies, but two elements are common to any definition — the employee's need for child care arrangements, and the employer's involvement in providing this needed service. A third element may include the involvement of a labour group in the provision of daycare.

"Involvement" might mean establishment of daycare centres at or near the place of work, complete or partial subsidies by business or labour groups, cash allowances to employees with children or counselling services to provide information, support or guidance to working parents.

Employers become involved in work related daycare for a variety of reasons which include both self-interest and good corporate citizenship. Reasons of self-interest usually have to do with control of high turnover rates, recruitment, absenteeism and lateness.

The premise that industry is indebted to the community supports the idea of employer supported daycare as part of good corporate citizenship. The programs motivated by this obligation address larger social issues of education and the prevention of social problems, and usually result in joint company-community efforts which go beyond servicing employees needs, providing programs open to the community as well.

Another rationale employers may have is consideration for the employee. Some employers such as the U.S. Department of Labour may open a daycare centre with the intent of providing a service for mothers being trained for employment. Other programs may be implemented with the view of developmental advantages that derive to the child. These educational and social benefits to society are difficult to measure but the expectation is that welfare roles are reduced and a greater contribution is made to the economy as a whole when quality daycare is provided (Bureau of Research, 1981). Some employers may also provide daycare services as research demonstrated projects, focusing on child development and providing a developmental curriculum.

This paper will review the various models of work related daycare which have been or are being used in Canada and in the United States. The benefits obtainable will be discussed as well as the advantages and disadvantages, and the role that work related daycare can play in the present situation of unmet needs.

#### a) *Workplace Daycare*

Workplace daycare is a much narrower concept than work related daycare. It is used to describe a centre located at the same site or in the same building as the employees' workplace. The concept of workplace or on-site daycare as permanent service to employees is a relatively new one in Canada.

In a recent study conducted by the Social Planning Council of Toronto, 38 workplace daycare centres were surveyed and it was found that 71 percent of them had been in operation for 5 years or less (Workplace Research Group,

1982). By far the largest number of employers involved in workplace daycare in Canada are hospitals and health centres. Fifty percent of the centres in the survey had such application but recently other employers have begun to consider the feasibility of providing the service to employees. In Alberta for example, a number of shopping malls have considered workplace daycare, as have a number of large companies in Calgary such as Trizec Corporation, Petro-Canada Corporation and Imperial Oil.

The advantages of on-site daycare are many. It meets needs other daycare centres do not. For example, daycare unrelated to the workplace does not recognize shifts, weekends and holidays for which many workers must have child care; it permits contact between parent and child during the working day, a particularly significant advantage for nursing mothers; and it shortens travelling time to and from work. Effect on travelling time becomes a major advantage of daycare if other centres are located outside the community in which the parent lives or works. When the employer subsidizes workplace daycare for operating or capital costs, then it also becomes a financial advantage to the working parent. This aspect is becoming increasingly important as inflation causes daycare costs, especially wages of daycare workers, to rise each year. At the present time, most daycare centres are accessible only to the poor who receive income subsidies, or for the upper income groups who can afford to pay ever-increasing fees. A 1979 survey on daycare costs reported:

... an expressed preference among parents of virtually all classes and ethnic background, for supervised and licensed group care for pre-school children.... under existing market conditions, only those parents at the top and the bottom extremes of the income scale can utilize this mode of child care (Social Planning Council, 1979).

The primary disadvantage of workplace daycare is location. Environmental hazards such as pollution and transportation problems in urban areas are cited as the main drawback (Bureau of Research, 1981). In places such as universities, health centres, hospitals, government offices and service industries where these drawbacks normally do not exist, workplace daycare functions well (Social Planning Council, 1979).

Another disadvantage is cost. If the employer chooses not to contribute to operating costs, fees to parents are often prohibitive even though employer sponsored child care centres reduce costs to parents when compared to costs to alternate centres (Department of Labor, 1980). It is not uncommon today for parents to pay \$100.00 per week per child for on-site employer sponsored daycare (Ministry of Labour, 1983).

Some research indicates that employers should be happy to provide on-site daycare to their employees if for no other reason than self-interest. In 1980, the Women's Bureau of the U.S. Department of Labor reported the results of a nation-wide survey of employer-sponsored child care centres (Department of Labor, 1980). One of the issues examined was whether or not any benefits accrued to employers from their sponsorship of daycare centres and if so, identification of those benefits.

The results of the survey indicated that many benefits resulted from the child care centres. Those mentioned by the employers surveyed included: increased

ability to attract employees, lower absenteeism, improved employee attitude toward work, favourable publicity to employer, lower job turnover rate and improved community relations (Colorado Symposium, 1973). This was in contrast to an earlier study (AT&T, 1977). From 1971-1974, American Telephone and Telegraph Company operated daycare centres at two of its locations, Washington D.C., and Columbus, Ohio. The purpose of the AT&T study was to determine whether or not industry-run daycare centres in large urban settings were viable. The questions posed were whether or not the centres could help retain good employees needing daycare for their 2- to 6-year-olds; whether qualified mothers could be attracted to work if their child care needs were met; and if daycare costs could be balanced by savings in labour force turnover, hiring and training costs.

Longitudinal research was conducted over a period of months among the experimental group of parents using two centres provided by the employer and a matched control group of non-users. The employer paid for half the cost of the service. The findings were:

- (1) lateness could be reduced by provision of on-site daycare as compared to the control group, but lateness was not a major cost to the employer;
- (2) absenteeism was higher among parents using the centre. The reason was that the daycare mothers had no other resources lined up for when children became ill, unlike control mothers. Consequently, they stayed home when children became ill;
- (3) there was no saving to the Company on hiring and training costs because there were no significant differences in turnover rates between the two groups;
- (4) the company was unable to ascertain whether or not recruitment was beneficially affected by provision of daycare;
- (5) the centres were under-used, averaging 65-70 percent occupancy.

It is probably unsafe to generalize the experience of AT&T to other employer-sponsored daycare programs because of the sharp restrictions of its applicability. The centres were both located in large-city environments with substantial home-to-work travelling involved. Even though the employer subsidized 50 percent of the cost it was an expensive program because it was aimed at working parents rather than welfare parents and was thus ineligible for federal daycare funding in the U.S. It was also education-oriented rather than custodial. The absenteeism factor would have been eliminated if back up resources such as a sick bay were made available to the centre when children became ill. The recruitment benefit would be extremely difficult to ascertain in the AT&T study because of the short period of time over which the study was conducted.

The University of Minnesota found quite different results on the absenteeism question (Colorado Symposium, 1973). Absenteeism was compared before and after employees began to use a daycare facility provided by their employer. It was found that the absenteeism of parent workers with children in the daycare facility was reduced by 21.4 percent. The study also found that the monthly turnover rate was 6.2 percent for employees not using the centre while the rate for those using it was only 2.3 percent, thus saving the employers significantly in so far as the costs incurred in retraining personnel were concerned.

The Hester How Daycare Center in Toronto City Hall, an employer subsidized project, has verified similar employee and employer benefits.

In a study undertaken by the New Jersey Bell Telephone Company in Newark, New Jersey, it was found that close to 40 percent of the employees who resigned in 1967 did so because they did not have adequate child care. The same study reported that Rochester Clothes Inc., of New Bedford, Massachusetts, recorded a drop in absenteeism from 12 percent to 3 percent when a daycare centre was established on their premises in 1965.

Some of the on-site daycare facilities started in the U.S. in the 1960s and early 70s have since closed, citing cost as the chief reason. Since that time, governments in the U.S. and Canada have provided more help to employers. Employer contribution in capital expenditures may be amortized and financial contributions toward start-up costs of any non-profit daycare centre are now eligible for government funding. An employer may also establish a non-profit daycare centre as a charitable organization as long as it is not for the exclusive use of children of employees. If open to participation for the entire community, the employer not only reaps the benefit of a tax write-off but also all the intangible benefits good corporate citizenship brings.

#### b) *Employer Provided Employee Benefit Packages*

At any level of employment, from the blue collar worker to the executive, employee fringe benefits can form a substantial portion of remuneration for work done. If an employee can acquire a benefit by having its cost added to his/her income as a taxable benefit rather than paying for the benefit out of disposable income, a very real impact is felt on earnings. Thus, employer provided employee benefit packages which address child care needs are another approach to daycare which should be examined.

There is a number of different ways the employer can provide child care benefits to employees. One way is to provide a direct subsidy to cover the cost or to assist the employee in purchasing the benefit. Alternatively, the employer can pay for the benefit and pay the employee less salary. A third option would be for the employer to pay for the benefit without reducing the employee's salary. In terms of daycare services, these benefits may take the form of the purchase of spaces for employee use in existing centres; the provision of vouchers to the employee to go toward the purchase of child care services; or provision of monthly child care allowances to employees with children. For subsidies to be equitably distributed the employer may have to take into account numbers and ages of children and income levels.

An example where the subsidy approach has been adopted is at the Y.W.C.A. in Toronto. In 1976, the C.U.P.E. local negotiated a subsidy of \$15.00 per month for employees with children in daycare. The clause was recently renegotiated to \$30.00 per month to include children up to 9 years of age.

The value of the economic benefit of the subsidy varies greatly depending upon whether or not the benefit is taxable. Section 6 of the *Income Tax Act* appears to characterize daycare as a taxable benefit to the employee if it is provided by, or supported by, the employer. The argument can be made however, that employer-provided daycare qualifies as a non-taxable fringe bene-

fit fitting the exceptions to the very widely stated rule in Section 6 (1) (a). It may be argued that regardless of the fact that the opening words of Section 6 (1) (a) are extremely wide and *prima facie* make any benefit received by the taxpayer taxable, the "benefit" of daycare is neither "received nor enjoyed" by the taxpayer. Rather, daycare is a service expense a parent must incur in order to earn an income and that in addition to being a service to working parents, child care provides a service to employers and thus benefits the economy of the country. An analogous situation to provision of daycare for working parents is an employee's use of a company car. As long as the car is used for business purposes only, the benefit is not taxable. As the taxpayer does not receive daycare service as a personal enjoyment or benefit, he/she should not be taxed for it either. The *Arsens* case may be authority supporting this argument. In that case, employees were required to make a business trip to Disneyland. Even though the destination had a connotation of "enjoyment" because of its popularity as a holiday resort, the Tax Appeal Board found that the employees received no benefit from the trip because it was initiated at the direction of the employer, for business purposes.

It may be overly optimistic to assume that courts or tax appeal boards will adopt such a benevolent attitude towards employer provided daycare benefits, but even if the employer provided or supported daycare is categorized as a taxable benefit to the employee, it is still more beneficial to the employee to have the employer provide it rather than purchase the service in the marketplace. The key to this saving is understanding the difference between before and after tax dollars.

It may be somewhat optimistic in addition to expect that an employer will voluntarily absorb the full cost of providing daycare services for its employees. It may also be undesirable for the employer to have full control over the child care of its employees. Unions quite commonly are suspicious of workplace daycare solely run by the employer. The Ontario Federation of Labour holds the position that employer-run workplace daycare is often motivated by the need to keep female workers in a company where the wages are low and working conditions are poor. They fear trade-offs between daycare facilities and pay or other benefits and feel employer provided daycare could put parents in a subtle ransom position during potential strike situations. Parents and unions, in their view should have control over quality care (Ontario Federation, 1975).

A more realistic and practical alternative may be for employees to negotiate a partial deduction in salary or agree to forego increases in return for daycare facilities which they would administer. The most equitable way of dealing with daycare expenses is probably somewhere near this middle ground. For example, a \$1,500.00 reduction in salary is still more advantageous to an employee than no reduction in salary but a fixed cost from earned income of \$3,750.00 for daycare services.

There is one other problem with compensation and benefit packages. Often these packages do not take into account the fact that two spouses are working, and hence they unnecessarily double up on benefits such as extended health care, dental care and family insurance coverage.

After randomly checking with employers in Calgary, it appears that in a number of cases there is a double coverage or overlapping coverage when both

spouses work. Where employers make an effort to discover if coverage is in place through a spouse plan, the benefit is most often simply dropped from the other spouse's benefit package.

One solution to this problem is for employees to check what benefits their spouse has and if there is double coverage, negotiate a cash settlement or placement of the benefit elsewhere, such as a daycare subsidy. Some employers have instituted "cafeteria" benefit plans in order to achieve an equal benefit system. Rather than providing workers with a limited number of benefits, some of which may be inappropriate to meet his or her needs, the employer instead offers a range of benefits. These may include employer payment for child care, legal insurance, dental insurance, days off on school holidays or house or car insurance.

If employers are unable to financially support daycare for their employees, there are other less costly contributions they can make to indicate their sense of social responsibility and awareness of work pressures on children of employees. Counselling and referral services are offered by some employers to inform their employees about daycare availability and cost. Some maintain a registry of daycare services and find and train babysitters willing to care for employees' children. If non-profit referral services already exist, they provide an excellent means for corporate support.

### c) *Flexible Hours and Part-time Work*

Perhaps the greatest source of assistance employers can offer to working parents, is flexible working hours. This benefit can often be offered without any substantial cost to the employer and warrants further exploration and development because in some instances it may provide an alternative to daycare services. Working husbands and wives could share the caring responsibility for their children if they worked different portions of the day. Another alternative deserving of consideration is the splitting of full-time jobs into part-time jobs without loss of benefits. This would have the effect of reducing demand for daycare services yet allowing parents to maintain their jobs.

### *Union Enterprises*

In addition to their role as bargainer for direct negotiated benefits for child care, unions can also play as equally an important role as the employer in the establishment of child care services for their membership.

In the United States there are unions which entirely operate and administer daycare centres. For example, the Regional Joint Boards of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America in the Chicago and Baltimore areas run six centres. Financing is obtained from employer contributions to the union health and welfare fund, which are tax deductible, and small fees in some cases are contributed by users (Women's Bureau, 1981). In 1972 the British Columbia Government Employees' Union initiated and operated a daycare centre in Victoria.

Alternatively, unions and employers may wish to jointly sponsor a daycare facility or in some situations, a better approach may be for unions to join forces with other unions in providing daycare service near, rather than at the workplace.

Many of the "on-site" advantages would still exist and a wider segment of the community would be served. This approach would be more practical where there are not sufficient numbers of parents with children requiring daycare on one job site to warrant implementing the service.

Some unions are in favour of on-site daycare. In its 1980 statement on daycare, the Ontario Federation of Labour reiterated its 1972 position paper which recommends that the Government of Ontario "promote the establishing of daycare centres at places of work. In new plants every effort should be made to have facilities planned and built in." (Ontario Federation, 1972).

*Negotiating Family Benefits*

If provision of the service is impractical in the circumstances, negotiating with the employer to purchase spaces in existing centres in the community may be the preferred option. This was done by Manulife in Toronto. The employer donated \$12,000 to a nearby centre which used the money for renovations to expand their service. In return for the donation, the employees of Manulife were given priority at the centre (Ontario Federation, 1972). The C.U.P.E. Local 2189 is a good example of the success that can be achieved in bargaining for family life benefits. Employer provision of a monthly subsidy to assist employees purchase child care, provisions such as cumulative sick leave to care for sick family members, maternity leave of six months, a provision for paternity leave and reimbursement of reasonable expenses for child care when working unusual hours, have all been successfully negotiated.

There is no question that collective agreements are a valuable tool for women seeking parental benefits from employers. They give employees the ability to acquire benefits over and above those available through legislation. In a recent survey of provisions in collective agreements in Canada, it was found that 71.4 percent of the maternity leave provisions negotiated exceeded legislative limits. The greatest number, 617 agreements affecting 792,242 employees, provide at least six months maternity leave.

A plan negotiated in Quebec covering 200,000 public sector workers includes the right to two years' unpaid maternity and paternity leave, during which seniority continues to accrue and fringe benefits can be maintained if the employee elects to pay for them (Labour Canada, 1982). In the private sector, the Steelworkers Local 7024 recently instituted two weeks of paid leave to care for their families upon the hospitalization of their spouse for maternity needs or other reasons. These breakthroughs may indicate trends for future negotiations. However, it must be remembered that the right to bargain collectively is not available to thousands of Canadian mothers who are employed as waitresses, sales clerks and domestic employees. Only 24 percent of women in Canada are unionized.

*Union Lobby*

In addition to negotiating for or providing daycare services as described above, unions are also a powerful lobby at all levels and can use their organizations to lobby governments to initiate child care research and provide funding or tax incentives for better child care. Unions can also play a very major edu-

cational role in the community. Within their own organizations they can insure daycare is provided so that members with children can attend meetings. They can also ensure that child care becomes an important labour issue by including child care as a bargaining goal.

**Business Involvement**

*The Commercial Daycare Centre*

The predominant method of delivery of daycare in Canada today is the provision of daycare service in return for a fee paid by the parent(s) of the children to a profit-making daycare enterprise. A national study on daycare conducted by the Canadian Council on Social Development in 1972 found that three out of four daycare centres and more than 50 percent of nursery schools were privately operated (CCSD, 1972). In 1979, the Ministry of National Health and Welfare reviewed and updated the study and found that commercial daycare increased by 28.3 percent over the previous year's spaces while growth in the licensed, subsidized sector increased by only 4.8 percent. In Ontario and Alberta, municipally operated daycare decreased by 38.7 percent in available spaces.

Business people have a very different attitude to daycare than most other groups. Rather than focusing on children's or parents' needs, the point of concern is above all, cost. A representative of Ohio Bell Telephone, involved in the establishment of a workplace daycare for the use of employees is attributed with the following statement:

We want to be sure... that we're at least not harming the children. A positive effect on the children is a nice fringe benefit. But let me restate that the whole purpose of these programs is to determine whether industrial child care saves us money in the areas of hiring, training, absenteeism, tardiness and attitude (Cohen, 1973).

Proponents of quality care for children are alarmed at such statements. They feel that where money and profit are the central concerns the quality of care is likely to suffer. Those who propose universal daycare would eliminate public funding of commercial centres altogether. It is their view that commercial centres cannot maintain the quality of care required for adequate daycare. The need to make a profit results in low wages for underqualified workers, high turnover rates and consequent poor care for children. The quality of service in commercial daycare has been questioned by politicians as well, as more American commercial chain operations moved into Canada.

Whatever the fears of daycare advocates, the commercial centres are fulfilling a need for daycare and are a financial success. They provide an alternative and cheaper source of daycare for middle income parents who want their children in group-care facilities but can neither afford the rates nor gain access to non-profit centres. More government regulated spaces are needed merely to catch up with existing need. In 1975, Phillip Hepworth reported that the deficiency of daycare facilities was enormous. At that time, there was an immediate demand for more than 200,000 full-time daycare spaces.

In Quebec there exists only one space in daycare centres for every 10 children 0 to 6 years of age who requires such a service. Over the past 7 years an average of 1,400 new spaces were created annually but the need requirements are for 3,600 new spaces annually. In the year 1981-82, more spaces were developed in commercial centres (444) than in non-profit centres (400). In 1982-83 no government funds were earmarked for development of new spaces and inadequate funding for existing spaces has caused many centres to shut down (Pitre-Robin, 1982).

### Costs

Costs of daycare range widely, depending on the type of service selected. Daycare is offered in private non-profit, profit, public and cooperative ventures. There are full-day, part-time, after school and drop-in services. Depending upon which province the daycare is located, provincial subsidies may be available to defray operating costs but subsidies and standards do not apply to the private, informal child care arrangements.

In 1970, the operational costs for good daycare in a group centre amounted to approximately \$4.60 per child per day (Clifford, 1970). Today, these costs range from \$30.00 to \$56.00 per child per day. Clearly costs are rising much faster than the salaries of working parents. An attempt will be made here to give a sampling of the costs of a variety of services currently available.

### The Non-Profit Centre Example

The daycare centre at the University of Calgary is a non-profit centre offering a high quality daycare service. Licensed daycare centres in Alberta are entitled to claim a monthly operating allowance for each child who attends for a minimum of 84 hours during the month. The amount of the allowance varies according to the age of the child. As of September, 1983, the actual cost of providing daycare per child per month in the daycare centre and the parent cost was as follows:

AGE OF CHILD	ACTUAL COST PER MONTH	PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT OPERATING GRANTS AVAILABLE TO ALL	COST TO PARENT
0-18 months	\$565.00	\$257.00	\$308.00
19 months - 35 months	\$439.00	\$131.00	\$308.00
3 - 4 years	\$386.50	\$78.50	\$308.00
5 years	\$373.00	\$65.00	\$308.00

Lighting, heating and security are provided free of charge by the University as are the record and bookkeeping tasks. Use of the premises is provided rent free.

### The Commercial Centre Example

The Kindercare chain of daycare centres in the Calgary area charge parents \$250.00 per month for daycare depending on the age of the child. This is \$58.00 to \$33.00 less per month than parents pay who have children at the University daycare. The Kindercare centres are licensed, so they receive the same subsidies as the University centre but unlike the University centre, must pay utilities and property costs.

Fifteen workers are employed at the University daycare centre to care for 65 children. This ratio conforms to the Alberta minimum standards which are also met by the Kindercare centres. The same commercial centres in addition to offering significantly lower fees, are also making profits. In 1981, shareholders in the Kindercare chain were paid an estimated 87 cents per share dividend (Kidd, 1981). The University daycare centre does not make a profit and operates on a balanced budget.

The major difference between the University daycare centre and the private centre is in wages paid to employees. Kindercare pays its staff on an hourly basis, the range being \$4.35 to \$6.00 per hour, or \$696.00 to \$960.00 per month. Within this range are two overlapping pay scales for junior and senior workers. No formal training is required for employment but on the job training is provided. The employer also has a training incentive program which pays 50 percent of the cost of further education in an early childhood care program leading to a certificate or diploma. Once a certificate or diploma is achieved, the employee automatically moves into the higher wage scale.

The wage scale at the University daycare centre on the other hand, ranges from \$1,100.00 per month for junior inexperienced personnel to \$1,940.00 per month for senior program supervisors. At the University centre all employees must be qualified daycare workers or have experience in the field and be in the process of achieving accreditation. As might be expected, the staff at the University centre tends to be stable and the majority of employees are in the experienced or senior category whereas the commercial centre has a high turnover rate and most workers are at the junior level.

As continuity of care is a very important part of a high quality program, it is difficult to maintain high standards with poor wages. In 1979, a study conducted in Toronto revealed that a turnover rate of 50 percent existed in city daycare centres (SPCMT, 1980).

### Non-Profit Workplace Daycare in Ontario

Even though the cost at the daycare centre at the University of Calgary is significantly higher when compared to the cost at the Kindercare centre, it is moderate when compared to other non-profit centres in Ontario. A recent study by the Women's Bureau (1983) on non-profit workplace daycare revealed that costs to parents ranged from \$220.00 per month to \$420.00 per month. All of the eight centres surveyed expected operating costs to be covered by fees. Many of the employers provided non-refundable capital finding and some contributed toward maintenance, renovations and rent but contributions by employers do not seem to have any correlation on the fees payable by the parents. For example, the Mutual Life Assurance Company in West

a centre in 1982. Operating costs which reflect the cost of running the centre are paid by fees. Capital costs were originally paid by the company but they are to be repaid by the daycare centre over the next few years. The daycare centre is also responsible for maintenance and rent as well as salaries and food. The fees in January, 1984 were \$65.00 per week, or \$260.00 per month.

Sunburst Children's Centre, at Environment Canada in Downsview, Ontario, on the other hand, requires that day-to-day operations, salaries and equipment be paid by user fees, but provided a grant of \$12,000 to cover initial equipment cost and free renovations. The facility is rent-free and maintenance is free, yet the fees range from \$287.04 per month to \$351.68 per month, depending on the age of the child.

The most expensive centre in the survey is the Sunnybrook Creche in Toronto. Grants and an interest free loan provided start-up costs and the creche is self-supporting as all operating costs are paid by user fees and donations. The fees range from \$300.00 per month to \$420.00 per month depending on the child's age. These fees are significantly higher than those at the University of Calgary and yet the University salaries of daycare workers were high when compared to other provincial averages which range from a low of \$677.00 per month in P.E.I. to \$883.00 in Nova Scotia.

#### *Informal Arrangements*

Informal in-home care is not subsidized by any level of government. The cost for typical informal or home-care arrangements in Calgary, according to our survey, range from being free to an average of \$200.00 per month or \$2400.00 annually. A more formalized arrangement with a live-in babysitter will cost in the range of \$469.00 (the minimum monthly wage) to \$700.00 per month, plus room and board. This salary is based on a forty-five hour week with two weeks paid vacation and all statutory holidays. The babysitter must also have a private room. Agencies charge placement fees ranging from \$250.00 to \$600.00 and usually provide a guarantee which can range from two months to one year.

