Ruth Updegraff

- Bachelor's degree from Vassar College; Ph.D. from University of Iowa

Major Areas of Work

- Child welfare, education

SRCD ORAL HISTORY INTERVIEW

Ruth Updegraff

Interviewed by Jodie Plumert
In Iowa City, Iowa

Updegraff: I was born in Iowa—in Preston, Iowa—but my home was in Swarthmore, Pennsylvania. And both my parents were Iowans. They had met at Cornell College and were married a couple of years after graduation. And then they went back to the east, but they kept in close touch with their families. Their families did not live in the same town in Iowa. My mother's family lived in Preston, my father's in Oskaloosa which is some miles away. And they kept in close touch with their relatives, not just their immediate family, but both families had a certain amount of extension so that I had an opportunity to develop quite an awareness of the extended family and an interest in it and affection for it.

My father and mother's life that they were living at the time made it possible for me to get around quite a good deal of the country and this also extended my background. I think that it must have had quite an influence as far as my awareness of differences between people, differences between situations, different types of living situations, and certainly in terms of different types of traveling. Because at that time you could get a Pullman in Philadelphia or Baltimore or Washington and get out to Preston, Iowa. When I came here to live in Iowa City there are many towns that I recognized the name of, although only because of some experiences that I had. I think that the fact that my relatives also traveled and I think that as I look back I can realize that in our home there always was a guest room because there would be people who would be coming to stay. And this is something, of course, that at the present day is so unusual. In the present day there are many more options that people can have as far as staying overnight is concerned than having a room all to themselves. And it does I think make some difference in terms of my understanding something of the relationships which can form between some other people besides your immediate father and mother.

Plumert: So what was your schooling like?

Updegraff: Can I go back to something else a little bit more?

Plumert: Sure.

Updegraff: I think I mentioned, sometime up until the age of six, my feeling that I was moving around a good deal. At the time when I was born my father was beginning the work on his Ph.D. at Columbia. Although, at the time, he was principal of a private school in Baltimore, and so we did have the opportunity to live in a large city, and I went as a child to kindergarten at the Horace Mann School at Columbia University. At that time kindergarten was for five-year-olds. There was—because of all the travel that went on and the fact that there would be times when my father would be working and would not be out in Iowa at the time that my mother and I were that he was having trips. For two summers he was in Alaska and for one of those my mother and I went and were there with him part of the time. My experience in Juneau, my experiences up on Kodiak Island, my experiences on some of the narrow track railroads of Alaska, and knowing what it was like, I mean, with the Eskimos and the Indians and so forth. This is all part of my early experience and it has widened my knowledge and my

interest for quite a while, for a long time, and I am able to remember quite a good deal in that year. I remember having had my sixth birthday in Alaska. The present was a cup of cocoa. Everything was being very carefully watched. I also had the experience of my mother being very susceptible to being seasick and my not being seasick at all and, you know, people were very good to me and I could adjust to it. So all of this widened my horizons. We went—I could see the prairie dogs as we crossed the land and see some of the rabbits that had the long ears. It's all very, very real to me and it gives me a different perspective. So the fact that I have stayed in Iowa for a long time, even though I traveled plenty since then, it has made a world which I think was very helpful, which I've enjoyed. I'm thankful for having had those experiences.

Now you asked me a question, so let's go back to that point.

Plumert: Right. So what was your early schooling like? Were there any interesting experiences you had in your early childhood?

Updegraff: Yes, I mentioned the fact that I had gone to kindergarten. Now this wouldn't have been for more than a semester probably, although I'm not sure, but I can remember Riverside Drive and I can remember the Hudson River as I would see it. We lived about half a block away from Riverside Drive in a small apartment. I can remember seeing the horses slide down on their haunches over these cobble streets in the winter trying to hold back the coal that they were driving. Now how would that be, just think of how that would be now! Well, it doesn't make any difference.