Parents who hire a worker to come into their homes to provide daycare cannot deduct his/her salary as a cost of doing business and earning an income like other employers can. Rather, they are restricted to the child care deduction. This inequity in allowable deductions is an issue which should be addressed in addition to the other reforms suggested under the Income Tax Act.

#### *Cost Consequences*

Many working parents find the assessed fees at group centres or the cost of a live-in sitter to be prohibitive. Daycare fees often amount to more than the cost of tuition at most major colleges and universities. As a result, parents often choose inferior daycare or babysitting arrangements. Costs are kept low at poor quality daycare centres by paying low or minimum wages, hiring unqualified personnel without offering in-service or further education incentives and by purchasing inferior quality food and equipment for the children. Researchers have found that informal babysitting arrangements are often mediocre, sometimes neglectful and perhaps even abusive (Johnson and Deneen, 1981). The

children of parents able to afford the higher costs of the better daycare on the other hand, enjoy the advantages of continuity of care because of low staff turnover, superior educational opportunities because of professionally trained staff and high quality equipment and nutritionally superior nourishment because of better quality meals.

In 1982, licensed daycare centres in Canada provided only 90,000 spaces for children of working mothers, yet over 3,000,000 children in Canada require alternative care arrangements while their parents work (Health and Welfare, 1982). In other words, licensed, supervised care is available to only 3 percent of the children even though research indicates most parents prefer group daycare to other kinds of child care arrangements (Averbuch and Rivaldo, 1975).

The criticism of this alternative is its expense. Its proponents acknowledge that daycare facilities would have to expand ten-fold in order to make them widely accessible to the children of working parents and would have to be subsidized to a very high level to meet the needs of the people who require it the most.

#### **Conclusion**

Daycare involves three very important functions, all of which must be considered when provision of the service, in any of its many forms, is contemplated. The three interlocking functions are social service, educational and economic. When one or more of these function is ignored, the provision of the service is often seriously deficient.

The social service aspect of daycare recognizes the public interest and requires that socially acceptable standards be observed in the care of children. Minimum standards for licencing group daycare centres are legislated across Canada and offer a basic level of protection for children. Where their needs have not been officially addressed, however, is in the private, informal care arrangements the majority of working parents in Canada choose for their children.

The educational function of daycare requires that the qualification and training of daycare workers be of a high standard and that the equipment and care have educational value. It also requires continuity in employment of care givers. This function is often given priority over the social services function by commercial and informal care givers. It results from an emphasis being placed on custodial care rather than on the developmental aspects of child care.

The economic functions of daycare must address two sets of needs: those of the parents, and those of the economy. Clearly, parents benefit from working. Even those whose income is small and who receive little economic benefit, benefit in terms of self-respect. The benefit or contribution of working parents to the economy must also be considered.

It is apparent that lack of adequate daycare has not kept women from working. On the contrary, women are in the workforce in greater numbers than ever before which must reflect a demand for their skills.

The question of whether or not working women (the prime nurturers of children) could contribute more to the economy if daycare better served their needs

seems to be answered in the affirmative whenever the issue is examined. Lack of flexible, high quality care for children is a barrier to advancement and opportunity in the workplace for the parent(s) because without it they cannot fully participate in activities which could allow them to advance or obtain better jobs.

Balanced against the contribution or potential contribution of working parents of children in daycare, the cost to society of providing the services must be considered. Cost-benefit studies of daycare in Canada are lacking but even if they were available, it is doubtful whether a study could reflect the personal, psychological and political factors which have a bearing on the issue. Certainly in economic terms, the cost of good daycare is high but if these services did not exist, it is unlikely society would experience an economic gain. Without daycare, the economy would lose the contribution of the working parents and costs of social assistance would go up. Another benefit factor difficult to measure is the preventative social service and education function that good daycare provides which can best be regarded as an investment in the future.

Universal, free government sponsored daycare is an attractive solution to the daycare problems in Canada. However, it is not a realistic alternative in the writer's view, in the current economic climate. Consequently, the next best alternative must be pursued which is the involvement of all the stakeholders in adequate daycare making a contribution towards its implementation and operation. Governments, employers, union representatives and parents must collaborate to establish a framework of goals which reflect benefits and services of adequate daycare and remove barriers to equality for women and segregation by socio-economic groups for children.

This process should be entered into voluntarily but the government should employ persuasive techniques such as greater tax incentives to employers to encourage participation in provision of daycare and equitable universal subsidies to allow more parents access to quality care at lower prices. Government should also make employer assisted child care a non-taxable benefit for employees and at the same time, adjust the tax credit system by increasing the tax credit for lower income parents. Money for this scheme could be obtained by abolishing the normal tax deduction for children as long as they are of daycare or after school care age. An alternative to adjusting the tax credit system and abolishing normal deductions for children is to increase the value of deductions for children as income decreases. This would have the same effect of assisting those in the lower income brackets by giving them more disposable income.

Government should also take on the responsibility of disseminating accurate information about the availability, cost and quality of daycare so that parents could make intelligent decisions when choosing daycare for their children.

The concept of shared responsibility for children's care between father and mother should be reflected in any new legislation. Commercial daycare and informal babysitting arrangements, although filling an important need, should not be encouraged through tax concessions or subsidies unless a higher standard can be guaranteed through either prerequisite controls or through contract compliance where applicable. Compliance with higher standards could also be achieved through a program if government assurances on loans for start-up costs

Employers should be encouraged to explore ideas such as part-time work and job sharing, the four-day work week, flexible work hours, and extended parental leave to reduce demand for daycare services.

If a multi-facted approach is adopted, a continual evaluation procedure must be established to ensure adaptiveness to changing needs of all concerned. By approaching the daycare issue this way, the diverse needs of working parents and organizations that employ them are recognized as well as the social, economic and political uncertainties of the present time.

### References

- AT&T (1977). *Two experimental daycare centres*. New York: Work in America Institute.
- Bureau of Research (1981). *Work related daycare - helping to close the gap*. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Municipal Research and Civic Affairs.
- CCSD (1972). *Daycare: Report of a national study*. Toronto: Canadian Council on Social Development.
- Clifford, H. (1970). *Daycare: An investment in people: A background paper*. Ottawa: Office of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women.
- Cohen, M. (1973). *Cuz there ain't no daycare (or almost none): A book about daycare in B.C.* Vancouver: Press Gang Publishers.
- Colorado Symposium (1973). *Fantasies of industry related child care: proceedings of a symposium*. Denver: University of Colorado Medical Centre.
- Department of Labor (1980). *Child care centers sponsored by employers and labor unions in the United States*. Washington, D.C.: Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor.
- Health and Welfare (1982). *Information bulletin*. Ottawa: National Daycare Information Centre.
- Johnson, L. and Deneen, J. (1981). *The kin trade*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill.
- Hepworth, P. (1975). *600,000 children: report of a survey of day care needs in Canada*. Ottawa: Canadian Council on Social Development.
- Kidd, J. (1981, December 7). Caring for little children. *McLean's Magazine*, p. 70.
- Labour Canada (1982). *Provisions in collective agreements in Canada covering 200 and more employees*. Ottawa: Labour Canada.
- Mahoney, M. (1984a). *Daycare and equality in Canada*. Paper submitted to the Royal Commission of Inquiry on Equality in Employment.
- Mahoney, M. (1984b). Supporting better daycare: The role of government. *Journal of Child Care*, 2, 1-20.
- Ministry of Labour (1983). *Inventory of workplace daycare*. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Labour.
- Ontario Council (1976). *Final report*. Toronto: Ontario Advisory Council on Daycare and the Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services.
- Ontario Federation (1972). *Position paper on daycare*. Toronto: Ontario Federation of Labour.
- Ontario Federation (1975). *Parental rights and daycare: A background paper*. Toronto: Ontario Federation of Labour.

- Pitre-Robin, C. (1982, September). La situation des Garderies au Quebec en 1982. *Perception*.
- Social Planning Council (1979). *100,000 children: Alternatives for service delivery: A report of the project child care policy task force*. Toronto: Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto.
- SPCMT (1980). *Effects of government restraints on daycare services in metropolitan Toronto*. Toronto: Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto.
- Workplace Research Group (1982). *Children at work: An inventory of work-related daycare in Canada*. Toronto: Workplace Research Group of the Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto.
- Women's Bureau (1982). *Workplace child care: A background paper*. Toronto: Women's Bureau of the Ontario Ministry of Labour.
- Women's Bureau (1983). *Daycare inventory*. Toronto: Women's Bureau of the Ontario Ministry of Labour.

## DAYCARE IN CANADA AND THE RESTRUCTURED RELATIONSHIPS OF FAMILY, GOVERNMENT, AND LABOUR FORCE

Alan R. Pence,  
School of Child Care,  
University of Victoria

### ABSTRACT

This paper argues that the current high profile discussion of daycare in Canada is generated by deep shifts in our economic and familial structures. All too often political and public opinion reflects an awareness of surface needs rather than subsurface restructuring. It is argued that in order to arrive at a comprehensive system designed to meet family and child caregiving needs we must look beyond the much discussed "quick fix" plans to an analysis of the restructured triadic relationship of family, government, and labour force. It is hoped that from such an in-depth analysis a variety of services and benefits would emerge that could empower parents with options that they lack at present.

### Introduction

Ten to fifteen years ago the topic of daycare in Canada focussed on the need to extend or enhance care for "other people's" children; today its purview includes "our" children as well. Daycare in Canada today represents the rumblings of a "New World" forming. To continue the geological analogy, deep beneath the heated surface displays of articles in the popular press, organizational protests and calls for "a return to..." or conversely "reform," immense sociological and economic "plates" grind against one another demolishing old structures while new forms emerge to replace them. This article will explore in overview both the enormous social pressures at work beneath the surface and the more readily observable surface phenomena that together constitute the reality of daycare in Canada.

The most significant interface of "plates" underlying contemporary daycare discussion is the replacement of one dominant family form with a multiplicity of family forms. The relative decline of what has been termed the Victorian family model with its tightly prescribed roles of father-breadwinner, mother-homemaker; and child-angelic/dependent (Strickland, 1980; Bernard, 1974), is closely associated with changes in a second set of "plates" consisting of changes in the Canadian economy and labour force.

These two sets of immensely powerful plates — family and labour force — converge beneath and activate surface debates regarding the care of young children. Unfortunately, the bulk of discussion and debate on day care in Canada focuses on surface elements such as regulations, ministerial responsibility, and private

versus public sponsorship, without examining in sufficient detail the underlying "deep-shifts" in social structure that activate these and other surface phenomena. In addition, public debate all too often mistakenly identifies the provision of daycare services as a causal rather than as a resultant factor in the "equation:"

$$\text{Family change} \quad \times \quad \text{Labour force change} \quad = \quad \text{New Social Needs, including Daycare}$$

The remainder of this article will examine these three components of the daycare equation noting how we have arrived at our current daycare policies and practices; in addition, given the deep-shifts discussed and present policy, possible future courses of action will be presented.

### Family Change

The relative position of the sexes in the social and political world, may certainly be looked upon as the result of organization. The greater physical strength of man, enables him to occupy the foreground in the picture. He leaves the domestic scenes; he plunges into the turmoil and bustle of an active, selfish world;...Hence courage and boldness are his attributes... Her inferior strength and sedentary habits confine her within the domestic circle; she is kept aloof from the bustle and storm of active life... grace, modesty and loveliness are the charms which constitute her power.

Reverend Thomas R. Dew, 1935

This and similar exhortations from the pulpit and press dominated the commentary on families during the mid to late nineteenth century. These images and expectations are with us today in both subtle and subliminal, as well as conscious, overt ways. So effective were the nineteenth and twentieth century promoters of the Victorian family model that we as a society today have great difficulty accepting the fact that other models have developed in other parts of the world and that alternative family models exist in growing numbers within our own society.

An example of our Victorian ethnocentrism can be seen in the author's annual survey of students' responses to the question: "Which of the following forms of care for children aged three to five is most common among various societies of the world?"

- A. Care by related adults
- B. Care by mother
- C. Care by non-related adults
- D. Care by an older child
- E. Institutional (Daycare Centres)

The vast majority of students select A and B, reflective of the Victorian models of the family, popular in our society, while virtually none select the correct answer, D "Care by an older child" (Weisner and Gallimore, 1977). In North America, where option D in the period preceding compulsory schooling was common, that practice could now result in apprehension for child neglect!

In light of the "world view" study noted above and similar historical perspectives, it is clear that there is no one, universal family form that exists across time or geographic space. The Victorian family model has predecessors in western civilization, as it has successors.

Canadian society is presently in a state of transition in family forms — the enormous socio-economic plates beneath us, relatively quiet for over a century, are once again in motion. Some of these key transformations, particularly as they relate to the experiences of children in families, include: an increase in Canadian marriage, remarriage, and divorce rates; a decline in typical family size and a decline in fertility rates; a significant increase in the number of female-headed, single-parent families, and a major increase in the number of married women in the out-of-home, paid labour force.

Each of these areas of change effecting family form, functions and composition will be briefly examined. The final issue, mothers in the labour force, leads to a discussion of the second component in the day care equation, changes in the economy/labour-force.

### Marriage and Divorce

Marriage in Canada is presently a popular institution. In the late 1970s approximately 65 percent of the adult population were married as opposed to 50 percent in the late 1920s, and 52 percent at the turn of the century (Statistics Canada 1981).

Divorce, however, has become even more popular. During the 1920s the divorce rate per 100,000 was less than 8 per annum compared to 280 per 100,000 today. A fairly stable divorce plateau was reached in the 1950s and early 60s when rates stood at between 35 and 40 per 100,000. Subsequent to the new divorce act in 1968, the rate has soared: 148 in 1972; 235 in 1976 (Statistics Canada, 1983); and as noted, almost 280 per 100,000 in 1981 (Statistics Canada, 1981). One result of the steep increase in marriage, remarriage and divorce rates is that a very large and growing percentage of the Canadian population has experienced being reared in more than one family unit. The implications of this change in the socialization experience of children is an area in need of additional research.

### Family Size and Fertility Rates

While an increasing number of Canadians are getting married and divorced the average household size is decreasing; it has declined from 3.7 in 1971 to 3.5 in 1976, and 3.3 in 1981. This decrease is in part reflective of families having a fewer number of children on average: from 1.9 in 1961 to 1.8 in 1971 and 1.4 in 1981. The number of families having four or more children has decreased from 16.4 percent in 1961 to 8.7 percent in 1981 (Statistics Canada, 1981).

### Single Parent Families

A growing percentage of single parent families are the result of divorce (as opposed to death of a spouse). The most conspicuous increase in single parent

families have been those that are female-head of household. While the number of male-headed families has remained fairly constant over the last twenty years, the percentage of female-headed families has increased by almost 30 percent as can be seen in Table 1.

### *Married Women in the Paid Labour Force*

Women now account for approximately 41 percent of the total Canadian Labour Force. Within the ranks of women engaged in the paid labour force the fastest growing component has been married women with children, and more specifically, the younger the age of the child the more rapid has been that group's increase in the labour force over the last ten years.

The statistics cited in Table 2 indicate a change not only in family forms, such as the increase in blended and single parent families, but in family members' functions as well. Women's role as family members has shifted a great deal from Reverend Dew's pronouncement that "she be kept aloof from the bustle and storm of active life." Increasingly women are expected to participate in out-of-home labour force activity in much the same way as men. The implications of this transition extend far beyond the individual and the home, to a necessary reconsideration of how society's and governments' obligations to families and children is altered by that transformation within families.

The discussion of the next factor in the day care equation, changes in the labour force, will consider the historical balance that has been struck between familial and governmental obligations to achieve the common good for society, and how that balance has now been displaced.

### **Changes in the Labour Force**

The creation of, and the ethos supporting, the Victorian family model is inextricably intertwined with the needs of the economy. In fact, the Victorian family can be viewed as the "industrial model" of the family. The family itself was successfully split into the two functions required by a developing, industrial society: a production sphere and a consumption sphere. In addition to fulfilling a consumer role the consumption sphere was also mandated to perform an unpaid domestic and human services function of care for children, care for the elderly, and other caregiving tasks. This unpaid service both within and outside the family relieved the state of an expense that it might otherwise have been called on to provide. The cult of domesticity, subsumed within the ethos of the Victorian family model, contained within it a strong admonition to perform charitable and spiritually redeeming acts on behalf of others. This admonishment forms part of the genesis of various human service professions, as can be discerned in Catharine Beecher's 1873 advice to every woman to obtain "appropriate scientific and practical training for her distinctive profession as housekeeper, nurse of infants and the sick, educator of childhood, trainer for servants and minister of charities" (Rothman, 1978).

Interestingly enough, the assignment of these separate spheres on a gender basis was secondary in importance to the fact of their creation itself. It was more

important that the roles were created, than was the determination of who would perform them.

This particular "spheres of influence" model which is the hallmark of the Victorian family, served Canada efficiently and economically for many decades. It allowed the country to make a transition from a rural, agriculturally oriented society based on a model of family self-sufficiency to an urban, industrial society with an interlocking system of production and consumption. This transition was accomplished at a relatively minimal cost to, and a minor role for, government. The woof of the new social fabric was an industrially based workforce receiving a "family wage" (MacDonald, 1982); the warp was the Victorian family and its prescribed familial roles. The origin of many government supported social services as we know them today can be found in this period of transition. Uniformly, those services were and are targeted at individuals who slipped through the new fabric of employability and family services; the birthmarks of their origin in a period of limited government can be seen in many social services today, day care included.

Fortunately (for the sake of this Victorian family-Industrial economy model) the manpower needs of the out-of-home, paid labour force have not, until recently, outstripped the supply of native born and immigrant male labourers available to fill it. However, during times of war when the supply of men available for the production sphere was depleted and an alternative market for consumption existed, women's role in society took on a third dimension—becoming members of a reserve and totally fluid, back-up labour force.

The multi-functional role of women in Canadian (and all of North American) society has been greatly restricted by women's recent entry into the more uni-functional sphere of production. One result of this transition has been a greatly increased need for various human services and alternative methods for delivering services for the very old and for the very young. The reaction in some parts of the country to this transformation in women's responsibilities has been to "slay the messenger" rather than to analyze the message. Using the geological analogy, public and political discussion has focussed on the surface issues, with loud debate around the issue that "Women's place is in the home," while a necessary analysis of the "deep structure" shifts, required for the development of an enlightened social policy, have gone largely unperformed and when undertaken have been largely ignored.

There is a cruel irony in the fact that government services are entering a period of restraint and cut-back at the very moment in our history when the need for certain services, such as day care, is expanding. There is further irony, and a basis for cynicism, that those groups calling the loudest for restraint, business and government, are the forces most responsible for the deep shifts in family form and function that we have witnessed over the last thirty years. Without a demand for an increase in female labour there could not have been an increase in the participation rate.

As has been noted earlier, married women's rate of work-force participation has increased an astonishing 500 percent over the last thirty years. Several theories have been put forward to explain this transformation, ranging from Marxist and other structuralist interpretations to more individualized, "me-

generation" and "women's lib" explanations. Without going into a detailed discussion of motivational cause and effect, it is apparent from a purely descriptive standpoint that the following related events have occurred: one, an expansion of jobs in areas generally held by women; two, a continuation of a lower salary structure for women's work; and three, an increasing need within the family for female employment to *maintain* the family's standard of living. Each of these factors related to women's participation in the out-of-home, paid labour force will be briefly discussed.

### *The Jobs Women Hold*

Although the labour force participation rate of all women has increased four-fold since the turn of the century, 12 percent to more than 50 percent (and more than 15 fold for married women), the number of occupations in which the majority of women work has not increased. "At the beginning of this century, three occupations—domestic service, teaching, and seamstressing accounted for over 60% of all female employment. In 1979 over 60 percent of all women worked at three jobs as well—clerical, sales and service" (Swan, 1982). The concept of "separate spheres" has followed women into the labour force creating female job ghettos. Resistance to integration within the labour force has been difficult to overcome with over "two-thirds of all employed women in occupations where they represent a strong majority" (Swan, 1982). Patricia Connelly, in her book *Last Hired, First Fired*, (1978) argues that there exists in Canada two labour forces, male and female, and given this division it can successfully be argued that women constitute an increasingly active reserve army of labour. The structural implications of this thesis would argue against the "free choice" interpretation of women's involvement in the labour force that is epitomized by "women's place is in the home" statements.

### *Women's Salaries*

Job segregation in the labour force is accompanied by pay differentiation. In an analysis by Armstrong and Armstrong (1978), industries ranked by female participation rate show a corresponding decrease in average employee earnings as female participation increases. In 1981 the average salary for a female employee stood at 58 percent of the average male working salary (Swan, 1982), demonstrating *virtually no change* over the preceding twenty year period. This relatively stable Canadian figure compares similarly with the Biblical determination that "a male between 20 and 60 years shall be valued at 50 shekels...If it is a female she shall be valued at 30 shekels," (Leviticus 27:3-4), a 60 percent differential (Swan, 1979).

### *The Family's Standard of Living*

One of the surface debates heard in the press and parliament is that women's entry into the labour force has been a matter of free choice, or as some suggest, spiteful rebellion against a century of oppressed and unrecognized labour within the domestic sphere. As noted above, the expansion of certain parts of the labour force in concert with relatively cheaper wages provides a more compelling rationale for women's increasing share of the labour market. Another obvious reason for female employment, in addition to job availability, is economic need. Accord-

ing to the National Council of Welfare (1979), there would be a 51 percent increase in the number of poor families in Canada if the wife in two parent working families had no earnings. Economic need as a primary determinate for maternal employment is obvious in the case of single parent mothers. However, as can be seen below, the same motivation is apparent in the relative decline of female participation rates as family income (exclusive of the wife's earnings) increases:

families with incomes of less than 5,000	- 67 percent
families with incomes of 15-20,000	- 57 percent
families with incomes of 25,000 +	- 46 percent

The increasing need in Canada for wives and mothers to join the labour force (Swan, 1982) in an effort to simply maintain the family's economic position raises a concern that the concept of a "family wage" system that facilitated the Victorian family's viability has been significantly eroded. That erosion in a livable family income, operating in concert with the following pressures in our labour force:

- the creation of a two-army force of reserve labour;
- an increasing segmentation in the labour force composed of those with and those without upward mobility (MacDonald, 1982);
- the possible reinforcement of that segmentation through the informatics revolution (Menziez, 1981);
- and the spectre of increasingly reactionary labour legislation such as that introduced by the Social Credit party in British Columbia in 1983<sup>1</sup>

raises enormous concerns for the future financial security of the family and its ability to meet family members' basic needs for food and shelter. Remembering Maslow's Needs Hierarchy (Maslow, 1970), and historical evidence as presented by Lloyd DeMause (1974), we must question the quality of family life where an ongoing quest for food and shelter predominate.

### **Family Change and Labour Force Change**

It should be highlighted briefly that even though family change and labour force change have been treated separately in this paper as two "deep structure plates" within our society, as can be seen in the above discussions, the two are intimately interrelated and changes in one must effect the other. Shifts and changes in these plates have major implications from the micro-personal through to the macro-societal levels. Unfortunately the focus of public discussion on these issues seldom delves beneath the surface phenomena and has attracted far too little of the research interest it deserves and which we as a society require. Given the enormous changes that have taken place in Canadian society, and in the labour force over the last 30 years, and their effects on the ability of the family to provide care for their young children, what has been the response to a growing need for day care services?

## The Provision of Daycare Services

We are witness to a society in transformation. No longer moored to one family form, no longer divided into separate "spheres of influence," what has been our societal-governmental response to the resulting need for child caring services? The answer can be seen in Table 3.

It can be seen that after an initially promising start in governmental response towards meeting the changing caregiving needs of Canadian families, the momentum has been lost and at present approximately 80-85 percent of all Canadian preschool children in need of care are in unregulated caregiving facilities. In short, governmental response (quite uniformly across the provinces) is that *families and not government are responsible* for the care of their preschool-aged children despite changes in family structure and in work-force composition. All provincial daycare licensing and funding regulations reflect this ideology. The result has been the enormous expansion of an unregulated, "cottage industry" of poorly paid child-caregivers about whose service we know very little. Only two Canadian studies, both based in Ontario, have attempted to examine this largely "invisible phenomena" and both would concur in the following recommendation from the Guelph study: "That federal, provincial and municipal governments recognize and respond to parents' needs for access to a variety of quality child care arrangements for young children" (Lero, 1983). Dr. Laura Johnson, Director of the Toronto study, went further in describing the current situation as "an epidemic of child neglect" (Johnson, 1981). A third study hopes to shed additional light on the phenomena from a British Columbia perspective (Pence, and Goelman, 1983).

The provision of daycare services in Canada is predicated on a Victorian family model, in a post-Victorian society. The Victorian model restricts state services to those families who slip through the Victorian family/industrial economy social fabric (described earlier) and who are thereby "at risk" to themselves, their children or to society at large. Canada and the provinces have yet to effectively address the conundrum of how the role of government may need to change now that the social and economic fabric is fundamentally altered.

Funding for daycare services in Canada is generated from both private and public sources, generally in the form of user fees. Public revenues are provided on a provincial-federal, 50-50 sharing formula and restricted to "Canadians who require social services to prevent, overcome or alleviate the causes and effects of poverty or child neglect..." (Shaw, 1982). This restriction, a vestige of the Victorian family definition of government responsibility, is generally tied to an income eligibility fee scale which biases funding toward single parent families; for example, in British Columbia single parents constitute approximately 12 percent of the family population, yet public dollars for daycare serve an estimated 70 percent or more single parents.<sup>2</sup> At a time when over 50 percent of all Canadian mothers of preschool children are in the labour-force (and the percentage increases annually), many question if state support for daycare services should continue to be restricted to those families who are economically in need when the vast majority of Canadian children are cared for in governmentally unregulated caregiving sites.

Concern regarding "Who cares for the Canadian Preschoolers?" is heightened by the fact that from a research and programme development perspective we now know how to create preschool caregiving programmes that can enhance the family's and child's development. Alison Clarke-Stewart's recent review of the literature (1982) led her to conclude, "In sum, it appears likely that there is something about daycare centres and nursery schools that stimulates or maintains children's intellectual development, at least until the beginning of school" Long-term benefits of early preventative care for children "at risk" have been demonstrated in follow-up studies to the Head Start programmes in the United States. Largely negating the significance of the early 1970s Westinghouse evaluation of Head Start, these longitudinal studies, such as that undertaken at High Scope in Michigan, show Head Start graduates performing at a full grade level higher than their non-Head Start counterparts by the time they reach grade ten.<sup>3</sup>

With an increasing number of parents in need of daycare services, a growing concern regarding the current caveat emptor (buyer beware) approach to regulating the majority of care, and the recognition that we know how to create positive alternatives to exclusive maternal care, the call for daycare reform grows stronger. At the Second National Conference for Daycare, co-sponsored by Health and Welfare Canada and the Canadian Council on Social Development held in Winnipeg, September, 1982, keynote speaker Judy Erola (Minister Responsible for the Status of Women) called for daycare to be reorganized "as a public utility," a universal service for all families requesting care.<sup>4</sup>

That same conference saw, for the first time in Canada, broad based coalitions composed of women's groups, labour organizations, parent advocates and more traditional early childhood associations, come together to discuss current inadequacies in the system. Using the key words "affordability and accessibility" a comprehensive system of publically subsidized, alternative care was envisioned by Day Care Action Coalitions from across the country. Such a universal system would insure that any infant, preschooler or after-school aged child requiring care would be able to receive it.

The cost of such a universal system, as with public education in general, would be very great. A 1981 task force of the British Columbia Day Care Action Coalition projected a figure of \$411 million per annum required to provide care for 50 percent of the B.C. population of preschool aged children (0-5 years).<sup>5</sup> The figure is approximately 24 times greater than the existing B.C. expenditure for day care subsidies.<sup>6</sup> Such an increase would raise the day care budget into the comparable realm of the budget figures for B.C. Transportation and Communication (581 million) and Courts and Policing (285 million).<sup>7</sup> The coalition study paper asks: "...could anyone argue convincingly that our children are not at least as valuable a resource as highways or the court system?" Yet financial responsibility for the care of young children continues to fall almost exclusively on parents.

The issue of governmental versus parental responsibility for the care of children of working parents remains central to the Canadian daycare dilemma. Unfortunately, the polarization of the issue itself contributes to its lack of progress. However, this adversarial "all or nothing" approach to increased services for daycare children appears to have been avoided to some degree in various Euro-

pean countries where a *service and benefits* approach has evolved over the last twenty to thirty years. In many of these countries the issue of state versus parental versus employer responsibility is diffused and distributed in a way too seldom discussed in Canada. For instance, in Spain "any worker who is directly responsible for the care of a child under the age of six is entitled to a reduction of not less than one-third and not more than one-half of their working day." In France, West Germany, Italy, Spain and Austria, provision for nursing breaks for nursing mothers is found in the legislation (Gallagher and Woel, 1983). And in Sweden either parent is eligible for nine months of parental leave at 90 percent of usual salary to care for their newborn (Kammerman and Kahn, 1981). In addition to these and other benefits not currently available in Canada varying daycare services from infant through after-school care have been created. A partial listing of these services and benefits is enumerated in Kahn and Kammerman (1981) in Figure 1.

Figure 1  
Child Care Benefit-Service (Major Components) by Country

Benefits:	Hungary	France	Sweden
A. CASH			
Income Replacement	Maternity leave To care for an ill child at home	Maternity leave	Parental leave to care for an ill child at home
Income Substitution	Child care allowance	-	-
Income supplementation	Family allowance, Housing allowance, Child health services	Family allowance, Housing allowance, Child health services, Family allowance supplement, Single parent allowance, Family-based tax system	Child allowance, Housing allowance, Child health services  Tax allowances for all dependents-
B. EMPLOYMENT			
Right to leave	Maternity leave	Maternity leave	Parental (9 months) leave
Work and Job Security	(20 weeks) Child care up to child's 3rd birthday	(16 weeks) Parental education 2 years	Unpaid 18 months; 6 hour day up to child's 8th birthday
C. SERVICES			
Percentage of children 0-3 in out of home care	12 percent mainly 1½-3-years old	13 percent	23 percent
Major care mode	Centre care (almost completely)	Coequal in policy but family daycare predominates	Policy favours centre care but present reality is family daycare primarily

Source: Sheila B. Kamerman and Alfred J. Kahn. *Child Care, Family Benefits, and Working Parents*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1981), p. 225.

The benefits and services structures that have evolved in these various western countries demonstrate their governments' awareness of the underlying economic and social realignments that have been discussed in this essay, and which have yet to be "discovered" in Canada. These creative responses, which share the caring among parents, industry and government and which enhance parents options as primary caretakers should serve as experimental models that we in Canada can observe and consider as we move from our current stance of inappropriate reaction and indifference to one of pro-active planning for our children and our country's future.

### Summary and a Look to the Future

This essay has identified the two forces of change in family forms and change in the economy/labour force requirements as the principal plates that are in motion deep within our social structure and which activate our surface debates and contemporary need for daycare services.

The current provision of daycare in Canada evolved during a period of social services development when the Victorian family was numerically and ethically powerful. This traditional milieu enforced a major role for families in the provision of many human services, including the daycare of preschool aged children, and a catchment role for government designed to assist/support those who had slipped through the social fabric of employment and family. Current legislation, funding, and regulations regarding the provision of daycare services are uniformly, across the various provinces, based on this traditional model.

This model is the reality of legislation, but it is not the reality of society. The widening chasm between the existing legislation and social need has brought together an increasingly vocal coalition of parents, daycare workers, women's groups and labour organizations. At the second Conference on Daycare in Canada held in 1982, the major focus of discussion was on a new role for governments in providing accessible, affordable, quality daycare for those parents requiring it. Using the provision of public schooling as an example, many of the provincial coalitions are calling for a universally available, publically funded daycare system. The cost of such a system, as with public education in general, would be very great.

Certain European countries, faced with the need for full female employment at an earlier period in their histories, have evolved various services and benefits structure that can either assist parents in the care of their own children or provide alternative caregiving arrangements for children as young as six weeks of age. It would appear that a services and benefits structure would allow the greatest range of options for families, with greater flexibility for the cost of care to be shared by parent, employer and government.

Despite cries and protestations the forces beneath us will not be reversed to recreate the Canada of the turn of the century. Our options at this time appear to be the three outlined in this paper:

- continue to provide Victorian services in a post-Victorian era;
- create a universal preschool-care system;

(c) reconsider the triangular relationship of Parenting—Labour Force Participation—Government, and utilizing cost and social benefit considerations, create a new services and benefits structure in Canada

This third model has generated little discussion to date despite the great and growing need for a critical examination of the importance of parenting, the relationship of parents to the labour force, and the role of government in fostering a just and humane society. This option requires a far-reaching and interdisciplinary examination of the shifting, triadic relationship of family/government/labour force with an emphasis on a creative redefinition of the role(s) each must play in fostering the positive development of Canada's children.

The essence of the daycare dilemma in Canada is that as a result of extremely powerful shifts in the ways in which we constitute ourselves in families and in which we perceive our relationship to, and participation in, the out-of-home labour force, a vacuum has developed where the role of child caregiver once existed. The question of who could or should fill this vacuum has yet to be adequately addressed. The question cannot be understood nor dealt with on its current surface level, we must become aware of the subsocial dynamics, the "plates" beneath, that impact on our daily lives and on the lives of our children.

Note: I would like to acknowledge the assistance of Alvina Harrison in the preparation of certain parts of this manuscript.

**Table 1**  
Male Head and Female Head of Lone Parent Family as a Percentage of all Canadian Families, 1961-1991

	Male head	Female head
1961	1.9%	6.5%
1976	1.7%	8.1%
1981	2.0%	9.3%
(projection) 1991	2.1%	9.8%

Source: J. Perreault and M. V. George, "Growth of Households and Families in Canada in the 1980s and 1990s," *Canadian Statistical Review*, October 1982, Figure 1.

**Table 2**  
Participation Rates of Married Women in Canada (Husbands Present), by Age and Group and Presence of Children in the Home, 1971, 1976, 1981.

	Wives Aged 15-34	Wives Aged 35-44
Wives Without Children Present		
1971		
1976	73.9%	59.4%
1981	77.5	65.5
Absolute increase (1971-1981)	87.3	75.9
Relative increase	13.4	16.5
	18.0	27.7
Wives With Children, all over 6		
1971		
1976	46.0%	44.2%
1981	54.9	53.6
	65.2	63.4

Wives With Children, all over 6 (cont'd)

	Wives Aged 15-34	Wives Aged 35-44
Absolute increase (1971-1981)	19.2	19.2
Relative increase	41.7	43.4
Wives With Children, under 6		
1971	28.0%	25.4%
1976	36.9	35.8
1981	47.8	46.3
Absolute increase (1971-1981)	19.8	20.9
Relative increase	70.0	82.2

Source: 1971, 1976: C. Swan. *Women in the Canadian Labour Force, The Present Reality*, Table 3: and Statistics Canada, 1981, Unpublished data.

**Table 3**  
Number of Children Potentially Needing Daycare Services, Number of Licensed Spaces, and Percentage in Licensed Spaces, 1973-1982

Year	No. of pre-school children (3-5) working mothers	No. of spaces in licensed or registered Day Care	Percent of pre-school enrolled in registered facilities
1973	304,000 (3-5)	21,736 (3-5)	7.15%
1976	345,000 (3-5)	63,501 (3-5)	18.38%
1979	504,000 (2-6)	77,929 (2-6)	15.46%
1982	664,000 (2-6)	95,350 (2-6)	14.36%

Source: National Daycare Information Office. *Status of Day Care in Canada, 1973-1982*. Ottawa: Canada Health and Welfare.

Note: The Status of Daycare in Canada report for 1983 performed a more complex analysis of children in need of care by type of parent occupation (full time/part time, student status, etc.). This analysis yielded children-in-registered-care percentages ranging from approximately 16 percent to 35 percent depending on parent classification.

### Reference Notes

1. "A Shock Wave of Change," *Victoria (B.C.) Times Colonist*, 8 July 1983, p. 1.
2. Private conversation with a Ministry of Human Resources official, The Government of British Columbia, Victoria, B.C., September 1983.
3. Carnegie Corporation of New York, News Release on Study by High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, "Study Finds Preschool Program A Lasting Benefit to Children and Society," 14 December 1980.
4. "Day Care 'Highly Inadequate'," *The Globe and Mail*, 24 September 1982, p. 10.
5. British Columbia Daycare Action Coalition, *Report of the Ministerial Task Force*, 5 November 1981, p. 7.
6. British Columbia. *Ministry of Human Resources Annual Reports, 1980-81*, p. 27.
7. British Columbia Day Care Action Coalition, *Report*, p. 7.

## References

- Allingham, John D. (1967). *Special labour force studies: the demographic background to change in the number and composition of female wage earners in Canada, 1951 to 1961*. Ottawa: Dominion Bureau of Statistics.
- Armstrong, Pat and Armstrong, Hugh. (1978). *The double ghetto: Canadian women and their segregated work*. Toronto: McClellan and Stewart.
- Bernard, Jessie. (1974) *The future of motherhood*. New York: Penguin Books Inc..
- British Columbia Daycare Action Coalition. (1981). *Report of the ministerial task force*. Victoria: Government of B.C.
- British Columbia. *Ministry of Human Resources Annual Report 1980-81. Canada update from the 1981 census*. (1983). Ottawa: Supply and Services.
- Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women. (1982). *Microtechnology and employment: issues of concern to women*. Ottawa: Government of Canada.
- Clarke-Stewart, Alison. (1982). *Daycare*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Connelly, Patricia. (1978). *Last hired, first fired: women and the Canadian labour force*. Toronto: The Women's Press.
- deMause, Lloyd. (1974). *The history of childhood*. New York: Harper Torchbooks.
- Denton, Frank T., Feaver, Christine H., and Spencer, Bryon G. (1980). *The future population and labour force of Canada: projections to the year 2051*. Ottawa: Supply and Services.
- Dew, Thomas R. (1968). "Sermon" in *Up From the Pedestal*. Edited by A.S. Kraditor. New York: New York Times Book.
- Divorce: Law and the family in Canada*. (1983). Ottawa: Supply and Services.
- Family characteristics and labour force activity. (1982). *The labour force*.
- Gallagher, Rosemary and Noel, Donna. (1983). *An international perspective on parental benefits*. Victoria, B.C.: Victoria caucus on the National Association of Women and the Law.
- Hersom, Naomi and Smith, Dorothy. (1982). *Women and the Canadian labour force*. Ottawa: Supply and Services.
- Initial results from the 1981 survey of child care arrangements*. Labour Force Survey Research Paper no. 31. Ottawa: Supply and Services, 1982.
- Johnson, Laura C., and Dineen, Janice. (1981). *The kin trade-the day care crisis in Canada*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson.
- Kammerman, Sheila B., and Kahn, Alfred J. (1981). *Child care, family benefits, and working parents*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Labour Canada. (1981). *Women in the labour force. part 1, participation*. Ottawa: Supply and Services.
- Lero, Donna. (1983). *Factors influencing parents' preferences for, and use of alternative child care arrangements for pre-school-age children*. Ottawa: Health and Welfare Canada.
- MacDonald, Martha. (1982). Implications for understanding women in the labour force of labour market segmentation analysis. In *Women and the Canadian labour force*, pp. 165-207. Edited by Naomi Hersom and Dorothy E. Smith. Ottawa: The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of
- Marriages and divorcees*. (1981). Ottawa: Supply and Services.
- Maslow, Abraham. (1970). *Motivation and personality* (2d. ed.). New York: Harper & Row.
- Menzies, Heather. (1981). *Information case studies* (Supplementary Material to "Women and the Chip"). Labour Market Development Task Force Technical Studies Series, no. 23. Ottawa: Supply and Services.
- National Council of Welfare. (1979). *Women and poverty*. Ottawa: Supply and Services.
- National Day Care Information Centre. *Status of day care in Canada, 1973-1982*. Ottawa: Health and Welfare Canada.
- Ostry, Sylvia and Zaidi, Mahmood A. (1979). *Labour economics in Canada* (3d. ed.). Toronto: MacMillan of Canada.
- Pence, Alan and Goelman, Hillel. (1981). Day care in Canada: Developing an ecological perspective. A research proposal funded by The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.
- Perreault, J., and George, M.V. (1982). Growth of households and families in Canada in the 1980s and 1990s." *Canadian statistical review*.
- Report of the Royal Commission of the status of women in Canada*. (1981) Ottawa: Supply and Services.
- Rothman, Sheila M. (1978). *Women's proper place*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Shaw, Susan. (1982). *Better day care for Canadians: Options for parents and children*. Ottawa: Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women.
- Statistics Canada. (1979). *Canada's families*. Ottawa: Supply and Services.
- 1981 census of Canada* (1981). Ottawa: Supply and Services.
- Strickland, Charles. (1981). Day care and public policy: An historical perspective. Paper, Department of History, Emory University, Atlanta, GA.
- Sufrin, E. (1970). *Working mothers and their child-care arrangements*. Ottawa: Women's Bureau, Department of Labour.
- Swan, Carole. (1982). Women in the Canadian labour force: The present reality. In *Women and the Canadian labour force*, Edited by Naomi Hersom and Dorothy E. Smith. Ottawa: The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.
- The Royal Commission Report—10 years later*. (1979). An update report by the Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women, Ottawa.
- Weisner, Thomas S., and Gallimore, Ronald. (1977). My brother's keeper: Child and sibling caretaking. *Current anthropology*.
- Women in the workforce: Affirmative action and parental benefits*. Conference sourcebook. Papers edited by Rosemary Gallagher and Kathy Gallagher-Ross. Ottawa: National Association of Women and the Law, 1983.

Fred Morrison  
Department of Family Studies  
University of Alberta

**ABSTRACT**

This overview of research on psychological consequences of daycare suggest that such care may benefit intellectual growth of disadvantaged children. However, we do not know enough about the effects of poorer quality daycare. Placement in daycare before 18 months of age may also have some adverse effects. However, in general children who attend daycare tend to be more assertive, curious and responsive to novelty. Much research on daycare effects needs to be done however.

**Introduction**

In recent years, economic, social, political and psychological forces have produced some rather radical changes in our society's attitude and behaviour toward such issues as divorce, women's role in society, the nature of family life and the various roles within it. One of the most salient aspects of these changes is that fact that a majority of them — divorce and working mothers for example — touch, directly or indirectly, the lives of children and their development. Of the many changes that have pervaded our society in recent years, none has had broader or deeper ramifications, in my opinion, than the dramatic increase of women in the work force over the past 30 years.

The concomitant need for, and development of, alternate care arrangements for children of working mothers raised initial concern about the psychological well-being of children raised for the better part of each day by relative strangers. Horror stories about the emotional insecurity and disturbed behaviour of children from institutionalized foster care reinforced the fear and suspicion that daycare children, separated from their natural and now working mother for extended daily periods, were at great risk for psychological damage. As we know, however, those early claims that normal psychological growth was only possible if the mother did not go to work were not only premature but were also wrong.

While the more exaggerated claims can be dismissed, it would be a mistake to abandon all concern for and interest in the psychological consequences of daycare on the intellectual and social growth of young children. Many serious issues remain unresolved (Belsky and Steinberg, 1978; Rutter, 1980). In this paper I would, therefore, like to examine what we have learned over the past two decades about the psychological consequences of daycare on the intellectual and social development of preschool children.

## The Basis of Concern

First we need to clarify the original basis of concern that children in daycare might be at risk for psychological damage. In essence, the main concern stemmed from the view that during the early years children were developing important selective attachments to their mothers. The fear was that prolonged separation from the primary object of attachment, the mother, coupled with multiple care-taker substitutes in the form of daycare teachers *might* impair the bonding process or otherwise produce attachments that were in some way less secure or less effective in bringing comfort and security.

The theory underlying these views derived in part from ethological studies of imprinting in animals, in which animals were shown to exhibit highly organized attachment behaviours — e.g., following in geese or ducklings or clinging in monkeys — without extensive reinforcement from the mother. Further ethologists demonstrated that the development of these attachment responses seemed to occur within a critical or at least a sensitive period, before and especially after which attachment behaviour was less pronounced. Most critically, animals deprived of the opportunity to attach to their mother showed severe emotional behavioural and social problems later on (Holmes and Morrison, 1979). The relevance of this work for human emotional development and for daycare lay in the following logical sequence. If human emotional security develops like the imprinting or attachment behaviours of young animals, then infants and young children need consistent contact with their mother, the primary crucial object of attachment, during the critical early years of development. Moreover, significant deviation from that consistent contact runs the risk of producing less securely attached (and hence less emotionally secure) infants and young children. Thus, in a quite direct manner, one could ask whether the attachment, emotional security and social adjustment of daycare children — who are presumed to spend less time with their mothers — is seriously impaired compared to home-reared children.

Two broad areas of psychological functioning have been examined in looking at the potential hazards of daycare: social/emotional well-being and cognitive growth (Holmes and Morrison, 1979; Rubenstein and Howes, 1979; Rutter, 1980).

## The Social/Emotional Consequences of Day Care

Two major questions have been asked regarding the effects of daycare on social/emotional development. First, what is the impact of attending daycare on the attachment or emotional bonding of the child to the parent, and in particular to the mother? Second, apart from maternal attachment, is there any evidence of emotional or social maladjustment in children attending daycare regularly?

### Attachment

With regard to attachment, the prevailing fear was that attachments would form the daycare personnel; and/or the child would exhibit insecure attachments to the parent.

However, regarding attachment over a decade of research (Caldwell, Wright, Honig, and Tammembaum, 1970; Farran and Ramey, 1977; Fox 1977; Kagan, Kearsley and Zelazo, 1978; Ragozin, 1980; Rubenstein and Howes, 1979) has demonstrated that:

1. Daycare children show more distress when they are separated from their mother than when separated from daycare personnel.
2. They are more likely to go to their mothers when they are upset.
3. They appear more responsive to reunion with mothers.

In general, with few exceptions (Rutter, 1980) the overwhelming conclusion of a decade of psychological research can be summarized simply: children attending good-quality daycare are no less securely attached or emotionally secure than are home-reared children (but see below).

### Social Maladjustment

The second concern revolves around whether prolonged daycare experiences produced emotional disturbances or social behaviour problems in children. Here research has uncovered a number of interesting differences between daycare and home-reared children, though none appear to reveal any severe maladjustment in daycare children:

1. Some research has revealed that daycare children are more assertive and somewhat more aggressive (Macrae and Herbert-Jackson, 1976).
2. Other research has shown that daycare children play more in an unfamiliar daycare setting, i.e., they are less inhibited when taken to a novel daycare environment than were home-reared children (Kagan, Kearsley and Zelazo, 1978).
3. Daycare children have been shown to play more with other children in group play situations in which children don't know each other, i.e., the daycare children were less shy or socially inhibited.

In general, a substantial amount of work testifies to the fact that daycare children show absolutely no evidence of greater emotional or behavioural psychopathology than home-reared children (Rutter, 1980). In addition, not surprisingly daycare children are more assertive, less inhibited and more exploratory in novel situations.

Overall, with regard to the larger question of the social and emotional well-being of daycare children, the data argue forcefully that, *other things being equal*, daycare children are at least as emotionally secure and socially adjusted as home-reared children.

We must however add one major caveat — nearly all research has been conducted on good quality daycare. We know almost nothing about poor quality daycares (or indeed about other alternate care arrangements).

### The Intellectual Consequences of Daycare

A separate area of concern has centred on the possible harm of daycare to the cognitive development of the young child. Here also, some interesting and important effects have been found (Rubenstein, in press).

### *Low-income Families*

In particular, recent research has revealed that children from low-income families who attended daycare scored significantly higher on standardized test of intellectual performance (i.e., preschool I.Q. tests) than did children from low-income families who did not attend daycare. Even more strikingly, the superior intellectual performance of low-income daycare children persisted into the second and third grade at elementary school.

When we look more closely at what it is that the daycare experiences is doing, we see an interesting trend. Essentially children from low-income families who are reared at home often show a progressive decline from the late preschool to early school years in standardized test scores. Daycare children do not exhibit the normal pattern of decline — they sustain their earlier intellectual status. How and why these effects occur, both the normal decline and the preventive effects of daycare, is not completely understood. Nevertheless it is noteworthy that daycare has a salutary effect on the cognitive growth of children from low-income families.

### *Middle-income Families*

In contrast to the differences observed for low-income families, research on middle class children has consistently shown that daycare has neither a beneficial nor deleterious effect on the intellectual performance of middle class children.

Again we are not sure why this should be so. As a qualifier, we must add that research has been done on "general intelligence" only. It is possible that specific aspects of cognitive performance might show superiority in daycare children; e.g., aspects of verbal skills, concept development, and social cognitive.

In summary, a good deal of psychological and educational research has demonstrated conclusively that group daycare, *at least high quality group daycare*, is not detrimental to the social, emotional or intellectual well-being of young children. Indeed, in the case of low-income children and as we shall see, in other ways, daycare may have distinctly beneficial effects.

### **Differences Between Home and Daycare**

Having set aside the more inflammatory claims about daycare, it is still important to examine more closely just what are the characteristics of daycare that distinguish it from home-rearing and what might be the psychological consequences of these differences for the personality development of preschool children.