It's an interesting memory for me, but as far as experiences are concerned, I think that I was moved around too much probably. The year that I was in Alaska in the summer they stopped and stayed for about a month in Seattle and decided, well, I was old enough to be in first grade. Maybe they thought it would be more interesting for me to be in school, and I don't remember anything about it, but I didn't think I particularly enjoyed it. And I don't think it affected me particularly. I can remember that I was very concerned then when we got back to Washington, where my father was at the time and a specialist in school administration, with his feeling that I should be in school. And the question was what grade do I go into? And I really never did get to first grade or second grade as far as I can remember, excepting that I can remember going to school one day—and this was trying to get me settled in school—that I was very upset when my mother left. In all these years, you see, my father, having been as busy as he was, my mother did a great deal that was very helpful to me and interesting to me. I mean, she took me places or else we would work on things at home. Not school kinds of things, but things I could do with my hands. Things that I could cook, things that I could sew, things that I could knit, all these things, but I think I became pretty dependent on her and I think that this may or may not have affected me later on. I think that when I first started school, I mean, when I really started school was in Washington where I was in the second grade and we were about to go west and my being very upset because the teacher told me that if I was gone for more than three weeks, the place could not be saved for me in the school. I felt that—I really was upset. I wanted to stay. I was interested and I can remember crying and being ashamed that I was crying, but she said, "Well, our schools are so full that we can't hold a place for a child." I don't know what her name was.

I also had the experience of the one girl, the little girl that I played with, having developed appendicitis and dying and this was difficult. I was fond of her father and mother. She was an only child. They lived in the same apartment house as we did. There's another experience that I had in death. While my father was gone on one of his trips my mother and I were at his family home, and her brother who lived in Illinois died quite suddenly. She, of course, was going to go, but my grandmother and my two aunts, one of whom was married and lived across the street and one of them was still at home, they all thought I should not go with her. They wanted to keep me and they said that this wasn't going to be the happiest of situations because there was considerable feeling that my uncle's wife had not helped too much in the situation by letting him to get as far as he had without having better care. Also there was an awareness, I think, that a lot of relatives would be there and that it would be just as well for me to stay where they were, but my mother insisted and I think although it gave me a very, probably, unfortunate experience with death, I think it probably was the better thing

to do for me to have gone. I think for one thing there were so many relatives that I wouldn't have seen for a second time and they were glad to see me, and probably maybe that was a help; I don't know. But I do remember things connected with that whole death and the funeral and so forth that have lived with me all my life.

Plumert: And how old were you about?

Updegraff: I was—at that time I was six.

Plumert: There are also questions about any early work experiences you had or early experiences as a young adult that were meaningful to you and then going on to college and those kinds of experiences.

Updegraff: No, I would think that—I'm going to say this: at that time we were just moving to Swarthmore and then I began to develop strong friendships with girls and boys who were in the grade. I would continue to be with those same people and in the same grade until I graduated from high school. I think that this was a very unusual experience—it is in these days sometimes—but for me, however, it was very unusual to have been able to stay this long and I developed strong relationships with girls. And I had friends which is as long as—well, they are all gone. I'm the one that's left now.

Plumert: How old were you when you moved to Swarthmore?

Updegraff: Six years old.

Plumert: You were six. So up until six you had done quite a bit of moving around?

Updegraff: Yes, and I'm not sure. I think I might have been older than that, but it was in the grade—well it may have been—I think I was older than that.

Plumert: But then up through high school.

Updegraff: Yes. Of course, Swarthmore High School was a very good. Swarthmore is a suburb, a small, unique suburb of Philadelphia and Swarthmore College is there. Most of my friends went to Swarthmore. I went to Vassar, but I have kept my friends as long as they lived and this has meant a good deal to me. Although I don't think that any of us were particularly good correspondents, but we did manage to keep in touch and I had had the opportunity every once in a while—if I had to travel for some reason—of being able to stop and see as many as I could.

Plumert: Now why did you decide to go to Vassar instead of Swarthmore?