Of the many characteristics that might be examined (Rutter, 1980) three major features deserve to be highlighted: the nature of adult-child interaction; the question of one or two versus many caregivers; and the pervasive question of transitions in daycare life.

#### *The Nature of Adult-Child Interaction*

In several studies comparing daycare caregivers and mothers of home-reared children, four major differences have emerged:

1. Adult caretakers in daycare spend significantly more time in physical contact with children, i.e., they patted and touched them more often and they held them longer (Rubenstein and Howes, 1979).
2. Daycare adults were more likely to intervene in a child's activity to provide help in playing with a toy (Rubenstein and Howes, 1979).
3. Mothers of home-reared children expressed more negative affect toward their children than did daycare adults to their students (Rubenstein and Howes, 1979).
4. Mothers of home-reared children were more controlling than were daycare adults, i.e., they expressed more do's and don'ts and placed more restriction on their child's behaviour (Cochran, 1977; Rubenstein and Howes, 1979).

In general, the picture that has emerged regarding adult-child interaction is that daycare adults are more physically involved and less restrictive and authoritarian than are mothers of home-reared children (Rubenstein and Howes, 1979; Rutter, 1980). While at first surprising, this pattern findings makes good sense. Mothers at home need to balance their child's needs with their other duties and with the need to keep the child away from certain objects or activities. Hence home mothers would be expected to be less physically involved and relatively more directive. In addition, home mothers don't get a break nor do they have the stimulation and company of other adults to the extent that daycare adults do.

#### *Number and Consistency of Caregivers*

The second major distinguishing characteristic of daycare versus home-care centres on the multiplicity of caregivers in daycare. There are really two issues here: one is the number of caregivers (or staff:child ratio), but more important is the consistency of caregiving.

Regarding the latter aspect, it has become clear that consistent caregiving is not to be overlooked in planning classroom assignments or activities. Specifically there is emerging evidence that inconsistent or unpredictable caregiving produces short-term anxieties and disorientation in children and can lead to progressive fear of separation from parent in the morning and less positive behaviour during the day (Rutter, 1980).

With regard to the optimal number of caregivers or the optimal staff-child ratio, the prevailing consensus suggests that for children greater than 3 years, the precise number may be less critical than the ability and organization of the teacher, in addition to aspects of the physical layout, e.g., opportunities for isolated activity. Nevertheless, for children under 2 years, a staff:child ratio as close to 1:1 if physically and financially possible, is recommended.

#### *The Question of Transitions*

Finally, concern has been emerging about what might be called "the question of transitions" in daycare. Specifically, attention has focused on the potentially disrupting effects of changing from one major setting to another, e.g., when dropping the child off in the morning or picking him/her up at night or when switching from one caregiver to another. Here also the question of consistency or predictability is paramount. It has become clear that these transitions can be smooth or traumatic, depending on how they are handled by parents and daycare

staff. Dropping the child off in the morning can produce some severe emotional upset if the transition is not coordinated carefully. A distinctive and emphatic greeting from the daycare staff person, coupled with a non-abrupt goodbye by the parent and perhaps a final goodbye wave from the window will go a long way to sustaining normal emotional equilibrium and activity in the child. On a more general plane, the relatively more novel or unexpected changes in schedule, people, and activities in a daycare environment necessitates sensitivity to ensuring that the transition proceed relatively smoothly and predictably.

### Modifying Factors in the Effects of Daycare

While to this point we have been examining more general consequences of daycare on the psychological growth of young children, it must be admitted that the effects of daycare will vary significantly depending on a number of other factors (Rutter, 1980).

#### Age

Some evidence suggests that daycare is more disruptive for children around the period of maximum separation anxiety, i.e., between about 12 and 24 months, then either earlier or later (Kagan, Kearsley & Zelazo, 1978). In addition, older children develop peer interactions more easily than young children and hence will adjust better (Rubenstein & Howes, 1976; Rubenstein & Howes, 1979). Further, there is some feeling that in mixed-age groups of daycare children, younger children around two years of age are more likely to be dominated by three and four year olds and to lose more frequently in competing for the attention and nurturance of the caregiver.

#### Sex

Some scattered evidence suggests that daycare may be harder on boys than girls (Moskowitz, Schwarz and Corsini, 1977). Some research has shown that boys cried more and were more fearful of strangers than girls (Moskowitz, Schwarz and Corsini, 1977). One tentative explanation of these findings is that boys are more sensitive to stress and need more control to curb aggression.

#### Ordinal Position

First-born boys have been shown to be more fearful of separation than later-born boys (Fox, 1977). While not studied extensively, there is reason to expect that daycare will have different impact on first versus later-borns.

#### Temperament

There is a growing realization that children may differ in basic, perhaps constitutional, temperament which could mediate the effects of daycare (Dunn, 1980). The degree to which a child is shy vs. outgoing, wary vs. exploratory, or aggressive vs. cooperative will vary, and may significantly influence the nature and quality of his or her daycare experience (Kagan, Kearsley and Zelazo, 1978).

### Prior Experiences of Separation

Experience of separation may influence adjustment to daycare. Obviously, to the extent that previous separations have been handled properly, the child will deal more effectively with the transition to daycare.

### Family Characteristics

Factors that may be important in adjusting to, and benefitting from daycare are: the security of attachment or pre-existing emotional security of the child; the type of family organization; and single vs. dual-parent homes.

One implication of the foregoing for daycare staff is that knowing about these modifying factors, including ordinal position, temperament, previous kinds of separation and family background can provide valuable information on the individual child and his or her family, which may increase the effectiveness of daycare for that child.

### Conclusions and Recommendations

In summary, the results of nearly two decades of work on the psychological consequences of daycare allow us to draw some reasonably firm conclusions and to offer some tentative recommendations for optimizing the psychological impact of going to daycare.

1. Daycare is not necessarily psychologically harmful nor does it impair emotional security and attachment. In fact, good quality daycare may benefit intellectual growth of disadvantaged children. But we do not know about the effects of poorer quality daycare.
2. In deciding when to put a child in some form of alternate care, the best advice seems to be either before 7 months or after 18 months or 2 years. From 7-18 months there is greater risk of prolonged separation protest, and at least short-term emotional upset.
3. Stability and continuity in staffing must be a prime concern. Within limits, it is preferable to maintain the same staff on relatively predictable schedules, over reasonably long periods of time. Obviously accomplishing this goal would be enhanced if daycare workers were fully trained, and paid better salaries so as to minimize rapid staff turnover.
4. Now that we have moved away from concern over the large questions of attachment and emotional security, it has become apparent that daycare does differ from home-rearing in ways that may affect the child's cognitive and personality characteristics. The evidence cited earlier on greater assertiveness, curiosity and responsiveness to novelty suggests that daycare is influencing children in important ways that we need to understand.
5. Finally, as professionals we need to learn more about those characteristics of children and their families that can significantly modify the daycare experience,

both in the short and long run. The more we know about the interacting effects of age, sex, ordinal position, temperament and family characteristics, the better able we will be to understand and to help children adjust to and enjoy daycare.

In conclusion, for those of us concerned with the lives of children, we have learned a great deal about the psychological impact of daycare on their intellectual and emotional growth. While some of our more radical fears have been quelled, there are still many questions to answer if we are to provide the optimal development we all so earnestly desire for children in our society.

*Note:* Preparation of this article was supported in part by grants from the Clifford E. Lee Foundation and the National Sciences and Engineering Research Council. The present summary and overview of recent literature drew substantially on the work of Jay Belsky, Judith Rubenstein and Michael Rutter.

### References

- Belsky, J., & Steinberg, L. D. (1978). The effects of daycare: A critical review. *Child Development, 49*, 929-949.
- Caldwell, B. M., Wright, C. M., Honig, A. S. & Tannenbaum, J. (1970). Infant daycare and attachment. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 40*, 397-412.
- Cochran, M. M. (1977). A comparison of group day and family child-rearing patterns in Sweden. *Child Development, 48*, 702-702.
- Dunn, J. (1980). Individual difference in temperament. In Rutter, M. (Ed.), *Scientific Foundations of Developmental Psychiatry*. London: Heinemann Medical.
- Farran, D., & Ramey, C. (1977). Infant daycare and attachment behaviours toward mothers and teachers. *Child Development, 48*, 1112-1116.
- Fox, N. (1977). Attachment of kibbutz infants to mother and mataplot. *Child Development, 48*, 1228-1239.
- Holmes, D. L., & Morrison, F. J. (1979). *The child*. San Francisco: Brooks-Cole Publishing.
- Kagan, J., Kearsley, R. B., & Zelazo, P. R. (1978). *Infancy: Its place in human development*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Macrae, J. W., & Herbert-Jackson, E. (1976). Are behavioural effects of infant daycare program specific? *Developmental Psychology, 12*, 269-270.
- Moskowitz, D. S., Schwarz, J. C., & Corsini, D. A. (1977). Initiating daycare at three years of age: Effects on attachment. *Child Development, 48*, 1271-1276.
- Portnoy, F. C., & Simmons, C. H. (1978). Daycare and attachment. *Child Development, 49*, 239-242.
- Ragozin, A. S. (1980). Attachment behaviour of daycare children: Naturalistic and laboratory observations. *Child Development, 51*, 409-415.
- Rubenstein, J. L., & Howes, C. (1976). The effect of peers on toddler interaction with mother and toys. *Child Development, 47*, 597-605.
- Rubenstein, J. L., & Howes, C. (1979). Caregiving and infant behaviour in daycare and in homes. *Developmental Psychology, 15*, 1-24.

- Rubenstein, J. (in press). The effects of maternal employment on young children. In F. J. Morrison, C. Lord & D. P. Keating, (Eds.), *Applied Developmental Psychology*. San Francisco: Academic Press.
- Rutter, M. (1980). *Social/Emotional consequences of daycare*. Donald Hastings Lecture. University of Minnesota, October.

# DAYCARE: DEVELOPMENTAL EFFECTS AND THE PROBLEM OF QUALITY CARE

Jay Belsky  
Department of Human Development,  
Pennsylvania State University

## ABSTRACT

Earlier research on psychological effects of daycare was usually carried out in quality centres. However, more recent research designed to evaluate the effects of more routine types of daycare involves the comparison of children whose experiences have varied markedly. Quality care has, in the longer term, no adverse effects. However, enrollment in poor quality care may have a later sequel in some forms of anxiety and maladjustment. In general, children from good quality centres tend to be more cooperative, more intellectually capable, and more emotionally secure than children who experience poorer quality care. Such differences may reflect aspects of social structure which cause parents to place children in such care, as well as the direct effects of poor quality care as such.

## The Developmental Effects of Daycare

Research on the effects of daycare can be usefully organized around three topics—intellectual, emotional and social development (Belsky & Steinberg, 1978; Belsky, Steinberg, & Walker, 1982). Before proceeding to present such a review, it is necessary to highlight once again the very real limits of research designs for studying the effects of daycare. Up until the past five years, most inquiry into daycare was restricted to university-connected centres providing high quality care (e.g., Ricciuti, 1974; Ramey & Campbell, 1979; Golden et al., 1976; Rubenstein & Howes, 1979; this volume). This new work tells us not simply what the effects of daycare can be for children fortunate enough to be enrolled in special programs, but what they are likely to be for the overwhelming majority of children in daycare who are not exposed to programs with special educational curriculums, well trained staff, and good caregiver-child ratios.

Even more serious a concern from the standpoint of design than sample limitations are the potential pre-existing differences that characterize children reared in daycare and at home. In most investigations of the effects of daycare, two samples are compared, one using daycare, the other being reared at home. Such comparative designs are founded upon the assumption that where developmental differences exist they can be attributed to variation in child care experience. But a major problem, perhaps the major problem of such designs, and indeed the "Achilles heel" of daycare research, is that important differences are likely to characterize home-reared and daycare reared comparison groups *before* varia-

tion in child care is experienced (Roopnarine & Lamb, 1978). Under such circumstances the attribution of subsequent development differences to daycare, and thus the very notion of daycare effects, may be inappropriate.

This brief analysis of two of the major limits in daycare research could easily and understandably lead the rigorous scientist to the conclusion that research on the effects of daycare cannot be done well, or at least not well enough so that it is useful for drawing valid conclusions. There are two reasons why I would not draw this conclusion. The first is that if the principal question is whether daycare is bad for children, then even nonperfectly controlled designs can answer this question. Unless we presume that families which place their children in daycare do a better job of caring for their offspring before and during their placement, then comparisons which consistently reveal few differences between daycare and home-reared children should allay most fears that parents, scientists, and policymakers are likely to have. Thus, while research designs might not be the best possible to document the effects of daycare per se, they appear good enough to chronicle deficits that may be associated with (as opposed to caused by) daycare rearing.

My second cause for confidence in available daycare research derives from the data themselves. Despite limits in design and especially measurement, findings across studies are surprisingly consistent, even if not perfectly uniform. And, as I hope to show, even where inconsistency is markedly apparent, this too appears both explainable and meaningful.

### Intellectual Development

Ever since the Soviet Union beat the United States into space with the launching of Sputnik in the 1950s, Americans have displayed great concern for the intellectual development of their children. In point of fact, this is one reason why the theories of Piaget and the cognitive perspective in general have come to dominate the American psychological scene over the past two decades. Concern for the effects of daycare on intellectual functioning merely reflects this historical influence.

An overwhelming majority of studies of the effects of daycare on subsequent intellectual development have indicated no differences between daycare-reared children and matched home-reared controls (Belsky, Steinberg, & Walker, 1982). Although a number of these investigators had found initial gains in one or many test subscales, all significant differences between daycare children and matched controls disappeared during the program or soon after termination. In the only long-term follow-up study in this area, 102 of 120 Swedish children initially investigated by Cochran (1977) during infancy were found at 5 years of age to be equal in intelligence regardless of whether they had been continuously reared in a daycare centre, family daycare home, or in their own homes by their parents (Gunnarson, 1978). For children from relatively advantaged families, then, exposure to daycare, even to high-quality, cognitively enriched programs, does not appear to result in any long-term gains in IQ test performance. Neither, though, does it seem that any losses in intellectual performance result from enrollment in daycare.

In contrast to this conclusion regarding children from advantaged families, it is of significance that positive effects of the daycare experience on performance on standardized tests of intellectual development have been reported by a handful of investigators for those children who have been categorized as higher risk than the average middle-class child. It should be noted, however, that most of the programs in which these economically-disadvantaged children were enrolled were specifically designed to provide cognitive enrichment, although they varied widely in the type and degree of special enrichment provided for the children and families involved (Belsky & Steinberg, 1978). Lally, (1973), for example, found that while 29 percent of a low education, home-reared group obtained an IQ below 90 on the Stanford-Binet test, only 7 percent of daycare group did so. On the basis of these results, it would appear that an enriching daycare experience may reduce some of the adverse affects typically associated with high-risk environments.

Further support for this conclusion comes from a longitudinal study of daycare rearing beginning in early infancy (Ramey, Dorval & Baker-Ward, 1981). In this work, three groups of children were compared: (1) a high-risk experimental group enrolled in a specially designed, cognitive enrichment daycare program; (2) a high-risk, home-reared control group matched to the experimentals on a number of important variables (e.g., social class, age, sex, race); and (3) a general population contrast group reared at home in more economically advantaged households. During the period between 6 and 18 months, performance on the mental developmental subscale of the Bayley Infant Test declined for the high-risk controls (from 104 to 86), while it remained stable (near 104) for the high-risk experimentals (who were *randomly* assigned to the daycare rearing group). In addition, motor development subscale scores on this same test revealed significant differences between these two groups favouring the daycare-reared children.

Follow-up comparisons demonstrate that these patterns of decline in the level of functioning for the home-reared, economically disadvantaged children and of stability for their daycare-reared counterparts continue into the child's third, fourth, and fifth years of life. In fact, while only 11 percent of the daycare-reared children are scoring in the range of cognitive-educational handicap (i.e., I.Q. less than 85) at age five, a full 35 percent of the home-reared controls are scoring below this level of functioning. A possible reason for this difference is suggested by a recent analysis by O'Connell and Farran (1982) of these children's linguistic functioning when observed with mother at 20 during free play and a structured give-and-take-an-object session. The experimental children cared for in daycare since their opening months of life engaged in more spontaneous showing of objects, and relied upon words more frequently when giving and requesting. In sum, they appeared more linguistically and communicatively competent, and it is just such competency upon which subsequent intellectual growth is likely to build.

The overall picture of evidence, duly qualified, suggests that the daycare experience has neither beneficial nor adverse effects on the intellectual development (as measured by standardized tests) of most children. For economically disadvantaged children, however, daycare may have an enduring positive effect, for it appears that such daycare experience may *reduce the declines in test scores*

typically associated with high-risk populations after 18 months of age (Belsky & Steinberg, 1978; Belsky, Steinberg & Walker, 1982).

### Emotional Development

Historically, the mother-child bond has been of prime concern to those interested in the influence of early experience upon emotional development. Psychoanalytic theory and early research on institutionalized children (e.g., Bowlby, 1951; Spitz, 1945) suggested that any arrangement which deprived the child of continuous access to the mother would impair the development of a strong maternal attachment and thereby adversely affect the child's emotional security. Since daycare, by its very nature, entails the daily separation of mother from child, a good deal of attention has been devoted to discovering whether child care outside the home does indeed disrupt the child's emotional tie to his mother. As already noted, the major strategy for making such an appraisal has been to observe young children's responses to separation from and reunion with their mothers (usually in an unfamiliar laboratory playroom), and to see whether children prefer to interact with their mothers, their caregivers, or a stranger in free play situations.

In a very early, and therefore noteworthy study, Blehar (1974) observed disturbances in the attachment relationships that children, 30 and 40 months of age, and enrolled in daycare for five months, had developed with their mothers. Specifically, while the 30-month-old children were more likely to show "anxious-avoidant" attachments in their mothers (more resistance and avoidance behaviour and less proximity seeking during reunion) than were their home-reared counterparts, the 40 month old children manifested "anxious-ambivalent" attachments (less exploration prior to separation, more crying and searching during separation, and more proximity seeking and resistance behaviour to mother during reunion). In each age group, the home-reared comparison subjects were more likely to greet their mothers positively following the stressful separation experience, a behavioural style that is considered an index of a secure emotional attachment (Sroufe, 1979). Much criticism has been wielded against this study (Belsky & Steinberg, 1978), and an attempt to replicate Blehar's 40-month results, using many more methodological controls, failed to find the home-care/daycare differences she discerned (Moskowitz, Schwarz & Corsini, 1977).

Results from several other investigations are contradictory in showing that either daycare (Cochran, 1977; Ricciuti, 1974) or home-reared children (Doyle & Somers, 1977) are more likely to get distressed upon separation from caregiver. It seems ill-advised, however, to interpret group differences on a single measure as indicative of a meaningful and functionally significant difference in psychological development (Belsky & Steinberg, 1978). This would seem especially true in the case of a measure of distress following separation from mother, since Kagan and his colleagues (1978) have observed that distress to separation shows virtually the same developmental course in children reared in markedly different contexts around the world, suggesting that it may be more maturationally programmed than experientially influenced. This is probably the reason why Kagan et al. (1978) found, in the most comprehensive and controlled study to date, that between 3 and 30 months of age daycare and home-reared infants did not differ in their emotional responses to separation from mother.

Further evidence of similar patterns of emotional development in daycare and home-reared children comes from a series of studies of 10-12 month olds (Brookhart & Hock, 1976), 5-30 month olds (Doyle, 1975), 36 month olds (Roopnarine & Lamb, 1978), and 41-45 month olds (Portnoy & Simmons, 1978). In each investigation response to separation from and reunion with mother were generally equivalent between groups that varied in early rearing experience. Why then do Blehar's (1974) previous results differ so markedly? Two explanations come to mind—one historical, the other developmental.

It is important to note that Blehar's children were enrolled in daycare in the early 1970s, a time when daycare, especially for very young children, was still looked upon negatively by many. Possibly, then, the guilt that parents may have experienced in violating cultural standards, or even the quality of care that was offered when daycare was such a relatively new phenomenon, could have adversely influenced the Blehar subjects. Thus, a cohort effect, emphasizing the historical timing of daycare enrollment, might be responsible for her divergent results.

Additionally, it needs to be noted that Blehar's children were only in daycare for 5 months when evaluated. And recent evidence indicates that a "transient distress reaction" may be associated with initial adaptation to daily separation from parents and thus may account for Blehar's data. Support from this possibility comes from several sources. First, Portnoy and Simmons (1978), who first proposed this explanation, were unable to replicate Blehar's results, but studied children who averaged 9 months of daycare experience prior to assessment. And, in an entirely independent study, Blanchard and Main (1979) found that avoidance of mother, both during daily pick-up from daycare and in a structured laboratory situation, decreased the longer that child had been in daycare. These findings suggest, then, that young children may go through a period of *stressful adaptation* to supplementary child care. But once they come to understand that regular separation from parent need not imply loss of the attachment figure, adaptation is achieved and problematic behaviour is reduced.

It is important to emphasize that beyond the just discussed transient-distress reaction, negative effects of daycare may be absent primarily when supplementary child care arrangements are reasonably stable and care is of a reasonable quality. In fact, a recent study of infants enrolled prior to their first birthday in unstable (i.e., frequently changing) daycare arrangements reveals that children in such poor quality care arrangements are at risk for developing anxious-avoidant attachment relations with their mothers (Vaughn, Gove & Egeland, 1980). An unrelated investigation by Schwartz (1984) also indicates that infants starting full-time daycare placement during the first year display more avoidance of their mothers when reunited with them following a brief separation of 18 months. Attachment relations characterized by high levels of such avoidance, and thus classified as insecure, have been found to predict problems in adjusting to peers during the preschool years (Arend, Gove & Sroufe, 1979).

A follow-up study of the children in the Vaughn et al. (1980) investigation led its authors to conclude that even these apparently negative effects may not be long lasting: "at two years of age the effects of out of home care were no longer striking... For this sample, then, it appears that the cumulative adverse effects of out-of-home care were minimal" (Farber & Egeland, 1982, p. 120).

episode which could lead a more cautious reader to a different conclusion. Specifically, toddlers whose mothers began working prior to their infants' first birthday displayed significantly less enthusiasm in confronting a challenging task than children who had no daycare experience. Furthermore, they tended to be less compliant in following their mothers' interactions and were less persistent in dealing with a difficult problem than children who had never been in daycare or who began daycare after their first birthday. Finally, they, like the late-entry daycare children, tended to display more negative affect.

In a recent and provocative reanalysis of the Farber and Egeland (1982) data, Vaughn, Deane and Waters (1984) demonstrate that the effects of early daycare entry are indeed long-lasting, "but can only be understood when the interaction of attachment history and nonmaternal care experiences are considered together" (p. 37, MS). For children classified as anxiously attached to their mothers at 18 months of age, no effect of daycare emerged; such children, regardless of daycare utilization or timing of entry into daycare continued to display less competent and more maladaptive behaviour in the problem-solving situation at 24 months. For children evaluated as securely attached at 18 months, however, those who had entered daycare before one year of age received "substantially less optimal scores on the 24-month measures than their home-care counterparts" (p. 37, MS). Indeed, although children who were secure at 18 months and whose mothers never worked looked more competent at 2 years than the insecure children from the early work group, no differences in functioning in the problem-solving task were evident between children who were secure at 18 months and whose mothers started work before 12 months and insecure children whose mothers never worked.

Since the initial Vaughn et al. (1980) analysis indicated that early entry is associated with greater anxious-avoidant attachments, and since these new data indicate that limits in child functioning become evident by 2 years of age even when the attachment history was characterized by security, there seems to be cause for concern about early entry to the kind of routine day that is available in most communities. This would seem to be especially true in view of two additional and recent studies which also raise questions about early entry into daycare. In one which was conducted in Bermuda, and will be discussed in more detail when we consider the second wave of daycare research, McCartney and her colleagues (1982) found that "children who began group care in infancy were rated as more maladjusted (when studied between 3 and 5-years of age) than those who were cared for by sitters or in family daycare homes for the early years and who began group care at later ages." These conclusions, it is important to note, were based upon analyses which controlled for a variety of important background variables, including child's age at time of assessment and mother's IQ, age and ethnicity. In a retrospective investigation of 8- to 10-year-olds who had varied in their preschool experiences. Barton and Schwarz (1981) also found daycare entry prior to 12 months to be associated with higher levels of misbehaviour and greater social withdrawal, even after controlling for the education of both parents.

past reviews in order to underscore the potentially problematic nature of early entry into community-based, as opposed to university-based, daycare (Belsky & Steinberg, 1978; Belsky, Steinberg & Walker, 1982). Supplementary child care exerts little influence on the child's emotional ties to his/her mother (other than *transient* distress) except under certain conditions, as when children are enrolled in unstable or poor quality daycare arrangements prior to their first birthday. Under such conditions, infants may be more likely to develop a particular kind of disturbance in their relations with their primary attachment figure: they will be likely to avoid her. Further, they may be more likely to display emotional and social problems in subsequent years. Important to note, though, is the fact that Farber and Egeland themselves concluded that little effect of early entry was evident at 2 years. Further, studies of high quality care have failed to discern negative consequences of early entry (Ricciuti, 1974; Kagan, Kearsley & Zelazo, 1978; Ramey, Dorval & Baker-Ward, 1981).

### Social Development

With respect to peer relations, available evidence indicates that daycare has both positive and negative effects. On the positive side, Ricciuti (1974) and Kagan et al. (1978) have shown that one- to two-year olds with group experience during infancy are more willing to approach a strange peer or continue their play in the presence of an unfamiliar age-mate, and Clarke-Stewart (1979) has reported that 2- and 3-year-olds cared for in daycare centres, nursery schools or family daycare homes display more cooperation while playing with a strange peer and are better able to appraise the perspective of another than are age-mates reared by their mother or a babysitter at home. More recently, Vliestra (1981) has reported, on the basis of observations of 2-4-year-olds, that those experiencing full-daycare, in contrast to those experiencing half-daycare (for at least 6 months), engaged in significantly more positive interaction with peers and displayed more of what she regards as prosocial aggression (tattling, defending property against counterattack, commanding, enforcing rules), but not more hostile aggression (physical or verbal attack on others). Studies such as these and others (Gunnarson, 1978) clearly suggest that daycare rearing may enhance certain social competencies, probably by providing children with early and increased opportunities to relate to peers. That these effects may be enduring is suggested by Moore's (1975) study of adolescents: boys who had experienced group rearing prior to the age of five reported higher concern for social activities and were also observed to be more sociable with peers and found to be chosen more regularly by peers as likable than were boys who were home-reared during their preschool years.

On the negative side, Moore (1964) observed that when these children were preschoolers, those in supplementary child care arrangements (which were often unstable) were more prone to toilet lapses and were more self-assertive. Schwarz et al. (1974) found in one of the first studies to raise concerns about the effect of daycare that preschoolers with daycare experience in infancy were more aggressive (both physically and verbally) toward peers than a group of home-reared

children who were enrolled in daycare for the first time when 3-4-years-old. Vliestra's (1981) earlier mentioned study raises some questions, however, about these results which were based upon observer ratings. While her observational data comparing children with part-time and full-time exposure to daycare failed to demonstrate that full-time care was associated with greater aggression, teacher ratings indicated that the full-time children were more aggressive. This contradiction, she suggests, may be a result of the greater activity levels of the full-time children which could have been interpreted as aggression by teachers. The relevance of his interpretation for the Schwarz et al. (1974) study is to be found in the fact that this early investigation discerned greater activity on the part of preschoolers with extensive daycare experience. Could it be that aggression and activity were also confused in the Schwarz study?

While this possibility cannot be discounted, the situation is further confused by a recent retrospective study by Barton and Schwarz (1981) who compared the teacher and peer ratings of 191 eight to ten year olds from white middle-class families who varied in daycare exposure during their preschool years. After controlling for maternal and paternal education, analyses revealed no differences on teacher ratings of children, but peer ratings indicated that full-time daycare exposure was associated with more aggression and attention-getting—what Barton and Schwarz referred to as misbehaviour. Although the evidence is by no means totally consistent, it does repeatedly suggest that in some respects daycare children engage in more negative interactions with peers. My own reading of these data is that with greater peer exposure comes greater peer interaction, which is more likely to be both positive and negative in quality.

When it comes to relations with adults, and the socialization of adult-like behaviours, the available evidence also raises concerns. In the initial Schwarz et al. (1974) investigation, observations and teacher reports revealed that preschoolers with extensive daycare experiences were less cooperative with adults, more physically and verbally aggressive toward them, and somewhat less tolerant of frustration. Results consistent with these data were reported a decade earlier by Ralph, Thomas, Chess, and Korn (1964) who found that negative interactions between middle- and upper-class first graders and their teachers varied directly with the amount of group-rearing the children experienced prior to first grade. Paralleling these results are recent findings from a retrospective analysis of 5- and 6-year-olds who were reared at home or in daycare during the preschool period. Robertson (1982) observed that boys with daycare histories were rated by their teachers as substantially and significantly more troublesome than peers cared for at home. Specifically, these daycare-reared boys were more likely to be rated as having little respect for other children and as being quarrelsome, disobedient, and uncooperative. Consistent with these findings are those reported as part of a retrospective study of 2-year-olds from Bermuda who had been cared for in daycare centres, by babysitters, or by mothers during their first years of life. Analyses which included statistical controls for variation in maternal and paternal IQ, education, and occupation indicated that, in testing situations with adults, centre-reared children were more apathetic, less attentive and less socially responsive (Schwarz, Scarr, Caparulo, Furrow, McCartney, Billington, Phillips & Hindy, 1981).

Additional evidence also suggests that daycare-reared children may orient to peers more than to adults. Schwarz et al. (1974) found, for example, that while preschoolers with prior daycare experience interacted more with peers than teachers, the opposite was true of the home-reared children who were having their first group experience at age three to four (Lay & Meyer, 1973). Similar results have been reported by McCutcheon and Calhoun (1976) who observed that increased interaction with peers was accompanied by decreased interaction with adults in daycare. The implications of this trend are suggested by several results from Moore's (1964) initial study that indicate that daycare-reared preschoolers are less conforming and less impressed by punishment.

Given these potentially disturbing effects of daycare on social development, several comments are in order. Lest these data be taken as a sweeping indictment of daycare rearing, it must be noted that like all social and educational efforts, daycare programs are likely to reflect, and in some measure achieve, the values held explicitly or implicitly by their sponsors and, through them, by the community at large.

From this perspective, the tendency we have observed for all-day group care to predispose children toward greater aggressiveness, impulsivity and egocentrism may represent a phenomenon specific to American society, for these outcome have been identified as characteristic of socialization in age-segregated peer groups in America generally. That the phenomena may indeed be culturebound is indicated by comparative studies of peer group socialization in the United States, the USSR, Israel, and other contemporary societies, which show that, depending on the goals and methods involved, group upbringing can lead to a variety of consequences, ranging from delinquency and violence at one extreme to unquestioning conformity at the other (Belsky & Steinberg, 1978).

Ambron's (1979) recent suggestion that daycare staff are more permissive, more tolerant of disobedience and aggression, and less inclined to set behaviour standards than parents is consistent with these conclusions. So too is McCrae and Herbert-Jackson's (1975) claim that the effects of daycare may be program specific. Empirical support for these speculations can be found in Gunnarson's (1978) Swedish daycare study, the findings of which contradict much of the data reviewed above. Specifically, naturalistic observations of 5-year-olds reared since infancy in daycare centres, family daycare homes, or in their own homes, revealed no rearing-group differences in children's compliance and cooperation with, and positive affect expressed towards adults. Moreover, structured doll play assessments of these 5-year-olds revealed that daycare children were no more likely than home-reared children to transgress against adult wishes in the face of peer pressures to do so. However, children reared in Swedish daycare centres, in comparison to those reared in homes (by family daycare providers or mothers), did engage more frequently in information sharing, compliance and cooperation with peers. These data demonstrate not only that daycare can promote positive peer skills, but that negative interactions with peers and adults which have been reported regularly enough so that they cannot be disregarded, need not be more frequent in any rearing environment. This leads us to reaffirm the conclusion quoted earlier: the effect of daycare on social development will likely depend on the community and cultural context in which daycare is employed as well as the particular practices of the daycare program.

## Summary: Research on the Developmental Effects of Daycare

The findings with respect to cognitive development are probably the most easy to summarize. There is no evidence that daycare influences the intellectual functioning of children other than those from impoverished homes who are reared in centres during infancy. Exactly how long such supplementary child care experience buffers these children from the intellectual declines so frequently observed among their home-reared counterparts remains to be seen. With respect to emotional development, available evidence generally fails to support the notion that supplementary child care negatively affects the child. Indeed, new evidence suggests that many of the negative effects that have been found for daycare vis-a-vis infant-mother attachment may be more a function of the timing of assessment than supplementary care per se. After 6 months of daycare experience, young children seem to successfully adapt to their supplementary care arrangements so that they are virtually indistinguishable from their home-reared counterparts. Where group differences are evident, little consistency across studies can be found, suggesting that the discerned effects of daycare rearing are program specific or unreliable.

These conclusions seem to hold true except under circumstances in which children are enrolled in care that is not of high quality prior to their first birthday. Such early enrollment has been associated with the development of anxious-avoidant attachment (Vaughn et al., 1980) and later maladjustment (McCartney et al., 1982; Barton & Schwarz, 1981). In view of many failures to discern a similar effect when children are reared in high quality programs, it cannot be emphasized enough that these conclusions pertain to the potentially deleterious consequences of early experience in poor quality care. What this suggests, of course, is that very early day experiences need not be problematic. Under conditions of high quality, development, at least so far as has been studied to date, need not be compromised.

With respect to social development the news is both good and bad. Exposure to daycare seems to increase both positive and negative interactions with age-mates; further, there is repeated evidence that this form of childrearing may also make children less oriented and responsive to adult socialization. Since such findings are by no means replicated in all or even most studies, either in this nation or in others, it cannot be concluded that there are necessary consequences of daycare. Indeed, the failure to discern negative effects in many studies clearly suggests that while such disturbing consequences can be produced by daycare rearing, they need not be.

This point is extremely important from the standpoint of policy. In response to the science- and policy-oriented question, "Is daycare bad for children?", it seems appropriate to conclude that it usually is not and certainly does not have to be, but that it can be. In view of this conclusion, the orientation of scientists and policy makers is forced to shift from one of daycare effects to the conditions of care that produce different consequences. This would seem to be especially so since parents who work need child care of some sort. If some arrangement must be made it would seem to be incumbent upon a society to know what are the best conditions for such care or, at the very least, what are the conditions to be avoided. Fortunately, daycare research by child developmentalists has responded to this shift in focus; indeed, it may have even preceded it.

## Conditions of Quality

Research designed to evaluate the effects of daycare routinely involves the comparison of children whose experiences have varied markedly. Some have been reared in daycare, others by their own parents. Such between-group designs afford scientists and policymakers little insight into those contextual conditions which are most supportive of development. Indeed, such inference is possible only indirectly—by comparing the results of investigations which sampled children from different daycare rearing milieus. Such between-study comparisons are inherently problematical because of the large number of factors across which investigations vary in addition to the quality of programs from which they have sampled children. Indeed, given the diversity of methods, procedures, and ages of subjects, study by study comparisons are only useful at the most global level of analysis, like a comparison of the results of investigations which relied upon community-based programs and those which relied upon university-sponsored, research-oriented programs to examine the effects of daycare. In the preceding analysis, I made reference to just such global comparisons.

The limits inherent to such approaches are the same as those inherent in social class comparisons. Although one may be able to document that class is related to some developmental outcome, the question of how or why remains empirically unanswerable because of the lack of specificity in the construct of social class. Recognition of this limit has led researchers to examine variation within a social class in order to determine how a set of experiences which may be probabilistically associated with a particular socioeconomic niche influences development.

A comparable awareness has led policy-minded students of child development to examine variation within daycare milieus in recent years. In part this work has been motivated by the recognized limits of home care versus daycare comparisons. It is also motivated, however, by the realization that daycare is here to stay and thus that policymakers need to know about the conditions of daycare, especially those that can be regulated, and how they effect the child's development. Toward this end, three approaches to specifying quality have been undertaken. One set of studies examines how regulatable dimensions of daycare, what I will refer to as social structural parameters of daycare, relate to child development. Investigations falling within this set attempt to relate to child dimensions of daycare like group size, caregiver-child ratio, caregiver training and whether or not a family daycare home is licensed or regulated directly to the child's intellectual, emotional, and/or cognitive development.

From a scientific standpoint such studies are limited since they cannot specify why or how such social structural parameters influence the child. In recognition of this weakness, a second set of studies attempts to link social structure with experience, since social structure is presumed to directly influence the types of experiences children actually have on a day-to-day basis in daycare. But why is this important? Because it is assumed that it is experience that influences development. In other words, this second set of investigations represent an effort to identify the experiential consequences of social structure.

But these investigations, too, are limited, since they rarely include an assessment of the child's development. Thus, although variation in group size or

caregiver training is limited to variation in experience, experience is rarely linked to development. And this, of course, is the weakness that the third set of studies address. Specifically, these investigations make an effort to relate observed variation in experience, scaled on a high-to-low quality basis, to developmental outcome.

Because only a single study has tried to coordinate all three pieces of this causal model (social structure + experience + development), it is most useful to discuss these investigations in blocks, weaving together results in order to generate a coherent picture. This is what I will do in this section in order to document what is currently known about the conditions and consequences of quality care.

### *Social Structure and Child Development*

Group size, caregiver-child ratio, and caregiver training are the dimensions of daycare which have received the most systematic attention by investigators interested in learning how parameters of daycare available to legislative regulation influence, or at least covary with, individual differences in the development of children reared in daycare. The National Daycare Study, which involved the systematic investigation of 67 daycare centres in 3 major metropolitan areas (Atlanta, Detroit and Seattle), was specifically designed to address issues of concern to policymakers. Consequently, sites and centres were chosen to maximize diversity of the sample; centres varied widely in staff characteristics, staff-child ratio, group sizes, and in the per-child expenditures and ethnic and socioeconomic composition of client populations (Ruopp & Travers, 1982).

Analysis of the performance of approximately 1,000 children on standardized tests of cognitive and linguistic development at two times of measurement (fall and spring) revealed that group size and caregiver training were the most important determinants of variation in children's development. Specifically, children cared for in small groups showed significantly greater improvement across testing periods on examinations designed to measure kindergarten and first grade reading readiness. Further, the specialized training of caregivers in subject areas pertinent to child care was also positively associated with child achievement.

Size of daycare group has also been implicated in a recent study of the care received by 64 two year olds in Bermuda who had experienced family daycare or centre care during their first two years (Schwarz, Scarr et al., 1981). In this investigation, maternal reports indicated that the size of the daycare rearing group which children experienced during the first and second year of life was negatively associated with a variety of developmental outcomes assessed when children were two years of age. Specifically, large group experiences during the first year were found to predict poor coordination, limited verbal expressiveness, and behavioural deviancy. Similar experience during the second year of life was related to limited attention span as well as poor coordination at the 24 month testing. While the influence of a poor caregiver-child ratio also appeared to be problematic, its pernicious effect seemed most striking when group size was also considered. Children who were reared in large programs with few adults per child displayed low attention spans, behavioural deviancy, hyperactivity, and an introverted style.

Stability of care is another dimension of social structure which merits consideration in any attempt to discern the processes by which variation in care influences child development. Unfortunately, and surprisingly, very little work exists on this important topic. Rubenstein and Howes' (1979) study of experiences at home and in daycare suggests that in addition to the frequent claim that a low turnover rate among staff is in the child's best interest, so too is a stable peer group. Stability has also been implicated as an important dimension of quality care in Cummings' (1980) investigation of emotional functioning. Observations made during separation from mother during daily morning drop offs at daycare revealed that toddlers were more likely to become upset when left with a caregiver identified as unstable than when left with one with whom the child was very familiar. Finally, the earlier-reviewed Vaughn et al. (1980) findings regarding the detrimental effect of daycare on attachment when supplementary care is initiated in the first year and tends to be unstable also underscore the importance of this dimension of the daycare experience.

Having found that certain parameters of the social structure of daycare environments are systematically related to how children fare in daycare, there is cause to wonder why such results obtain. Evidence which addresses this issue is reviewed next by considering research linking social structure with variation in experience.

### *Social Structure and Daily Experience*

If parameters of daycare structure like size, ratio, and caregiver training are predictive of the effect that daycare will have on a child, it is probably because aspects of daycare determine, at least in part, the nature of the child's daily experiences in care. To what extent is there evidence to substantiate this claim that the social structure of daycare is associated with the experiences children have? To answer this question, we turn first to analyses of group size and ratio.

Centre/group size and child-caregiver ratio are the characteristics of centres that have received the most empirical attention in efforts to understand how variation in programs affect children's experience. In an early observational study of 69 California preschool/daycare programs, Prescott, Jones, and Kritchevsky (1967) found that when the total centre population exceeded 60, more emphasis was placed upon rules and routine guidance than when size ranged from 30-60 children. Teachers, in fact, placed twice as much emphasis on control in the large groups, possibly accounting for the observation that in small centres children displayed more pleasure, wonder, and delight. Additional evidence from this study revealed that large centres were less flexible in their schooling, offered children fewer opportunities to initiate and control activities, and had teachers who displayed less sensitivity to the individual needs of the children (Heinicke, Friedman, Prescott, Pancel, & Sale, 1973).

Recently, most of these findings have been replicated in the National Daycare Study. Travers and Ruopp (1978) reported that for children three to five years of age, group size was the single most important determinant of the quality of children's experience. In groups of less than 15-18 children, caregivers were involved in more embellished caregiving (e.g., questioning, responding, praising, comforting), less straight monitoring of children, and less interaction with other adults. And in these smaller groups, children were more actively involved in

classroom activities like considering and contemplating, contributing ideas, cooperating, and persisting at tasks. On the basis of these findings, and others to be reviewed shortly, it seems reasonable to draw the conclusion that size affects caregiving, which in turn influences child functioning in daycare. This may well be the reason why size is also associated with daycare outcomes.

Interestingly, the NDC study found that child-to-caregiver ratio had little effect upon the quality of *preschoolers'* experience in daycare, though it was an important determinant of *infants'* experiences. More overt distress was observed among children under three as the number of children per caregiver increased. Additionally, in such high ratio infant and toddler programs, staff spent more time in management and control interactions, and engaged in less informal teaching (Connell, Layzer & Goodson, 1979; Travers & Ruopp, 1978). Biemiller and his colleagues (1976) reported similar findings in a small study comparing two infant daycare programs.

Other investigations also underscore group size and ratio as important determinants of the quality of children's experience. As part of an investigation of 40 toddlers in 16 daycare homes and 8 daycare centres, Howes (in press) carried out systematic observations (each lasting two hours) on 20 caregiver-toddler dyads in each of these types of daycare settings. Results revealed that caregivers with fewer children in their care (low group size, low ratio), who worked shorter hours, and who had less housework responsibilities engaged in more facilitative social stimulation (talk, play, demonstrate, toy, touch), expressed more positive affect, were more responsive, and less restrictive and negative. More years experience as a child care worker and more formal training in child care were also related to the provision of such "high quality" care, it should be noted.

In another investigation by Howes, 55 middle class toddlers from 11 daycare centres and 16 family daycare homes were observed (Howes & Rubenstein, 1983). Toddlers in both settings with ratios of three or few children per caregiver engaged in more responsive and spontaneous talking and were more positively affective, as revealed by high levels of laughing, smiling, and sharing than those in settings with between 3.5 and 6 children per caregiver. This observed difference in child behaviour was quite possibly a function of the fact that, in those locales with higher ratios, caregivers engaged in more spontaneous talking, more hugging and holding, and more social mediation of objects.

Given the pattern of findings that seem to be emerging, it should not be surprising that Vandell and Powers (1982) reported similar results in their observational investigation of 55 white, middle class preschoolers (age 3-5) at 6 different centres varying in quality. High quality centres, operated by universities, were characterized by a low caregiver-child ratio (1:5), high levels of teacher training and child care experience, large amounts of space per child, and many toys, whereas low quality centres had high ratios (1:24), low levels of teacher training and experience, and less adequate toys. Sixteen minutes of observation on each child revealed that in the high quality centres children were more likely to interact positively with adults, and less likely to engage in solitary activities or to be uninvolved in any sustained activity.

Several of the studies mentioned above included analyses of family daycare homes as well as daycare centres. Beyond parameters like size, ratio, and caregiver training, it should be noted that three different types of family daycare homes can be distinguished. *Unregulated homes* are those that are not licensed or registered by a public agency. Unregulated care, although illegal in many cases, is the most prevalent form of family daycare. Indeed, a 1971 survey estimated that unlicensed care constituted 90 percent of all daycare arrangements (Westinghouse/Westat, 1971). In *regulated or licensed care*, the provider has been licensed by a state, county or local government agency (e.g., department of human resources, county board of health). Across the nation there is considerable variation in licensing standards, but most deal with group composition (i.e., staff-child ratio) and basic health and safety measures. Licensed homes are visited (often irregularly) by local officials who review the health and safety of the environment. Finally, *sponsored or supervised homes* are part of networks of organizations of child care providers. These are groups of licensed caregivers whose organization provides them with referrals and training or other child support services (e.g., play material). Such networks frequently work on the assumption that provision of training and assistance to caregivers improves the quality of care provided.

A recent study of 41 sponsored (i.e., supervised), 35 licensed, and 23 unlicensed FDC homes tends to corroborate this assumption. On the basis of lengthy, naturalistic observations, Hawkins and her colleagues (Hawkins, Wilcox, Gillis, Porter & Carew, 1979) found that sponsored caregivers were most involved with their children (e.g., teaching, helping, offering direction), while providers in unlicensed homes were least involved. Moreover, these sponsored homes were found to offer safer physical environments (Stallings & Porter, 1980). Probably as a consequence of such differences between types of family daycare, toddlers in the unlicensed homes were more likely to spend time on their own, not interacting with anyone; were most frequently unhappy; and were most inclined to engage in antisocial behaviour (Carew, 1979). Such differences in caregiving environments and children's experiences in family daycare are probably a function, at least in part, of the fact that unlicensed homes tend to have less favourable adult-child ratios than do licensed and supervised homes (Emlen, 1977; Hall & Weiner, 1977).

On the basis of the work reviewed in this section, we see that those aspects of the social structure of daycare which have been related to the developmental consequences of daycare tend also to covary in a meaningful manner with variation in day-to-day experiences in daycare. Such a pattern of covariation provides support for the assumption that size, ratio, and training influence child development by shaping experience. In order to make the strongest case possible for this influence, we turn next to investigations linking variation in day-to-day experience to variation in the effects of daycare.

#### *Daily Experience and Child Development*

Studies that speak to the issue of how experience in daycare influences the development of children exposed to such rearing have assessed a variety of outcomes which can be broadly distinguished in terms of those that assess socioemotional development and those that focus upon cognitive-linguistic

development. Interestingly, there exists striking similarity across studies in the dimensions of experience that have been sampled, even though measurement procedures vary from caregiver or maternal reports to systematic behavioural observation. The fact, too, that results are strikingly consistent makes these studies relatively easy to summarize. In this section, then, a relatively global summary will be offered of five different investigations before focusing in detail upon the single most comprehensive study of this issue to date.

Golden and his colleagues (1978) studied approximately 400 children reared at home or enrolled in one of 31 service-oriented, licensed, public, and private, community controlled, group and family infant daycare programs in New York City. Carefully collected observational assessments of the physical and social caregiving environments at 12, 18, and 24 months revealed that 2-year-olds who experienced high levels of cognitive and social stimulation scored appreciably higher on measures of social competence and language comprehension when they were three.

Complementing these findings are those from another large scale investigation of infant-toddler daycare, this one conducted in California. Kermoian (1980) found, on the basis of their observations of more than 225 infants in various child care arrangements, that those in low quality milieus—characterized by infrequent play and instructional interactions with caregivers, and frequent negative interactions, were less sensitive to experimental mother-infant separations than were those reared in high quality centres (Kermoian, 1980). The infants' failure activity suggested to these investigators that low quality care may increase the development of avoidant attachment relations.

Variation in daycare experience appears to effect the quality of the child's emotional tie to its caregiver as well as to its parent. Such a conclusion emerged from an investigation assessing the effect of variation in physical environment and caregiver involvement of 17 daycare centres serving 35 white, middle class children ranging in age from 19-42 months (Anderson, Nagel, Roberts & Smith, 1981). Children observed in the strange situation who come from centres where caregivers were observed to interact frequently with the children and were planned daily routines and activities, attractive physical space, and age-appropriate equipment characterized the centres, behaved in a way suggestive of a secure relationship to their caregivers. Specifically, the children exposed to such care explored more freely and showed a preference for interacting with the familiar caregiver over the stranger. In contrast, children from centres of low physical quality and/or low caregiver involvement displayed a preference for interacting with the stranger whom they had never before encountered.