Updegraff: I think, for one thing, my mother had always wanted to go to Vassar and she hadn't been able to go and she thought it was fine. I was interested in psychology and my father was interested in my having a good education. I think he felt the standards were very good and he sent for a good many college catalogs. They were awfully good in psychology at Vassar and I think that that's probably the reason. Beyond that, I don't know. I think my mother's influence. Of course, Vassar and Wellesley and Mount Holyoke, those places all sounded good to me, and I think that I would have been happy to go to any one of them, but I am happy that I went where I did. Swarthmore had a limited attendance, it was limited to 500. Vassar varied between 1,200 and 1,500. I guess just because I was interested in going away from home and maybe they thought it was good for me to go away from home too. I don't know.

Plumert: Was that a topic that you talked about with your friends who were all staying at Swarthmore, that you were going off, or did other people go off too? It sounds like a lot stayed.

Updegraff: Well, no. One friend, whose maid of honor I was in her wedding, she went to the Art Institute in Philadelphia for four years, but there were three of my close friends who did go to Swarthmore. We were all doing what we wanted with our lives. We lived different lives in Swarthmore too. It was a place where people knew each other and accepted each other entirely on the basis of the way they were living.

Plumert: So you went to Vassar with a psychology interest already, right?

Updegraff: Yes.

Plumert: Are there any other experiences at Vassar that were important in directing your interest?

Updegraff: Yes, I was very interested in economics and I majored in economics, although I had courses equal to a major in psychology. I could have, as it turned out, gone back to either one of those departments the year after graduating, but I chose psychology.

Plumert: Well, how did you end up getting interested in child development then?

Updegraff: Well, I think that I have always been interested as far as children are concerned, but the Bird T. Baldwin and Lorie I. Stetcher book—*Psychology of the Preschool Child* I think it was called—was just published and they really had done quite a bit of applied work in terms of testing and so forth. The Child Welfare Research Station had just been started for a matter of three years, and at that time my father—it was kind of a broken up time in my family because the year that I graduated was the year that my father decided to go—I mean, went to Cornell College here in Iowa as the President. They were moving here to Mt. Vernon and that meant I would have no home in Philadelphia. Margaret Floy Washburn asked would I like to go back to Iowa and be an assistant in the department, that she would like to have me go. Well, it just seemed like it came in very comfortably and very interesting for me. She and I became very close friends, and she has been dead a long time, but her influence, I think, has been considerable as far as I'm concerned. And I think that everything seemed to go together to say, well, this is probably right, so I wrote to Bird T. Baldwin and I asked if they had any possibility of work toward the Ph.D. in which I could earn my living and right away I got the answer. I was offered the assistantship.

Plumert: So he was at Iowa, and the woman you mentioned, Washburn?

Updegraff: Yes.

Plumert: Was she here also?

Updegraff: No, she was at Vassar. She was the head of the Psychology Department at Vassar. She wrote the *Animal Mind* and she also wrote *Movement and Mental Imagery*. I think that she was one of the early psychologists, like William James, all the ones who were doing tests and so forth, but there was a group that developed after all of them getting their Ph.D.s at Cornell University and then going out—when Bentley went to Illinois, they went out to universities—this is the Titchener influence in psychology. Now this is probably so far back from your history, your thinking about it, but she was the second woman president of the American Psychological Association. She was the second woman to ever be elected to the National Academy of Sciences.

Plumert: That's interesting. And so you got to know her when you were at Vassar, so she was an important person to you?

Updegraff: Yes, she was.

Plumert: That's interesting. So then you contacted people here at Iowa and so you started your graduate work?

Updegraff: Started the graduate work here at Iowa.

Plumert: Who did you work with when you were here as a graduate student?

Updegraff: I'm going to go back to the name of a woman who was responsible back then for the idea of there being some way that is more scientific and more dependable about the development of children than existed in Iowa at that time. This would have been probably around 1912 or 1913. She was a woman who was apparently a very effective and likable and intelligent influence among women in Iowa. She was a person from Kentucky and she married and came to live in Iowa in Des Moines. She had a small family, but she apparently was well off enough—I think that her background and her husband's affairs were such that she had considerable time to work with other women. She became nationally known because of other organizations that pulled women together, and particularly mothers together, so that she had a national presidency of some kind that was related to this. She was on the go a good deal, but she was also very concerned about her children, of which I think she had three. All of them developed quite serious illnesses at one time or another and she had all the money that she needed to get the help for them and she couldn't get it. She would go from one doctor to another and they would all try, but they didn't know what to do. She also realized from talking to the children's schools that there was a lot that they didn't know, and that parents didn't know because she would talk to other parents. She felt that something should be done to have some research that might be better and would discover something more about the welfare and the health of children. She began to think, Well, why don't we get this connected to universities? She went to Ames and talked to the president there. Did I say her name?

Plumert: Actually not, but I can guess.

Updegraff: Cora Bussey Hillis. She talked to the president of Iowa State University in Ames and he said, well, it was a nice idea, but they didn't have any money for it, and she didn't get anywhere. So that was disappointing, but eventually she tried then to go to the University of Iowa where she met with a fairly similar experience. She was very discouraged because in between time had passed and one of her children had died, and so she decided to try again, and I think she tried Ames again. I'm not sure, but she did try Iowa another time. She got much more in the way of interest at the University of Iowa, but nothing tangible. She tried—there is one place, I think, that I remember that she stood at the front of the old capital and said, "Will I ever be able to climb those steps and find out if I can do anything?" At any rate, the president got in touch with Dean Carl Seashore, who at that time was dean of the Graduate College, and he was the one—he went over and talked to the president. He said maybe there was something to this, maybe they could do this. Well, this was the beginning of talking about having the State Legislature pass a bill that would establish an institution here at the University. There was a committee of different departments that were interested here: the Medical School, Education, Psychology, the Hospital. They got together and worked together as a committee with Dean Seashore as the chairman. And gradually over a period I'd say of maybe a year or eighteen months, I don't remember, but they did make a specific request for money for the University. There was a bill and as a part of this, Mrs. Hillis had people all over the state, women and men's associations both, working on the idea and so there was pressure brought for them. The first time the bill came up, it failed, but the second time it came up during the following legislature, it passed. And that established the Child Welfare Research Station. Now this was established, I think, in—the first director came in 1917, so it was near to that date at any rate. And the first director was—I think they were trying to get Bird T. Baldwin, but he was in the army. There was a temporary appointment made and then later in 1917 Bird T. Baldwin was appointed and he eventually came. At the time he was teaching psychology at Swarthmore College and he had been doing a lot of measurements on children, physical measurements, not psychological measurements. So he was one of the few people who had something that could be done in terms of statistics to work with, and he went out and got a staff and this is when the project started. The president at that time was President Jessup and he was tremendously

interested. The institute, the Child Welfare Research Station, started by testing children in the University school, but it was not very satisfactory because they felt they were not able to do what they wanted to do earlier and the children were not really available for testing. So it was decided that the children should be tested when they were younger.

And the building—the first building in the United States built as a preschool was in back of what is now the Geology Building. When the land was needed for other things, the building was moved. They moved the building over onto Market Street. It was a one-story building. It was one large room with two small rooms and a toilet room and a hall and vestibule, but it had a nice big yard and could be fenced in. And so the—and this was when I came—the building was moved after I first came, they moved it up the alley because there was an alley that it could come up then. I came in 1925 and the Iowa Child Welfare Research Station was in this square frame, formerly a household, just a regular house on the southeast corner of Market Street and Capital Street. It wasn't a big building, it was just a square two-story and the basement wasn't being used, but they sort of put in some partitions I think. Dr. Baldwin's office was there. There was one secretary and, well, there was one room where a seminar could be held, but of course classes were in a variety of university buildings.

I'm going to go on now to the point that Lorie Stetcher, who had written the book along with Dr. Baldwin, *The Psychology of the Preschool Child*, was here, was on the staff. Beth Wellman had come; she had been in Cedar Falls as a secretary and she came and, I think, got her doctor's degree here studying the motor development of the child. Idele Pile was working in the field of physical development. There was someone—I can't remember her name, I'm having some difficulty with names—but she was interested in knowing about children's vocabularies. There was another study that was being done my Julia Kirkwood on learning. All these people were here and then there was someone who was trained as a journalist and in editorial work and she had an office because she was getting word out into the state and into the country about the work that was done at the Institute.