Rubenstein, Howes, and Boyle's (1979) small scale study of infant daycare also highlights the importance of caregiver involvement—a theme that keeps reappearing in these analyses linking variation in day-to-day experience to variation in child functioning. In their follow-up study of ten 3-year-olds cared for in centres since 12 months of age, they reported that frequency of social play with caregiver predicted subsequent greeting behaviour upon reunion with mothers ( $r = .70$ ) in a separation situation, while caregiver directiveness (i.e., intrusiveness) predicted future temper tantrums ( $r = .67$ ). The possibility is raised in this study that these daycare experiences which appeared to influence later development may have been instigated by the children themselves; for

example, infants who were more socially oriented tended to elicit more playful interaction from their caregivers.

The developmental significance of the quantity and quality of caregiver involvement is most apparent in a comprehensive investigation of 156 families with preschoolers in daycare centres on the island of Bermuda (McCartney, Scarr, Phillips, Grajek & Schwarz, 1982). The subjects of this study, it is of interest to note, ranged in age from 36-60 months and represented virtually the entire population of preschoolers in daycare on the island. Observations of children and interviews with directors were utilized to gather information on the activities children were exposed to and the stimulation they encountered. Child functioning was assessed using standardized assessments of language, social and emotional development, and data were gathered on family background so that hierarchical multiple regression analyses could be carried out controlling for confounding factors. The first variables entered into regression equations to predict child functioning were characteristics of children's families, including child age, and maternal IQ, education, and ethnicity. In the next step, status characteristics of group care were entered, including age at entry, and mean number of hours the child was in care. Finally, indices of the quality of care experience were entered; these included measures of the frequency with which the child was spoken to by an adult when alone and when a part of a group, and an overall quality of environment score based upon over 50 questions from two instruments completed by specially trained raters after extended observations of each centre.

Results revealed, consistent with findings reported already, that even after controlling for background characteristics, variation in quality significantly predicted linguistic and social competence. Specifically, a measure of adaptive language and two ratings of intelligence and task orientation were strongly effected by variation in quality among centres. In fact, in the case of language, nearly 20 percent of the variances was accounted for by differences in quality. With respect to social development, nearly half the variance in sociability (i.e., extroversion) from a standardized measure of classroom behaviour (filled out by parents and teachers) was accounted for by total quality; similarly a measure of consideration for others was also predicted by positive aspects of the daycare milieu. In contrast, children rated as dependent tended to come from centres with low overall quality. Furthermore, poor emotional adjustment (i.e., anxious, hyperactive, aggressive), as rated by caregivers, tended to occur in centres with low levels of adult verbal interaction with children.

In sum, "children at the better quality centres score higher on measures of language development... Caregivers at higher quality centres note their children as more sociable and considerate than do caregivers with centres with less adult-child verbal interaction and poorer overall quality" (McCartney et al., 1982). Centres with limited verbal interaction also have children who look less emotionally well adjusted, as revealed by higher levels of anxiety hostility/aggression, and hyperactivity.

## Conclusion

On the basis of the preceding analyses, it should be clear that not all daycare is the same. There exists great variation in social structure, experience, and the

outcomes associated with daycare exposure. Further, on the basis of the data reviewed, a case can be made for the claim that social structure influences experience which in turn affects child development. As we have seen, in centres and family daycare homes in which group size is modest, ratios are low and staff training is high, caregivers tend to be more stimulating, responsive and positively affectionate, as well as less restrictive. Moreover, children who experience such care tend to be more cooperative, more intellectually capable, and more emotionally secure.

What is so especially intriguing about these results of investigations aimed at chronicling the conditions of quality daycare is how consistent they are with research on family influences on child development. Whether we look at the research on infancy or early childhood (for reviews see Belsky, Lerner & Spanier, 1984; Clarke-Stewart, 1977), there is consistent evidence that certain qualities of parental care promote optimal psychological development. In infancy we speak of mothers being sensitive to their children and during the preschool years Baumrind's (1967) notion of the authoritative (as opposed to permissive or authoritarian) parent captures the essence of quality care. Operationally these terms refer to parents who are involved with their children, responsive to their needs, controlling of their behaviour, but not too restrictive. Such growth facilitating care also relies heavily upon linguistic communication, which we know fosters general intellectual development, as well as the use of inductive as opposed to power-assertive discipline, which we know fosters prosocial development. It would seem that in quality daycare, that is, in care systems in which physical and personal resources are not overextended, sensitive, authoritative care is also provided, and in this setting it continues to facilitate human development.

What this analysis suggests is that it is not where the child is reared that is of principal importance but how she is cared for. One's social address does not determine development, be it home care, daycare, lower class, middle-class; rather it is the day-to-day experiences one has which shapes psychological growth. Social structure is influential because it probabilistically influences whether certain experiences will be experienced. When group size is large and ratios are poor, individual attention to children falls victim to the exigencies of coping with an overextended set of resources. Either restrictions and controlling behaviour increase, or disregard and aimless behaviour on the part of the child increases. Neither is in the child's best interest. But when the necessary human resources are available, daily experiences tend to be stimulating and rewarding, and child development is facilitated. This is true in a daycare milieu as it is in a family environment.

### References

- Ambron, S. (1980). Causal models in early education research. In S. Kilmer (Ed.), *Advances in early education and day care. II*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Anderson, C. W., Nagle, R. J., Roberts, W. W., & Smith, J. W. (1981). Attachment to substitute caregivers as a function of centre quality and caregiver involvement. *Child Development, 52*, 53-61.
- Arend, R., Gove, F., & Sroufe, L. A. (1979). Continuity of individual adaptation from infancy to kindergarten: A predictive study of ego-resiliency and curiosity in preschoolers. *Child Development, 50*, 950-959.
- Barton, M., & Schwartz, C. (1981). *Day care in the middle class: Effects in elementary school*. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Annual Convention, Los Angeles.
- Baumrind, D. (1967). Child care practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behaviour. *Genetic Psychology Monographs, 75*, 43-88.
- Belsky, J., & Steinberg, L. (1978). The effects of daycare: A critical review. *Child Development, 49*, 929-949.
- Belsky, J., Steinberg, L., & Walker, A. (1982). The ecology of day care. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *Nontraditional families: Parenting and child development*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1982.
- Belsky, J., Lerner, R., & Spanier, G. (1984). *The child in the family*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Blehar, M. (1974). Anxious attachment and defensive reactions associated with day care. *Child Development, 45*, 683-692.
- Biemiller, A., Avis, C., & Lindsay, A. (1976). *Competence supporting aspects of day care environments— a preliminary study*. Paper presented at the Canadian Psychological Association Convention, Toronto.
- Blanchard, M., & Main, M. (1979). Avoidance of the attachment figure and social-emotional adjustment in day-care infants. *Developmental Psychology, 15*, 445-446.
- Bowlby, J. (1951). *Maternal care and mental health*. Geneva: World Health Organization.
- Brookhart, J., & Hock, E. (1976). The effects of experimental context and experiential background on infants' behaviour toward their mothers and a stranger. *Child Development, 47*, 333-340.
- Carew, J. (1979). *Observation study of caregivers and children in day care homes: Preliminary results from home observations*. Paper presented at Biennial Meetings of the Society of Research in Child Development, San Francisco.
- Caudell, W., & Weinstein, H. (1969). Maternal care and infant behaviour in Japan and America. *Psychiatry, 12*, 32-43.
- Clarke-Stewart, A. (1977). *Child care in the family*. New York: Academic Press.
- Clarke-Stewart, A. (1979). *Assessing social development*. Paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, San Francisco.
- Clarke-Stewart, K. A. (1980). Observation and experiment: Complement any strategies for studying day care and social development. In S. Kilmer (Ed.), *Advances in early education and day care*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Cochran, M. (1977). A comparison of group day and family child-rearing patterns in Sweden. *Child Development, 48*, 702-707.
- Connell, D. B., Layzer, J. I., & Goodson, D. (1979). National study of day care centres for infants: Findings and implications. Unpublished manuscript, ABT Associates Inc., Cambridge, Mass.
- Cummings, E. M. (1980). Caregiver stability and day care. *Developmental Psychology, 15*, 31-37.

- Doyle, A., & Somers, K. (1978). The effects of group and family day care on infant attachment behaviours. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 10, 38-45.
- Emlen, A. (1977). *Family day care for children under three*. Paper presented for the International Symposium on the Ecology of Care and Education of Children under Three.
- Farber, E. A., & Egeland, B. (1982). Developmental consequences of out-of-home care for infants in a low-income population. In E. Zigler & E. W. Gordon (Eds.), *Day care: Scientific and social policy issues*. Boston: Auburn House Pub. Co.
- Fraiberg, S. (1977). *Every child's birthright: In defense of mothering*. New York: Basic Books.
- Golden, M., Rosenbluth, L., Grossi, M. T. Policave, H. J., Freeman, H., Jr., & Brownless, M. (1978). *The New York City Day Care Study: A comparative study of licensed group and family day care programs and the effects of these programs on children and their families*. New York: Medical and Health Research Association of New York City, Inc.
- Gunnarson, L. (1978). *Children in day care and family care in Sweden: A follow-up*. Bulletin No. 21, Department of Educational Research, University of Gothenburg.
- Hall, A., & Weiner, S. (1977). *The supply of day care services in Denver and Seattle*. Menlo Park, CA.: Stanford Research Institute, Centre for the Study of Welfare Policy.
- Hawkins, P., Wilcox, M., Gillis, G., Porter, A., & Carew, J. (1979). *Observation study of caregivers and children in day care homes*. Paper presented at the biennial meeting for the Society of Research in Child Development, San Francisco.
- Heinicke, C., Friedman, D., Prescott, E., Puncel, C., & Sale, J. (1973). The organization of day care: Considerations relating to the mental health of child and family. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 43, 8-22.
- Hill, C. R. (1977). The child care market: A review of evidence and implications for federal policy. In *Policy Issues in Day Care: Summaries of 21 Papers*. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
- Hill, C. R. (1978). Private demand for child care: Implications for public policy. *Evaluation Quarterly*, 2, 523-545.
- Hofferth, S. (1979). Day care in the next decade: 1980-1990. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 644-658.
- Howes, C., & Rubenstein, J. L. (1981). Determinants of toddler experience in daycare: Social-affective style age of entry and quality of setting. Unpublished manuscript, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Kagan, J., Kearsley, R., & Zelazo, P. (1978). *Infancy: Its place in human development*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Kermorian, R. (1980). *Type and quality of care: Mediating factors in the effects of day care on infant responses to brief separation*. Paper presented at the International Conference on Infant Studies, New Haven, CT.
- Lally, R. (1973). The family development research program: Progress report. Unpublished paper, Syracuse University.
- Lay, M., & Meyer, W. (1973). *Teacher/child behaviours in an open environment daycare program*. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Children's Centre.
- Macrae, J. W., & Herbert-Jackson, E. (1975). Are behavioural effects of infant day care programs specific? *Developmental Psychology*, 12, 269-270.
- Matas, L., Arend, R., & Sroufe, L. (1978). Continuity in adaptation in the second year: The relationship between quality of attachment and later competence. *Child Development*, 49, 547-556.
- McCartney, K., Scarr, S., Phillips, D., Grajek, S., & Schwartz, J. C. (1982). Environmental differences among day care centres and their effects on children's development. In E. Zigler & E. Gordon (Eds.), *Day care: Scientific and social policy issues*. Boston: Auburn House Pub. Co.
- McCutcheon, B., & Calhoun, K. (1976). Social and emotional adjustment of infants and toddlers in a day care setting. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 46, 104-108.
- Moore, T. (1964). Children of full-time and part-time mothers. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*, 2, 1-10.
- Moore, T. (1975). Exclusive early mothering and its alternatives: The outcome of adolescence. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 16, 255-272.
- Moskowitz, D., Schwarz, J., & Corsini, D. (1977). Initiating day care at three years of age: Effects on attachment. *Child Development*, 48, 1271-1276.
- O'Connell, J. C., & Farran, D. C. (1982). Effects of day-care experience on the use of intentional communicative behaviours in a sample of socioeconomically depressed infants. *Developmental Psychology*, 18, 22-29.
- Portnoy, F., & Simmons, C. (1978). Day care and attachment. *Child Development*, 49, 239-242.
- Prescott, E., Jones, E., & Kritchevsky, S. (1967). *Group day care as a child rearing environment*. Final report to Children's Bureau. Pasadena, CA: Pacific Oaks College, 1967.
- Ralph, J., Thomas, A., Chess, S., & Korn, S. (1964). The influence of nursery school on social interaction. *Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 38, 144-152.
- Ramey, C. T., & Campbell, F. A. (1979a). Compensatory education for disadvantaged children. *School Review*, 87, 171-189.
- Ramey, C. T. & Campbell, F. A. (1979b). Early childhood education for psychosocially disadvantaged children: The effects of psychological processes. *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, 83, 645-648.
- Ramey, C., Dorval, B., & Baker-Ward, L. (1981). Group day care and socially disadvantaged families: Effects on the child and the family. In S. Kilmer (Ed.), *Advances in early education and day care*. Greenwich, CT.: JAI Press.
- Ricciuti, H. (1974). Fear and development of social attachments in the first year of life. In M. Lewis & L. A. Rosenblum (Eds.). *The origins of human behaviour: Fear*. New York: Wiley.
- Robertson, A. (1982). Day care and children's responsiveness to adults. In E. Zigler & E. Gordon (Eds.), *Day care: Scientific and social policy issues*. Boston: Auburn House Pub. Co.
- Roopnarine, J., & Lamb, M. (1978). The effects of day care on attachment and exploratory behaviour in a strange situation. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 24, 85-95.
- Rubenstein, J. L., & Howes, C. Caregiving and infant behaviour in day care and in homes. *Developmental Psychology*, 15, 1-24.

- Rubenstein, J. L., & Howes, C. Caregiving and infant behavior in day care and in homes. *Developmental Psychology*, 15, 1-24.
- Rubenstein, J. L., Howes, C., & Boyle, P. (1979). *A two-year follow up of infants in community based infant day care*. Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, San Francisco.
- Ruopp, R., & Travers, J. (1982). Janus faces day care: Perspectives on quality and cost. In E. Zigler & E. W. Gordon (Eds.), *Day care: Scientific and social policy issues*. Boston: Auburn House Pub. Co.
- Schwarz, J. C., Scarr, S. W., Caparulo, B., Furrow, D., McCartney, K., Billington, R., Phillips, D., & Hindy, C. (1981). *Centre, sitter, and home day care before age two: A report on the first Bermuda infant care study*. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association, Annual convention in Los Angeles.
- Schwarz, J., Strickland, R., & Krolick, G. (1974). Infant day care: Behavioural effects at preschool age. *Developmental Psychology*, 10, 502-506.
- Spitz, R. A. (1945). Hospitalism: An inquiry into the genesis of psychiatric conditions in early childhood. *Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, 1, 53-74.
- Sroufe, L. (1979). The coherence of individual development. *American Psychologist*, 34, 834-841.
- Stallings, J., & Porter, A. (1980). National Day Care Home Study: Observation component. Draft final report to the Day Care Division, Administration for Children, Youth, and Families, DHEW.
- Travers, J., & Ruopp, R. (1978). *National day care study: Preliminary findings and their implications: 31 January, 1978*. Cambridge, MA: Abot Associates.
- Vandell, D. L., & Powers, C. P. (1982). Day care quality and children's free play activities. Unpublished manuscript.
- Vaughn, B., Deane, I., & Waters, E. (1980). The impact of out-of-home care on child-mother attachment quality: Another look at some enduring questions. Unpublished.
- Vaughn, B., Gove, R., & Egeland, B. (1980). The relationship between out-of-home care and the quality of infant-mother attachment in an economically disadvantaged population. *Child Development*, 51, 1203-1214.
- Vliestra, A. G. (1981). Full versus half-day preschool attendance: Effects in young children as assessed by teacher ratings and behavioural observations. *Child Development*, 52, 603-610.
- Waters, E., Wippman, J., & Sroufe, L. (1979). Attachment, positive affect, and competence in the peer group: Two studies in construct validation. *Child Development*, 50, 821-829.
- Westinghouse Learning Corporation and Westat Research, Inc. *Day Care survey — 1970: Summary report and basic analysis*. Washington, D. C.: Office of Economic Opportunity.

## CONSUMERISM, ARBITRARY MALE DOMINANCE AND DAYCARE

Elliott T. Barker,  
 Consultant in Psychiatry,  
 Mental Health Centre, Penetanguishene, Ontario; and  
 President, Canadian Society for the  
 Prevention of Cruelty to Children

### ABSTRACT

There are two powerful and dangerous social forces underlying the need for daycare: consumerism, and arbitrary male dominance. The former lures parents into believing that they need to be making more money rather than caring for their children. The latter drives women away from nurturing their children to gain emancipation via the marketplace. The problem is that the shared, discontinuous, and changing caretakers almost inevitable in substitute arrangements for the nurturing of infants and toddlers puts at risk development of their capacities for trust, empathy, and affection. No one sees these deficits because they don't show up clearly until adulthood, and even then they are not measurable like an intelligence quotient is. What is worse, their absence can actually be an asset in a consumer society which often rewards the opposite values. But the capacities for trust, empathy, and affection are in fact the central core of what it means to be human, and are indispensable for adults to be able to form lasting, mutually satisfying co-operative relationships with others. In a world of decreasing size and increasing numbers of weapons of mass destruction it is dangerous for these qualities to become deficient. What is needed is greater understanding of the pragmatic nature of the values of trust, empathy, and affection; means of measuring the degree of their presence or absence in adults; more rapid progress in the elimination of arbitrary male dominance; and closer examination of the destructive aspects of consumerism.

### Introduction

My concern is that daycare programs, in particular infant daycare, may be creating partial psychopaths. I see the need for daycare resulting from two widespread problems in our society — our addiction to consumerism, and our tradition of arbitrary male dominance. I submit that it makes more sense for society to expose and rectify these underlying problems than to create an alternate system of child care which puts at risk the development of partial psychopathy.

### What is Psychopathy?

It is an unsettling experience to meet a charming, intelligent person in whom one can detect no abnormality, and then learn the gruesome details of one or

more heinous crimes he has committed — crimes which reveal the utmost in callous, unfeeling, unempathic behaviour. It is a shock to believe this person with poise, charm, perceptiveness, clarity of thought — who somehow exudes a sense of supernormality — could actually have done such things. It forever shakes one's faith in the ability to detect abnormality.

We get used to the idea of being able to see emotional damage: the endless self-torture of the neurotic, the obvious craziness of the psychotic, the limitations of the severely retarded. That there can be gross emotional abnormality not detectable as one talks with another person runs counter to our general experience. The public fantasy of the mass murderer Clifford Olson, if you know only of his offences, conjures up images of gross abnormality. If you had just met and talked with him without knowing his background, you might even have enjoyed his company.

This has been the enigma of psychopathy — first described as “*manie sans delire*” by Phillip Pinel in 1801, later as “*moral insanity*” by Pritchard in 1837, and more recently as the “*mask of sanity*” by Herver Cleckley.

### Some Definitions and Classifications

I would recommend to the reader Chapter 22 of the *Comprehensive Textbook of Psychiatry*, 3rd edition, Vol. 2 by Kaplan, Freedman & Sadock (1980). It is eminently readable, authoritative and current. Much of what follows in this section is based on that text.

At the present time there are a number of different classification schemes and attempts to define psychopathy. One, which is used mainly in Scandinavia, is built around four dimensions of personality — capacity, validity, stability, and solidity. In Western European psychiatry eleven different personality types are defined, among them depressive psychopaths, insecure psychopaths, compulsive psychopaths, fanatic psychopaths, affection-less psychopaths, attention seeking psychopaths, labile psychopaths, and aesthetic psychopaths.

The International Classification of Diseases (ICD-9) defines personality disorder as “*Deeply ingrained maladaptive patterns of behaviour generally recognizable by the time of adolescence or earlier and continuing throughout most of adult life, although often becoming less obvious in middle or old age. The personality is abnormal either in the balance of its components, their quality and expression or in its total aspect.*” The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of the American Psychiatric Association elaborates further the classification and definition of personality disorders (Wito, 1977).

In 1938 Herver Cleckley published the first edition of his now famous book *The Mask of Sanity*. It is said of Cleckley that his descriptions of the psychopathic personality served the same function that Kraepelin's did for the recognition of schizophrenia. Cleckley uses some general phrases to describe the deficits found in psychopaths:

Psychopaths fail to know all those more serious and deeply moving affective states which make up the tragedy and triumph of ordinary life, of life at the level of important human experience...

Objective experience is so bleached of deep emotion that the psychopath is invincibly ignorant of what life means to others.

Those who have dealt with psychopaths for any length of time get a feeling for the meaning for those rather poetic descriptions of the core deficit of psychopathy. For me the deficit can best be described as an inability to trust, an inability to empathize, and an inability to form affectionate relationships, a personality style which I shall argue may be fostered by some forms of daycare.

Cleckley also provided a checklist of some 16 symptoms frequently associated with psychopathy: superficial charm and good intelligence; absence of delusions and other signs of irrational thinking; absence of “*nervousness*,” unreliability; untruthfulness; lack of remorse and shame; inadequately motivated antisocial behaviour; poor judgment; pathological egocentricity and incapacity for love; general poverty in major affective reactions; specific loss of insight; unresponsiveness in general interpersonal relations; fantastic behaviour with alcohol; suicide rarely carried out; sex life impersonal, trivial and poorly integrated; failure to follow any life plan.

### Prevalence

Estimates of the prevalence of personality disorders come from several sources. Using a rural community in Nova Scotia, the Leightons and their co-workers (1963) surveyed 1010 households that they obtained from a systematic sample. They found 18 percent of the men and 11 percent of the women affected by some kind of personality disorder. Studying an urban population of 1660 persons in the Midtown Manhattan study, Langer and Michael used different survey instruments but observed roughly the same prevalence (Langer, 1963).

In a study involving the interviewing of a complete community of 2550 in rural Sweden, Essen-Moller and Hagnell (1975) were able to enumerate the number of those with personality disorders in an entire population — 5 percent of the women and 9 percent of the men.

Cleckley (1982) in discussing the prevalence of the anti-social personality disorder says: “*I have been forced to the conviction that this particular behaviour pattern is found among one's fellowmen far more frequently than might be surmised from reading the literature... It presents a sociologic and psychiatric problem second to none.*”

### What is Partial Psychopathy?

Wells (1981), a psychiatrist at the Mayo Clinic has described what he calls restricted psychopathy. But Cleckley (1982) in a section of his book entitled “*Incomplete manifestations or suggestions of the disorder*” has been the most explicit in trying to describe partial psychopathy:

Some of these patients I believe are definitely psychopaths but in a milder degree, just as a patient still living satisfactorily in a community may be clearly a schizophrenic but nevertheless able to maintain himself outside

the shelter of a psychiatric hospital... I believe that in these personalities designated as partially or inwardly affected, a very deep-seated disorder often exists. The true difference between them and the psychopaths who continually go to jails or to psychiatric hospitals is that they keep up a far better and more consistent outward appearance of being normal. This outward appearance may include business or professional careers that continue in a sense successful, and which are truly successful when measured by financial reward or by the causal observer's opinion of real accomplishment. It must be remembered that even the most severely and obviously disabled psychopath presents a technical appearance of sanity, often none of high intellectual capacities, and not infrequently successful in business or professional activities for short periods, sometimes for considerable periods...

The chief difference between full blown psychopaths and partial psychopaths lies perhaps in whether the mask or facade of psychobiologic health is extended into superficial material success. I believe that the relative state of this outward appearance is not necessarily consistent with the degree to which the person is really affected by the essential disorder. An analogy is at hand if we compare the catatonic schizophrenic, with his obvious psychosis, to the impressively intelligent paranoid patient who outwardly is much more normal and may even appear better adjusted than the average person. The catatonic schizophrenic is more likely to recover, and despite his appearance, is often less seriously disordered than the paranoiacs...

...I believe it is probable that many people outwardly imposing, yet actually of insignificant emotional import really are so affected.

### Causation

The causes of psychopathy are not clearly understood. Any thorough review of the matter includes a discussion of possible genetic influences, constitutional influences, cultural influences, and maturational influences, as well as environmental influences.

The nurturing of the infant in the very earliest years has been most frequently implicated in psychopathy. To quote the *Comprehensive Textbook of Psychiatry* (Kaplan et al., 1980):

In making sense out of those findings, one must remember that methodologically it is easier to gather the adoption data than to follow children with well-studied childhood environments, prospectively into adulthood. In animal research, where environmental manipulation is possible, cross-fostering studies have demonstrated that the environment is often dominant over genetics in shaping behavioural patterns. Work by Glueck and Glueck is unique in combining the study of mothers and heredity in a prospective follow-up: it also provides compelling evidence for the importance of the maternal environment in antisocial disorder (p. 1566).