Plumert: So you had your own publicity.

Updegraff: Yes. The students—as we came, well, you had your place where you lived and you'd stop and probably find a place at the building, but you were busy doing something around with children. When I myself first came appointments for assistants were 12-month appointments with one month's vacation. And as long as I worked at the Institute we had 12-month appointments with one month's vacation. I don't think this was such a good idea, but the point was that the money was coming directly from the state. It wasn't coming from the state to the University and then being divided.

Plumert: Oh, you were directly employed by the state?

Updegraff: Yes. It's interesting that the President of the University—the presidency was changed after the initial planning that had been done by the committee and particularly Dean Seashore, and President Jessup, who was the one who had just succeeded to the presidency, was extremely enthusiastic about the idea. He himself had been Dean of Education before being President and he knew quite a lot in terms of the needs of the total situation and apparently went along with the planning which involved the different departments in the University. For instance, in medicine, in education, in psychology—there wasn't a school of social work at that time—but in social work. I don't remember others. I think there was someone there from the College of Nursing, but I'm not sure, and in biochemistry. The initial plan for having a director was carried out, but Bird T. Baldwin was the person, who I think I referred to at the time of the last interview, who was planning to come but was in the army, so for a time there was someone else, but after he got there then the organization really began and the research started.

And the point right from the beginning was that this is a research station. This is research about children. The emphasis was that it was not being planned particularly for these particular children, but the material would have to come from children. As I indicated, they were using children who were already in the University elementary school. It soon became apparent that the children in the

elementary school could not always participate at the time that they were needed or to the extent that they were needed and that some different arrangements would have to take place, and it was then that the idea began that they would start with very young children. I think that the possibility of having children who were in their third year of life—in other words, between two and three—was, of course, a surprise to a good many people, but the idea was one President Jessup was very much in favor of and, of course, it seemed as if having children at that time together, at that age, was going to have to be in a spot that was the right kind for them to be in for a certain amount of time. They thought of setting it up on a half-day basis and having children who were in that second and third year. And the size of the building, it was a single-story building, and what was in the building was planned with the idea there would be children who were not very big who would have to reach doorknobs and have to reach into cupboards and lower shelves and have to hang things on hooks that were lower, but the children who were that age, were not always wanting to be with somebody else, some other child. So there were certain adjustments made for a child to be able to be right in the midst of where they were other children, but be somewhat protected and they had the sort of fences that would go back against the wall. This is—simply I'm giving as an illustration—but could be pulled out so that the children would be surrounded on three sides and so that whatever a child was playing with could be right in there with him or else he could put it back or else he could get out. Also so that the children could have a little experience with steps, there was a kind of balcony put in the room in which the children could go up maybe eight or ten steps and be up at the level and be fenced in, but they could go up and look around and see what the others were doing. There was a room, a small room with quite a large window in it, that would hold a couple of tables and a couple of chairs and could be watched through a small opening in a wall so that a child could be taken there for a certain amount of testing. There was a small kitchen so that juice and perhaps something else could be brought to the children and then, of course, a small toilet room, but both girls and boys used the same toilet room. I guess I can't remember. I think there were probably two toilet seats. I just don't remember. This opened right out to a yard, which was very, very large and they could step out onto a platform which was very low and go down a kind of ramp and then they would be where there was grass or snow in the winter. It would be cold and snowy, but they could get out. This building was finished, I think, in 1921 and was the first building to be built in the United States for the use of children of preschool age in a group situation. Now there were other places in—well, there was one in New York where there were children in groups, but there was nothing built. The reason there was some point on this that I can remember, I think probably in the late '20s or a little even later than that that I got a telephone call from Joe Stone in Poughkeepsie who wanted to know when that building was built. He said, "Well, I thought we had the oldest one, but yours is older." It is interesting because that building later had to be moved to go in the back of another yard which was across the street and around on the other side of a block, all of which was used by the Institute, so it was kind of a surplus when it was needed for holding some piece of equipment or something the children were working on or you wanted to get to where children worked where not all the space was being used. I'm getting behind myself here because this building that was built was then moved to a lot which was three or four lots away from what was, at the time that the Institute or the Child Welfare Station started, on the corner of Capital Street and Market Street, the southeast corner of that intersection. In between the time that this building was built in 1921 and the time that it was moved was a period of, I would say, probably about 14 or 15 years.