It is likely that a clearer understanding of environmental influences will evolve as we increasingly learn how to observe and document the emotional

subtleties of infant-parent-infant interactions — as we, so to speak, make observations under higher and higher magnification. The burgeoning new field of infant mental health, the growing number of clinicians focussing on this area and the variety of research being done all suggest that we may one day be able to understand in detail the early environmental factors involved. Instead of the crude fact “he was moved through seven foster homes in the first two years of life” we can now talk about specific details of attachment, and for example the emotional availability of caregivers at many different stages of development in the first eighteen months. Moreover, we can now study these phenomena with such techniques as the microanalysis of videotape recordings. My own view is that the understanding of the environmental causes is similar to that of learning about the effects of exposure to radiation which produce damage only detectable fifteen or twenty years later.

### Why is Infant Daycare Suspect?

Why is infant daycare suspect as having the potential to produce partial psychopaths? The reason is that those capacities which are most deficient in psychopathy — the capacity to trust others, the capacity for empathy, and the capacity for affection, develop as a result of attachment in the earliest years of life.

The child psychoanalyst Selma Fraiberg (1977) has been most explicit:

...we can see that the diseases of non-attachment give rise to a broad range of disordered personalities. But if I have emphasized the potential for crime and violence in this group, I do not wish to distort the picture. A large number of these men and women distinguish themselves in no other way than their attitude of indifference to life and an absence of human connections...

Once extensive study was done on unattached children, some of the missing links in etiology appeared. We now know that if we fail in our work with these children, if we cannot bring them into a human relationship, their future is predictable. They become, of course, the permanently unattached men and women of the next generation. Beyond this, we have made an extraordinary and sobering discovery. An unattached child, even at the age of three or four, cannot easily attach himself, even when he is provided with the most favourable conditions for the formation of a human bond. The most expert clinical workers and foster parents can testify that to win such a child, to make them care, is the work of months and years. Yet all of this, including the achievement of a binding love for a partner, normally takes place, without psychiatric consultation, in ordinary homes, and with ordinary babies, during the first year of life...

It is important also to note what Jerome Kagan (Cayley, 1983) has to say — for his work is often cited to “prove” that daycare is not harmful:

We don't know how to measure attachment. We use superficial measures, although the best available... I wouldn't be surprised if in the next twenty

years there are more sensitive measures of attachment — maybe daycare children are less closely attached.

There are two major forces in society which are combining to force parents to make risky and mutually less satisfying child care arrangements. One is our inculcated addiction to consumerism and the other our irrational tradition of arbitrary male dominance.

### Consumerism

Altschuler and Regush (1974) have wisely observed that the corporate consumer system has imposed its own domination of reality and its own definition of the "good life" on all of us. The mass media have imposed on us a conception of reality which defines for us what happiness is, what the "good life" is, what the human being is potentially capable of achieving, in fact, all that we hear, say, and think. Simple observation shows that they have been extremely successful. But in the process they have left us believing that happiness can be achieved only by continually buying new products and services:

Many couples feel compelled to show they have made it together by what they have accumulated. When the debts begin piling up, and economic strain becomes a constant feature of the relationship, rather than cut back on the good life, the husband, as mentioned before, begins to work more, or, as is the growing necessity these days, the wife begins to work. The cycle is apt to grow more vicious if, rather than admit that their way of life is the source of the problem, the wife — who is forced to work to help pay the bills — identifies with ideologies to justify her activity, and adds to the problem by getting farther and farther away from its root...

The relationship between man and women must be examined within the total context of a society such as ours, which tyrannically and with startling ingenuity sells dreams in the marketplace and fosters an outmoded work-to-buy cycle to make these dreams a reality. This is not the nineteenth century. We are living in a highly technological society which holds vast potential for providing us with the necessities of life, and at the same time freeing us from stupid, meaningless work. The emphasis should be to utilize this technology so that we have less jobs and more time to relate to each other as human beings and benefit from our true creative expression...

In the same vein, Gregg (1977) observes that:

Simplicities must not infringe upon the minimal needs of individuals, or upon even the wise surplus margins above those minima. But inasmuch as the desires of mankind are boundless, and we all tend to rationalize our desires, there is endless dispute as to how wide the surplus margin should be in order to be wise...

Likewise, in support of this thesis we can cite Gardner (1976):

...Without making distinctions between those who have money and those who do not, we can say of most Americans at the present time that they suffer from a hunger of the soul, which they try to satisfy by eating too much, smoking and drinking too much, buying too much, looking at too

much T.V. and rushing around more and faster than necessary. Their unfulfilled hunger drives them to self-destructing life habits and the growing gap between what they need from life and what they succeed in getting opens them to anguish and despair that they try to suppress by sedatives, stimulants, and mind-changing drugs in enormous amounts, at enormous cost.

...We know that millions of Americans in rural as well as urban areas are ill-fed, ill-housed, and ill-clothed. We could be so incautious as to suppose that these areas are the centre of poverty in our society. Yet how many gleaming, cheerful, well-centred faces one sees among men and women whose livelihood is meagre; and how many clouded, petulant, craving faces among those who seem to have everything! Which of the two is poorer? And if want cries out so painfully, so balefully, from the squalor of ghettos, how much of this sense of want is the simple need for more adequate food, housing and clothes; and how much results from inner deprivations and distortions that can hardly be distinguished from those of pampered rich?...

In my judgement those who are least able to establish mutually satisfying, lasting, trusting and affectionate relationships are most attracted to and most require the consumption of goods and services (and status and careerism based on consumption) to give meaning to their lives. And if the drive for ever more consumption requires that one's children be reared by shared and changing substitute caregivers, the next generation of consumer addicts may be getting off to a good start. If the need to find meaning in consumerism and materialism were the only hazard of partial psychopathy perhaps we should not be concerned. Would that psychopathy were such a benign disease.

### Arbitrary Male Dominance

Albee (1981) has stated some of the realities of sexism bluntly but accurately as follows:

Sexism means ascribing superiority or inferiority, unsupported by any evidence, in traits, abilities, social value, personal worth, and other characteristics to males or females as a group. The "standard of excellence" usually is the white male.

Most commonly sexism involves perceiving and acting toward females as if they are categorically inferior. This places sexism in the pantheon of prejudices alongside racism, ageism, and other political pathologies defended as part of natural eternal cosmic truths revealed and supported by religion and science. The hand that writes the truth has long been attached to the "masculist" patriarchal body. And whether the writer has been engaged in producing scripture, literature, scientific treatises, or law — or painting pictures or writing songs — the result is the same: kings rule by divine right, slavery is a natural consequence of the superiority of the masters and the inferiority of the slaves, and women are born to be objects deprived by nature of autonomy and freedom and subservient to the master sex.

Sexism is woven into the texture of our lives and damages both the sexist and the target group. Not only are many forms of psychopathology produced in the victims of sexism, but sexism itself is a form of psychopathology. Traditionally, a major criterion of mental disorders is the judgment that the person is so irrational and emotionally out of control as to be dangerous to others. According to this definition, sexists (along with anti-Semites, antigays, racists, and bigots of all kinds) should be defined as emotionally disturbed.

Individual members of groups that are the objects of prejudice and are mistreated tend to live a powerless, pathological existence. Understandably, members of the group often accept the prejudiced view of themselves. Social learning theorists point out that symbolic models portrayed at home, on T.V. and in books and magazines are important sources of sex stereotyped attitudes. The descriptions become self-fulfilling prophecies. Members of the group begin to live and behave in ways that are expected of them, and they become caught up in self-perpetuating behaviour, thereby reinforcing the prejudices.

Whether the woman's defect — her fatal flaw — is explained on the basis of Freudian chauvinism (penis envy), on observable physical differences (the weaker sex), or on historical guilt (Eve caused the Fall), the result is the same. We see profound and debilitating suffering in the victims, acceptance by some of them of the values and beliefs of their oppressors (see Morgan, 1973), and widespread learned helplessness and despair. We also hope to see a spirit of resistance and revolution emerge that gathers strength through mutual support, encouragement, and the enlistment of significant numbers of defectors from the oppressor group.

As Kolbenschlag (1979) observes:

In a sense everyone's liberation depends on the liberation of white males, precisely because they have the power to prevent women and minorities from seeking a broader range of alternatives if they do not play the game by the rules of the masculine value system. Unless (you) can admit that (you) are the problem and begin the task of liberating (yourself) and dismantling the male-ordered system, many so-called "liberated" women will be seduced into a patriarchal, elitist, one-dimensional, masculine role. We will simply have a new set of "half-persons" who happen to be female.

What is needed is more widespread recognition of the costs hidden beneath the glitter of unbridled consumerism and its basis in male dominance and the psychological carnage ensuing from arbitrary male dominance.

The energy and resources spent creating costly and potentially dangerous substitute child care arrangements would be better spent exposing and dealing directly with these underlying problems.

*Note:* This paper is based on a presentation to the Fifth World Congress of Child Abuse, Montreal, September, 1984.

## References

- Albee, G. W. (1981). The prevention of sexism. *Professional Psychology*, 12, 20-28.
- Altschuler, R. and Regush, N., (1974). *Open reality - The way out of mimicking happiness*. New York: G. P. Putnam.
- American Psychiatric Association. (1980). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (3rd ed.). Washington, DC. pp. 305-330.
- Caley, D. (1983). The world of the child, part 2. CBC radio series. Transcript available from CBC Transcripts, Box 500, Stat. A., Toronto, Ont. M5W 1E6.
- Cleckley, H. (1982). *The mask of sanity*. New York: C. B. Mosby Company.
- Essen-Moller, E., and Hagnell, O. (1975). "Normal" and "lesional" traits of personality according to Sjobring: Re-ratings and prognostic implications - The Lundby project. *Neuropsychology*, 1 146.
- Fraiberg, S. (1977). *Every child's birthright: In defense of mothering*. New York: Basic Books. 49-50.
- Gardner, J. F. (1976). *The poverty of a rich society, proceedings No. 31*. New York: The Myrin Institute.
- Gregg, R. (1977). Voluntary simplicity, *Co-Evolution Quarterly*.
- Kaplan, H. I., Freedman, A. M., and Sadock, B. J. (Eds.). (1980). Vol. 3, pp. 1562-1590. (3rd ed.) Boston: Williams and Wilkins.
- Kolbenschlag, M. (1979). *Kiss sleeping beauty goodbye*. New York: Doubleday.
- Langer, T. S., and Michael, S. T., (1963). *Life, stress and mental health*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.
- Leighton, D. C., Harding, J. S., Macklin, D. B., Hughes, C. C., and Leighton, A. H. (1963). Psychiatric findings of the Stirling County study. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 119, 1021.
- Morgan, M. (1973). *The total woman*. Old Tappan, N.J.: Spire Books.
- Wells, Lloyd, A. (1981). Family pathology and father-daughter incest: Restricted psychopathy. *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, 42, 45, 197-202.
- WHO (1977). *Manual of the international statistical classification of diseases, injuries, and causes of death*. Geneva: World Health Organization.

## **MOVEMENT AND THE DEVELOPING CHILD; A PRACTICAL RE-EXAMINATION**

David Bean  
Faculty of Education,  
University of Calgary

### **ABSTRACT**

Movement education for 5- and 6-year-olds has frequently ignored the pre-operational and egocentric psychological stage of their development. A new approach to movement education is described which accommodates the young child's concern with self, and the beginning of co-operative activity in relation to simple and easily understood movement tasks which are based on a minimal of verbal and intellectual instruction. The program aims to develop basic movement skill, desirable social behaviours, and the development and maintenance of a love of physical activity.

### **Introduction**

Most of us with professional, and in many cases personal, interests in young children have developed a knowledge of fundamental aspects of child development theory as a part of that professional preparation. In most cases, the nature of the developing child will have been examined as part of broader coverage in, perhaps, behavioural psychology or teaching and learning. Only rarely, however, is the development of the young child taken beyond the theoretical structure in a systematic and cohesive way in relation to specific aspects of learning experiences. The purpose of this paper, therefore, is to redress some of this imbalance by first identifying and clarifying significant attributes and needs of the young child and then examining how best this understanding might be used to enhance learning and teaching. "Young" in this context may be broadly defined as the kindergarten or grade one child, the 5- to 6-year-old.

### **Information Processing and Conceptualization**

In games and physical activity, the "child as a young adult" syndrome dies hard, often even when the adults present are relatively well informed and positive in approach. The fact that the child processes information in a manner that is qualitatively different from that of the adult tends to be ignored in favour of a need to adhere to the pre-determined and adult established activity or pattern of movement. There is a "perception gap" that frequently appears to be a very difficult one to bridge, in large part because the adult is either unable or unwilling to accept the fact that children do indeed process and interpret information differently. We tend not to acknowledge that no matter how positive, well meaning and understanding the teacher, if the methods used ignore the unique

characteristics of the child, then the whole teaching/learning process cannot be optimally successful.

In the area of information processing, Piaget categorizes the 6-year-old as pre-operational and egocentric, an individual who tends to centre attention upon an isolated feature of particular stimulus display to the neglect of all else. He or she is also likely to concentrate on the present state, ignoring the changes that alter one state of an object to another. Similarly the age group is characterized by irreversibility of thought; implying a lack of awareness that actions can be counteracted by reversing them. And yet in so many games and movement situations one sees a level of sophistication presumed by the teacher that bears little relation to reality. If movement skill and understanding are the prime concerns of the teacher, as far as the child is concerned, it is essential that the elements of the skill are presented as units that are sufficiently clear, simple and distinct for the child to focus on and comprehend. Similarly, where understanding is needed, appropriate concepts must be equally simply presented and, above all, clearly related to the skill itself.

Most teachers (even movement education teachers!) have a strong tendency to over-verbalize. One of the foremost essentials for the 6-year-old in processing the movement information that he receives, however, is the ready availability of concrete examples and opportunities for practice. At this age he is a doer. Abstract ideas and concepts, suggestions and advice have little meaning or value unless they can be seen, tried, used and experimented with. Thus, for example, the concept of resilience to provide lightness in landing from a jump, only *begins* to have meaning when we provide the child with a wide variety of activities, examples and challenges that enable him to relate the concept to what is actually happening. Even then, the relationship of concept to practice must still be taught in order to ensure understanding. Seeing and feeling the contact of feet with ground in landing is the key to meaning in this case, with the teacher ensuring that the appropriate concept is linked with the action.

### The Concern With Self

The egocentricity of children at this age is perhaps one of the most obvious attributes and is further evidence of an inability to reverse and coordinate other points of view. Whilst there may be, in the average child, a general willingness to "get along," the major tendency is to play beside each other rather than cooperate or even compete specifically. In trying to acknowledge this characteristic the teacher is confronted with something of an anomaly. On the one hand, the fact that the child is primarily concerned with self must logically provide a basis for the development of teaching approaches and the establishment of relationships. On the other hand, the teacher must be equally concerned with the encouragement of desirable social attributes; most importantly, cooperation. Piaget (1965) suggests that traditional education in early childhood has reinforced egocentric behaviour and hindered socialization by emphasizing constant individual work and subsequent competitive assessment.

Sensibly, and this is particularly the case in movement education situations, both egocentricity and the need for desirable social behaviour must be acknowl-

edged in programme planning. This is perfectly possible given a well planned effort to integrate the two in accordance with what we know of these youngsters' intellectual, psycho-social and physical maturity. However, team and group games and activities which demand the submerging of personal desires in the interest of the larger unit would be beyond the level of maturity present at this age. Similarly, such activities are likely to demand overall levels of motor performance not yet available to children who are still vitally concerned with the refinement of *fundamental* skills. Much more appropriate are games and activities of low organization, original games, and activities of various kinds where:

1. Cooperative concepts are simple and easily perceived and understood in relation to the result of the cooperation.
2. The child is able to be affiliated with a group, but functions essentially as an individual.
3. The physical situation itself (equipment, playing areas, boundaries, other children, etc) is sufficiently elemental as to aid necessary perception and understanding.

In low organization games there is a good opportunity to prepare the way for true role reversibility in later more complex games. Different roles, as in non-elimination tag, for example, form an integral but easily understood part of the game itself. In original games that are invented by the children themselves, the nature of the game and the way it is played reflects the maturity and attributes of the age group and depends little upon direct adult influence. Simple cooperative games can be used to introduce the concept of work sharing and coordination of activity to achieve common success and, at the same time, emphasize fundamental skills appropriate for later more complex activities.

### Attention to the Task

It is easy to interpret the 6-year-old's natural difficulty in remaining "on task" in movement for any appreciable length of time as boredom or inappropriateness in the task itself. Movement tasks must of necessity be sufficiently brief and concise, so that the child can bring each to an acceptable conclusion within an attention span that, by adult standards, is extremely short. This may well mean planning a series of tasks, each sufficiently different from the other, in developing a given skill, where with an older group a single challenge would be appropriate. If intrinsic feedback can be built into the task, so much the better, since at this age the usefulness of advice and information regarding movement decreases as it is distanced in time from the movement itself. "Building in" feedback need not be a complex process; any objective that the child can recognize — aiming for wall or floor markings, counting consecutive catches, jumping over specific obstacles and so on — can be potential sources of information that will eventually lead to skill improvement. The essential quality in any intrinsic feedback is, of course, that having received the information the child is able to modify subsequent attempts to produce the skill. If a line on the floor is identified as an aiming focus in developing throwing skill, for example, the bounce of the ball in relation to the line should provide the thrower with *specific* and *immediate* information relating to his or her skill attempt. The precise meaning of the

information to the child would be shaped by the content of the task and by general guidance provided by the teacher.

The provision of simple, intrinsic feedback as a part of movement tasks and problems with young children does not eliminate the need for the teacher to help and advise, but it is certainly a step towards catering for the urgency that is felt at this age.

### Activity and Energy

The energy and high activity level of 6-year-olds can be awe-inspiring to the teacher whose responsibility it is to channel the energy into movement experiences that are part of an overall educational scheme. Add to this a pronounced tendency to tire quickly and the short attention span mentioned earlier and the challenge becomes formidable. In fact we have something of a paradox. High activity needs and rapid fatigue are seemingly contradictory. What we see, however, if we observe the kindergarten/grade one group closely is that there is a *general* need for high levels of activity coupled with a tendency to fatigue that is associated with the repeated use of *specific* movements, activities and muscle groups.

It is essential that we shape the movement teaching situation to meet these particular needs, since the kind of activity produced by the child will determine whether or not effective learning takes place. Three elements provide a key to successful accommodation of the high activity/rapid fatigue tendency:

1. The availability of sufficient equipment and space so that each child is able to spend the maximum amount of time *directly* involved with the skill concerned, rather than waiting, sharing or involved in subsidiary activity. Ideally, this would mean one piece of equipment per child, though in many cases one between two children would be adequate.
2. An emphasis from the teacher that children remain "on task," concentrating on the specific demands of the work assigned.
3. Activity based upon individual work and small groups using space and boundaries that are easily seen and recognized and whose significance is readily understood in relation to the skills being learned.
4. The physical nature of the activities themselves should change sufficiently frequently to counteract the problem of fatigue caused by over-long use of a particular muscle group or type of activity. "Rest periods" are not likely to be needed in a typical 25 minute activity session, but frequently changes in the type, pace and nature of movement are essential.

In conclusion it is worth returning to a concern expressed earlier, that of the need to see these children as unique beings with characteristics peculiar to the age group. As teachers, if we ignore the practical implications of child development theory, we do so at our peril. The 6-year-old is unsophisticated in movement; the *basic, simple and the fundamental* remain challenges to be explored and, given sound guidance, eventually met. It is a process that cannot and should not be hurried in favour of more highly structured, adult-type activity. Ideally at this age we are striving for progress in three directions: the development of basic movement skill and understanding, desirable social behaviours, and the develop-

ment and maintenance of a love of physical activity. The practical application of what we know about physical, psycho-social and intellectual attributes can greatly enhance this progress.

### References

- Caine, Dennis (1980). Child development and games teaching in Grades 1 and 2. *Physical Education News VIII*.
- Cratty, Bryant J. (1972). *Physical expressions of intelligence*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Ginsfield H., & Hoppes S. (1969). *Piaget's theory of intellectual development*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Logsdon, B. (Ed.) (1977). *Physical education: A focus on the Teaching Process*. Philadelphia: Lea and Febiger.
- Piaget, T. (1965). *The moral judgement of the child*. New York: The Free Press.
- Sakola, Sally Parent. (1982). A K-6 Progression built on Organizing Concepts. *Journal of Physical Education Recreation and Dance* 53, 7.
- Ward, Bonnie. (1975). Implications of Physical Education for Pre-School Children. *Physical Educator* 32, 2.

## FATHER-ABSENCE: A SUMMARY OF SOME RECENT PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDIES

P.S. Fry

Department of Educational Psychology,  
University of Calgary

There is a vast array of literature which confirms unequivocally the indispensable role which mothers play in the social and emotional development of children. This literature draws out the salience of the maternal role and establishes without doubt the contribution that mothers make to the social and emotional development of children. However, almost all of the earlier and current studies assessing mother-child interactions and mother's influence in child rearing were done in the context of intact families where fathers were also assumed to be contributing, directly and indirectly, to child development.

Today, however, the best statistical predictions suggests that increasing numbers of children are going to experience their parents' divorce and that a majority of these children will reside with their mothers and be subject to father-absent child-rearing. Thus one theme in recent investigations is the extent to which prolonged father-absence affects the healthy personality development of children raised predominantly by mothers. Father-absence effects on a wide variety of social, emotional and cognitive characteristics of children and their personality development have been the topic of extensive studies for the past two decades or more. Although many of the recent studies have stressed the importance of fathering to children in intact families, the direct effects of father-absence on children's personality and cognitive development are still contested. In a 1973 review of the effects of father-absence, Herzog and Sudia concluded that father's absence from the home makes no difference whatever to the child's achievement or development. More recent studies, however, have tried to overcome many of the earlier methodological problems in research on father-absence effects. In other words, researchers are now employing a more concise definition of father-absence, which takes into account varying reasons for father-absence, duration of father-absence, child's age at the onset of father-absence, and/or the availability of father substitutes during the period of father-absence. Thus the more recent investigations are in a better position to challenge the basic conclusions of previous studies in father-absence effects.

A number of studies which I have done to assess the effects of father-absence on children's achievement motivation, cognitive development, and interpersonal orientation are based upon the confluence model of intelligence developed by Zajonc (1976) and Zajonc and Markus (1975). The confluence model of intelligence stresses the significance of the family configuration and provides a theoretical framework for the examination of the effects of father-absence on children's personality and cognitive development. Within this model it is contended that when an adult figure or an older sibling is absent or is totally or relatively

unavailable for a long period of time in the early years of child development, the family configuration is likely to become impoverished in terms of the cognitive feedback and intellectual stimulation that this adult member can provide. Thus, in the average household, Zajonc and Marcus would argue that the father more often than the mother has been the more achieving parent who is at a higher intellectual development. Thus father-absence implies that the more achieving parent who would normally impose high standards of incentive on the children and provide more cognitive stimulation during the early formative years, is missing.

Our own work has examined the question of how children's development appears to be affected by father-absence. In a 1982 study (Fry & Grover, 1982) we studied equal numbers of father-parent and father-absent third grade children who were matched on a number of socio-demographic characteristics. For these third grade children, fathers had been absent for a period of three years. These children were assessed on measures of social problem-solving performance. Father-absent children were found to have significantly lower scores on measures of social problem-solving and measures of ego-strength which include the child's ability to share feelings and to have a sense of personal adequacy. In phase two of the same study, half of the children from the father-absent category received a 15 week social problem-solving intervention program which was conducted by adult male models. Results demonstrated that father-absent treatment subjects compared to father-absent control subjects improved their problem-solving skills significantly. The findings from phase two of the study are therefore very encouraging for us in that they suggest that the adverse effects of father-absence on children's social problem-solving competency are reversible and may be rectified by children's exposure to father substitutes and adult male models.

Our results suggested that children who experience three to five years of father-absence were less adept in comprehending social role concepts. Our tentative conclusions were that children reared in father-absent homes under the sole care of mothers became less spontaneous and less interactive. We speculated that these deficits in children were due to a greater than average lack of social cognitive interaction with male models or male figures.

Such conclusions are, of course, very tentative and await replication. The implication for social policy, therefore, is that children who experience prolonged father-absence may be at greater social-cognitive development risk. Our results provide a persuasive rationale for including a strong cognitive component in educational services designed to help mothers, especially single parent mothers, develop more sophisticated cognitive interactional styles with their children. It is important that single mothers be equipped to provide the children a more social problem-solving orientation in addition to a nurturant and authoritative orientation which comes very naturally to mothers.

In another five-year longitudinal study (Fry & Scher, 1984) that we carried out with adolescents, our findings showed that father-absent adolescents, compared to father-present adolescents, declined in achievement motivation. They declined also in competitiveness, perseverance and a desire for mastery. Father-absent adolescents showed a corresponding increase in social alienation and self-centredness and a decrease in personal adequacy. Impacted more keenly on adolescent boys than girls, suggesting that fathers are more necessary agents of change to their

sons than to their daughters, particularly when children are approaching adolescence. Our results, therefore, underscored the need to include father-child interactions in any model of adolescent personality development. Over all, this longitudinal study suggests that father-absence may bear a significant relationship to the magnitude of adverse effects that occur in children's cognitive and social development. Our findings, although tentative, lend support to the notion of the inadequacy of a pure mother's effect model on children's development.

Hetherington notes that: "In the current eagerness to demonstrate that single parent families headed by mothers can provide a salutary environment for raising children and that the presence of fathers is not essential for normal development in children there has been a tendency on the part of mothers to overlook the contributions of fathers." These implications touch the use of divorce studies as the source of wisdom for "decisions concerning custody." If, as the data from our study suggests, the relationship between fathers and children impacts strongly on the social-cognitive function of the child, then it follows that fathers have to make to the children's social-cognitive development and to the child's total ecological involvement. The social policy implication of our research is that children's relationships with the non-custodial father is of equal importance to their well-being and quite separate from the relationship with the custodial mother. One of the implications of our findings is that a social policy that impedes rather than facilitates the father-child relationship is overlooking or ignoring the potentially maladaptive effects which father deprivation is likely to have on the cognitive development of children. It is conceivable, and here we are only speculating, that fathers exhibit a wider range of interests, skills and intellectual attributes which make them more cognitively competent agents of socialization to their children, particularly to their adolescent children.

Our perceptions as researchers lead us to believe that mothers, at least in our sample, were not equipped to offer the children a wide array of cognitive features to model. Our results suggested that children who had experienced father-absence for a number of years were less adept in interpersonal reasoning. Interpersonal reasoning in our study was defined as a composite variable including the ability for perspective taking, intent assessment, and the knowledge of factors related to the initiation, maintenance and termination of relationships.

The findings of our studies (Fry & Trifiletti, 1983; Fry & Grover, 1983) also touch on the significance of visitation by the father. In two father-analytic studies we interviewed children and adolescents directly and we obtained, first hand, the children's perceptions of positive and negative fathers in the single parent family. In the case of both children and adolescents, our results suggested that visitation by the father was the single most important factor in bolstering the child's morale. In those mother custody homes where father was denied visitation or unable to visit, children reported much more personal anxiety, depression and anger towards the custodial mother and reported much more personal guilt and self-blame. Our study of children's perceptions leads us to conclude that the child's continuing relationship with the father appears to be one of the most powerful influences on the child's adjustment to parental divorce. Any social policy must therefore consider and appreciate the positive significance of regular visitation by the father.

We interviewed some children who, after a forced separation from father, showed perceptions generally resembling those following the death of a parent. The implications of these findings for parental post-divorce counselling is that parents must attempt to distinguish their marital roles, which have terminated, from their parental role which must continue for the sake of the children. Such abstractions are very difficult for children and adolescents to handle on their own, and the task may often require direct facilitations by single mothers and social work personnel. Counselling or therapy should be aimed at promoting the post-divorce relationship between the child and each parent separately. The mother's education towards recognizing that the child's relationship with the father is crucial to the child's social and cognitive development may help the mother to view the father's visitation more favourably. The implication is that where discord arises regarding fathers' visitation mothers should seriously reconsider the contribution that fathers may and do make to the child's emotional and cognitive development (Fry & Addington, in press).

Concerning the question of mother custody versus father custody, a number of points need to be detailed. Our study of children and adolescents' perceptions of negative and positive factors in the single-parent family pointed to differences in the anxiety that children felt in the relationship with mother and father. In both mother and father custody homes the stress factors which were identified by the children were essentially the same. Our data reaffirmed that in both mother and father custody homes, children perceived the father's willingness to discuss divorce related concerns as a salutary event. They also perceived the father's extra special efforts at self-disclosure and emotional sharing with the children to be a very positive event (Fry & Grover, 1983; Fry & Leahey, 1983; Fry & Trifiletti, 1983).

One other study of perceptions that we did, (Fry & Addington, 1984), attempted to tap teachers', social workers' and community mental health nurses' perceptions of the ability of children from mother and father custody homes and from intact homes. The findings of this study drew our attention to the tendency of these child care professionals to have very strong stereotypic perceptions of children from divorced families. Such stereotypic views are held especially towards boys from father custody homes who were seen to be less adequate in their emotional functioning than children from mother custody homes. These data clearly implicate the role of child care professionals in the child's adjustment to divorce. In terms of social policy, our recommendation is that child care professionals increase their skills, knowledge and sensitivity as to the needs of children from single parent homes.

Our interview data showed that children perceived teachers to be in the most strategic position to help them. In father custody homes in particular, male teachers were seen as the only stable figures in the child's environment. These data point to the significance of implementing training programs and cognitive training for single parents mothers.

In summary, our data lead us to conclude that children exposed to prolonged father-absence effects are cognitively and socially at risk (Fry, 1983). Adverse effects are greater if father-absence occurs in the early formative years of the child's development; adverse effects impact more strongly on adolescent boys than girls; adverse effects are more easily reversible in children than in adolescents;

and father-present effects are critical in any model of personality development of children.

Current demographic predictions are that by 1990, 33 percent of North American children will experience their parents' divorce before they are 18 years old. Given this increase, factors relevant to child development in father-absent homes need to be considered within a framework that takes full account of (a) the significant contribution which fathers make to the child's emotional and cognitive development; and (b) the inadequacy of a pure mother's effect model of child-rearing.

Note: An earlier version of this summary was presented at the Child Welfare Colloquium in Calgary, Alberta, May, 1983.

## References

- Fry, P. S. (1983). Children's social-cognitive development: Implications for intervention and training. *Journal of Psychiatric Treatment and Evaluation*, 5, 304-312.
- Fry, P. S., & Addington, J. (1984). Professional's negative expectations of children from father-headed single parent families: Implications for the training of child-care professionals. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 2, 271-285.
- Fry, P. S., & Addington, J. (in press). Perceptions of parent and child adjustment in divorced families. *Clinical Psychology Review*.
- Fry, P. S., & Grover, S. C. (1982). The relationship between father absence and children's social problem solving competencies. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 3, 105-120.
- Fry, P. S., & Grover, S. C. (1983). An exploration of the child's perspective: Children's perceptions of parental treatment, personal anxiety and attributions of blame in single-parent families. *Journal of Psychiatric Treatment and Evaluation*, 5, 353-362.
- Fry, P. S., & Leahey, M. (1983). Children's negative and positive perceptions of stress in the single parent family. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 4, 377-394.
- Fry, P. S., & Scher, A. (1984). The effects of father absence on children's achievement motivation, ego strength and locus of control orientation: A five-year longitudinal assessment. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 2, 167-178.
- Fry, P. S., & Trifiletti, R. J. (1983). An exploration of the adolescent's perspective: Perceptions of major stress dimensions in the single-parent family. *Journal of Psychiatric Treatment and Evaluation*, 5, 384-394.
- Herzog, E., & Sudia, C. E. (1973). Children in fatherless families. In B. Caldwell and H. Ricciuti (Eds.), *Review of child development research: Vol. 3* (pp. 141-232). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hetherington, E. M. (1979). Divorce: A child's perspective. *American Psychologist*, 34, 851-858.

- Zajonc, R. (1976). Family configuration and intelligence. *Science*, 192, 227-236.
- Zajonc, R., & Markus, G. (1975). Birth order and intellectual development. *Psychological Review*, 82, 74-88.

## THE FIFTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS ON CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT, MONTREAL, SEPTEMBER 1984

Scholars and practitioners from around the world congregated at Montreal to present and discuss hundreds of papers on child abuse and neglect. There was a notable increase in the number of presentations on the topic of sexual abuse, and it was timely that Dr. Robin Badgely, Chairman of the Committee on Child Sexual Abuse whose Canadian report had just been issued, was able to address the Congress in a plenary session. This radical, scholarly and wide-ranging report was received with general acclaim by the professional community from Canada, the United States and Europe.

The Congress coincided with the Pope's visit to Canada. Jean-Paul II telephoned the Congress with a brief message, concluding "Children are the richest resource of the Universe," a fitting message for all of us who work with children.

A number of papers given to the conference are of particular importance to those working with young children, and are reproduced here with the permission of the authors.

"Child Abuse Policy and the School: The Manitoba Story"  
Claridge, B., Marshall, D.  
Riverside School, Canada, Univ. of Manitoba, Canada.

School personnel in Canada often identify children who are victims of child abuse. These abused children usually remain with the school system after the abuse has been reported, during the involvement of other agencies of society and after other agencies have ceased their involvement with the family. School teachers and administrators are in a position to do more than the initial identification of abuse. What other involvement is sanctioned by the employing school board? This study examines the approach taken by school divisions in one Canadian province, Manitoba, with regard to the existence of policies on child abuse and what might be the components of such policies. The literature on school jurisdiction child abuse policies identifies four major components of policies. These are: (1) Child abuse identification and reporting procedure; (2) Staff Training to recognize child abuse; (3) Staff involvement as part of a multi-disciplinary team; (4) Inclusion of child development and child rearing programs in the curriculum. The 47 school divisions in Manitoba were surveyed by questionnaire in February 1984 to ascertain the existence of policies and procedures on child abuse and to examine those policies against components recommended in the literature. It was found that of the 37 responding school divisions 7 had written policies and 26 had unwritten procedures which teachers and principles followed. Data analysis reveals that child abuse policies not only are not widespread, they are not comprehensive in scope. A procedure to develop school division child abuse policies has been established and is recommended.

“The Use of Therapeutic Day Care to Resolve the Legal Dilemma of Protecting the Rights of Both Children and Parents in Equivocal Cases of Child Abuse and Neglect”

Durkin, R.

Seattle Day Nursery Assoc., USA.

The legal system has not developed effective guidelines on deprivation of custody in equivocal cases, and the social and behavioural sciences lack reliable and statistically valid means to assess the risks to a specific child of removing him or her from the parents' custody. The Seattle Day Nursery Care and Treatment Program for Abused and Neglected Children has helped judges resolve this legal dilemma. Children have been remanded by the judge to the program. The children are called for at their homes and returned to the parent or parents each day. This ongoing contact with either or both parents is a deterrent to abuse and thus protects the child. While the child is in the care of the nursery, the parents can demonstrate their concern and, more important, their ability to care for their children by participating in the program. Their participation has proved to be *prima facie* evidence relevant to their keeping the children or having them removed from the home. In this way, the courts are able to balance the right of parents to raise their children and the responsibility of the state *in loco parentis* to protect children. The experimental design, sample and choice of instruments and the implications of the data are presented and discussed.

“The Social Behaviour of Abused and Control Children in Public Day Care”

Hay, T. F., Thompson, M. G., Marton, P.

Behavioural Team, Canada, Rotary Creche Child and Family Clinic, Canada, Hinck's Treatment Centre., Canada.

Community daycare centres can play an important role in all levels of prevention of child abuse and neglect. In addition to providing services and support for families having problems, they can also assist in primary prevention by providing a positive social environment for children. But not enough is known about the social environment for children in a daycare setting. This study looks at the behaviour of abused and control preschool children during their first six months of public daycare centres. Videotapes made during free play periods indicate major differences in the social interactions of the two groups. The abused children spend significantly less time in either positive or negative interactions, and more time playing alone. The sole play of the treatment children is more likely to end when another child approaches or interacts with them. The control children take a more active role in terminating solo play and in following through on approaches. These differences become greater over the time of the study, because the controls become more social while the abused children do not. This paper discusses both the details of the group differences and the implications for daycare programmes. Obviously, these children will need additional help if they are to take full advantage of the daycare experience.

“Remediating Developmental Delays of Preschool Age Abused and Neglected Children Through Day Treatment”

Heide, J., Richardson, M.

CASC/The Children's Place, USA.

Child abuse has its most devastating consequences on the developmental status of children under the age of six. This presentation will support the hypothesis that an innovative day treatment program can assist preschool age abused and neglected children by successfully remediating developmental delays and facilitating future normal growth and development. In its first five years The Children's Place served 140 children. Research at the centre documents the characteristics of these children and their families and uses test scores from the preschool assessment book, *Developmental Programming for Infants and Young Children*, to evaluate development. Results show that regardless of chronological growth, the children's developmental growth in all areas accelerates between the time of entry and the first testing as follows: Fine Motor — 1.9 months per month; Cognition — 2.2 months per month; Social-Emotional — 2.6 months per month; Self-Care — 1.5 months per month; Gross Motor — 1.6 months per month; and Language — 2.0 months per month. Also included in the presentation will be an explanation of types of treatment provided for parents and family members with particular emphasis on parent-child interaction training which helps the parents contribute to the developmental growth of the child. The viewer should come away with an understanding of an effective treatment program for preschool age abused and neglected children and their families as tertiary prevention for this significant problem.

“Why Don't Teachers Report Child Abuse?”

Mandell, A.

Queen's Univ., Canada.

The Ontario *Child Welfare Act* defines child abuse and contains wording similar to that of many other jurisdictions requiring professionals who have reasonable grounds to suspect that a child is being subjected to abusive treatment to report their suspicions to the appropriate Children's Aid Society. This legislation was in place for five years before any attempt was made to enforce it by prosecuting a professional for failing to fulfill the requirement. The first prosecution in 1983 resulted in an acquittal. The decision is being appealed.

The author is a lawyer and a professor of law and philosophy at Queen's University Faculty of Education. The paper provides a philosophical and jurisdictional analysis of the legal requirement to report suspected child abuse. It provides a critique of the legal process that is relied on by the legislation and of the legal definition of child abuse that is provided in the *Act*. It explains why teachers and other professionals fail to report as required.

The author offers proposals for legislative reform and considers the difficulties posed by the Canadian system of criminal justice to any attempt to enforce the reporting requirement.

“High Risk Infant Project, Children’s Aid Society of Metropolitan Toronto”  
Pearson, M. C.  
Metro Toronto Children’s Aid Society, Canada.

Improved ability in identifying high risk factors has highlighted the need for additional resources to work with infants — 0-18 months. The high risk infant in a fragile environment, frequently not visible in the community, is the most vulnerable client is Child Welfare. This project address this issue by using nursing professionals. Using a team concept, the nurse and social worker, both officers of the Children’s Aid Society, provided an expanded service of assessment, education, support, supervision and monitoring. The crucial concept was that service was intensive and highly visible.

The objective of the project were three-fold. For the infant — to reduce the risk, enhance the well-being of the child, and ensure the healthiest baby possible. For the parent — to provide support and instruction in parenting skills, so as to increase the chance of the child remaining in his home. For the caseworker — to allow for better decision making on the part of the caseworker, as well as to reduce anxiety by providing additional support. Research, conducted by the Sutcliffe Group Incorporated, an independent body, was based on 97 cases. It was concluded that the nurses’ medical expertise, assessment abilities, frequent visits, educational services in child care techniques, and support to the parent all combined to reduce the chances of abuse or neglect. The project clearly demonstrated both a preventative and protective focus. This unique service in Child Welfare has become a program within the operational budget Toronto Branch, Children’s Aid Society, Metropolitan Toronto.

“Child Sexual Abuse: Making Our Children Safer”  
Stewart, C.  
Special Committee on Child Abuse, Canada.

In response to a growing awareness and concern about the prevalence of child sexual abuse and the difficulties of early identification and prevention, a multi-faceted program has been introduced into primary and junior division schools in Metropolitan Toronto. The program teaches children about issues of personal safety, how to protect themselves, as well as how to get help if they need it. Recognizing that child sexual abuse is a community problem and everyone has a responsibility in doing something about it, the program also actively and successfully encourages the involvement of as many people as possible in the community.

An evaluation conducted in 1983 concluded that the program was demonstrably successful in precipitating disclosures, increasing the likelihood of a child reporting an incident, enhancing children’s feelings of safety and greatly changing attitudes of parents and teachers toward child sexual abuse (e.g., believing the child).

This workshop describes the Preventive Education Program including its three main components: community preparation, the play *Mission from Ydob*, and the Child Abuse Prevention Kit. Slides and visuals are used to illustrate the program

and its demonstrated effectiveness. Materials are provided for participants who may want to initiate similar programs in their own communities.

“A Multidisciplinary Proposal to Roll Back the Age of School Enrollment as an Abuse Prevention Strategy”  
Vayda, E.  
York Univ., Canada

Normal anticipation and acceptance of societal intervention into the family occurs when the child reaches the age of school entry. By the time a child reaches this age, however, he or she may have already suffered some form of abuse which may affect that child’s well-being and capacity to benefit from any educational programme. Societal involvement and concern can begin at birth if we assume that all children have a right to an optimum developmental environment within the cultural context of the individual family. To ensure this right each child would be enrolled in the local school shortly after birth since the school occupies an accepted and familiar space in the community. The parents or caregivers would be expected to attend meetings held at the school on an ongoing basis to participate in a group network of support, and to identify the need for specific resources. Early childhood educators, public health personnel, social workers for community agencies, and nutritionists would serve as resources persons for the groups. The focus of the meetings would vary as needed, the tone would be informal and culturally sensitive. The expected outcome would be a decrease in child abuse across time, a lessening of family isolation during the critical early years of a child’s development, early detection of some children at great risk, and a normalization of societal interest in the environment of the very young child. A pilot project located in several different communities distinguished by contrasting economic and cultural characteristics could be designed to measure this outcome but participation might have to be on a voluntary rather than a compulsory basis.

“Parents at Risk: Assessment and Preventive Care for Childbearing Families”  
Williams, D., Ledger, K. E.  
Queen Alexandra Hospital for Children, Canada.

The period surrounding the birth of a child is a critical time for programs aimed at the primary prevention of child abuse, neglect and malparenting. This workshop will present a framework for the assessment of parenting potential and preventive intervention with childbearing families.

Based on a synthesis of findings from a variety of noted researchers in the areas of child abuse and neglect and perinatal care the workshop addresses the following:

1. Parenting potential — a conceptual model.
2. Criteria for perinatal family assessment:
  - prenatal

- labour and delivery
  - early postpartum.
3. Preventive approaches for families at risk.
  4. Community resources — responding to the needs of high risk families.

The presentation includes tools for data gathering, assessment and intervention planning. Participants are given opportunities to explore the application of these tools for use in their own specific vocational and community settings. Content is most relevant to professionals working directly with childbearing families.

## REVIEWS AND NOTES

Laura Johnson and Janice Dineen  
*The Kin Trade: The Day Care Crisis in Canada.*  
 Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1981, pp. 147.

Although published over three years ago, this important book is worth reviewing in a special issue on daycare. It is an important book which has received too little attention.

The thesis of this book is that inevitable pressures make it imperative that many mothers work outside the home. Yet good daycare placements are hard to find and parents frequently use, "... neighbours, friends, relatives, even strangers. The result is an epidemic of child neglect. At the most critical stage of their lives, Canadian children are battling daily indifference, overcrowding, inadequate nourishment and emotional, even physical abuse."

This thesis is elaborated with a series of case histories and interviews with working parents and babysitters. The villains in this scenario which the authors cast are not parents or the unsupervised sitters or private daycares, but governments and social welfare authorities who fail to provide high-quality, non-profit centres.

The authors give case examples of daycare in which children were locked in a bathroom, tied to toilet, and had masking tape put over their mouths. Yet it is not inevitable that home daycare should be of poor quality. With the aid of a good community worker,

... Home day care with a local neighbourhood base can strengthen bonds within a community and involve people in a network of service. It can be a pleasure for children to be able to stay near home and play with their own friends after school instead of being sent to another neighbourhood. It is also a great convenience for parents if they can find good family daycare near their home, since it cuts down on the travelling time needed to drop the children off... A family daycare is a place where parents can take several children of different ages... Home daycare is also good for parents because it has much more flexible than do daycare centres.

In an ideal system some mothers work outside the home, while others work within the home caring for their own and others' children, within the context of an integrated neighbourhood which is fostered by a professional family and daycare support worker.

Is Canada too individualistic a country for such a neighbourhood model of good daycare practice to work?

Chris Bagley

*Network News*, published by the National Day Care Research Network.  
 Edited by Dr. Alan Pence, School of Child Care, University of Victoria,

P.O. Box 1700, Victoria, B.C. V8W 2Y2. Subscription \$5.00 per annum.

This newsletter was created in August of 1984, and aims to link researchers from a variety of disciplines who are working in the daycare field. A national survey of daycare is being planned through a grant from the Department of Health and Welfare.

The origins of the National Day Care Research Network lie with a workshop/conference that was held in Vancouver in December, 1983. Several of the twelve individuals attending this workshop supported by Health and Welfare and UBC Faculty of Education had met earlier in the Fall at a SSHRC supported symposium in Toronto hosted by Dr. Andrew Biemiller (U. of Toronto) and Dr. Ellen Regan (OISE). The Toronto (SSHRC) meeting focussed primarily on Canadian participation in an International Pre-Primary Education Research project, however an opportunity was provided for attendees to discuss their own areas of research interest. Several of the participants with interests specifically in daycare research identified each other and agreed to explore the possibility of collaborating on and coordinating with each other in undertaking daycare research in Canada. The Vancouver meeting and the National Day Care Research Network followed from that expressed interest.

One of the goals the Day Care Research Network identified in Vancouver was "... to create vehicles for the sharing and analysis of information on daycare in Canada" (Goelman, 1984, Report on the Vancouver Conference). The "Network News" is an extension of that goal.

*The Canadian Child Day Care Federation*, P.O. Box 6370, Station C, Victoria B.C. V8P 5M3.

The Canadian Child Day Care Federation was formed to provide support and networking services to the daycare community. The Federation seeks to be an association of provincial organizations and individuals who want to share experience, expertise, and knowledge. In addition, support in coordinating or planning in workshops, conferences and seminars in areas such as curriculum development, administration, staff development, assessment and evaluation of programs, and fundraising techniques will be an important part of the work of the Federation.

The 1982 Conference on Day Care in Winnipeg, Manitoba produced a strong daycare advocate's voice in the Canadian Day Care Advocacy Association. The Federation's work will not be the work of an advocacy association, rather a "service to members" organization.

The Federation has recently produced a poster outlining ways of establishing a community group which can exercise pressure for better daycare provision.

Burch, Jennings Michael  
*They Cage the Animals at Night*.  
New York: New American Library, 1984.

Malarek, Victor  
*Hey Malarek!*  
Toronto: MacMillan of Canada, 1984.

These two books are important additions to the still relatively sparse literature depicting child welfare systems from the inside: from the child's viewpoint. The two accounts are a contrast in style but emerge with similar themes. Jennings's story, for all it includes accounts of serious mistreatment in foster care and institutional care, is basically a gentle story. Jennings as a little boy was evidently able to evoke and give love, and to teach friendship to other children. He had a mother, but illness and poverty prevented her from providing consistent care for him and his brothers. Jennings's story has a happy ending: in contrast his closest friend in the institution, Mark, dies in childhood without ever having anyone to "tuck him in or kiss him goodnight." Until they met Jennings abided by the "lifer" kid's rule, to have no friends, "they go away and it hurts."

Victor's story is very different in style and content: it includes even more serious mistreatment and brutality experienced at the hands of caretakers and the reader is made to feel the fear, the growing anger and frustration and the eruption into violence. Victor's story could so easily not have had a satisfactory ending, that it did seem in good part due to reactions of a judge and a psychiatrist who had the insight to look beyond Victor's behaviour. Victor's turnaround was also attributable to his conviction that his parents loved him notwithstanding his father's drinking and violent outbursts.

The first, and most important theme in Victor's account is the value of the knowledge of parental love — in Victor's words "our's wasn't a perfect family, but the deep bond we shared ... gave each a certain strength." Another was the profound effect, for good or ill, that teachers can have. For children entrapped in the system a teacher can intensify the hurts and the deprivation, or conversely provide hope and encouragement. A further theme was the sense of bewilderment and fear experienced by the young child entering the child welfare system which is coupled with insensitive handling and the inability or failure on the part of caretakers to mitigate and intervene. There is the risk that children without families will fail to attach to anybody, or attach to a deviant sub-culture in order to belong somewhere. Perhaps the overriding message is that professionals whose task it is to assess and care for children in disrupted families should value and support the affectional bonds that exist, and that support should be as important as the alleviation of the environmental stresses.

And, in Victor Malarek's own words "we must ensure that, as the system moves to professionalize, computerize, and technologize, child care professionals don't lose the capacity for individualized judgment."

Kathleen Kufeldt