Okay. I'll forget about buildings now and go to the fact that there was an organized situation in which children could be observed, could be studied, and which could be a relaxing happy one for them and which would have the opportunity of building a set of groups, but in the original building that I just described at the corner that held offices of the director. The building between the building which had been moved onto Market Street, which had been on Capital Street but now was on Market Street, had between it and the original child welfare building, a small one-story building of brick which became the chemistry laboratory for the nutrition aspect of the program in the Child Welfare Station and a place where there were offices and test rooms both at 9 East Market Street. However, by1926 Bird T. Baldwin, the originally appointed director, had arrived and had started his work and started the preschools. There were other people on the staff, but the major person I think at that time was Lorie Stetcher who wrote the book along with Bird T. Baldwin called the *Psychology of the Preschool Child* which was published, I would say, about 1923 or '24, but I'm not sure. No, no, it could've—well, it

doesn't make any great difference. The fact that these buildings were there made it very convenient to plan the possibility of using a very large private home across the street called the Welch House, a very well and beautifully built building. This was then asked for and Dr. Baldwin arranged uses for what would be called the Home Laboratory. This was planned to be set up as an all-day situation in which children would both eat and nap while they were in school and would make it possible to do research in relation to nutrition. It was at this time that the use of that building was contemplated. Dr. Amy Daniels, who was at that time appointed in the Department of Pediatrics in the University Medical School, who had been the first woman to receive a Ph.D. at Yale in Biochemistry, and who had gone to the University of Wisconsin after that, she had come and was working with infants in the hospital. She was not very happy doing it. She felt the difficulties of planning research so that it was good research with the babies, that she just wasn't able to do what she wanted to do with it and was unhappy. At this time I was very new at the Child Welfare Station. All that I knew was that Dr. Daniels was now going to join the Station staff and that her office was going to be across the street at 10 East Market Street, the Welch House, and there would be work done over there. Well, now at the same time that some of these things were developing and there were some people who had come to start, there was research work that was being done. Dr. Wellman had come from Cedar Falls and she had worked on her Ph.D. with a study on motor development and control. Idele Pile was working in the field of muscular development and physical growth. Julia Kirkwood was working on vocabulary and someone else—and I can't remember her name—was working on speech. These people were all at work in the Station and needing offices. Dr. Baldwin was then working to get money for a much larger more varied staff.

I want to point out at this point, I guess, that the history of the Child Welfare Station had had, I suppose, its full quota of tragedies and accidents that have interfered with some of the developing plans. First, for example, was the plan that Dr. Baldwin was working on for having graduate scholarships in a variety of fields to get people there for one year. This was apparently in the works at the time, and this would have been in 1927, I think, and they were getting applications for these scholarships. He was on a speaking tour and as a result of a very real accident, which I won't go into, he suddenly died. He died on this trip, so the whole situation was left. Here was Dr. Daniels moving into the Station. There was the possibility of a lot of money being spent on the training of people to be appointed and, at the same time, there was all the ongoing activity of the people who had been appointed already, one of whom was the woman who was going to manage the home laboratory. Now, however, at this point the full support of the President was very good and they immediately began working on the possibility of a new appointed director. They very soon appointed George Stoddard. Now this is a familiar name. Dr. Baldwin at the time of his death was planning to be married to Beth Wellman and he had four children, one of whom was, I think, sixteen or seventeen years old and twin boys, ten, and Pat was five years old. Beth Wellman immediately took over as far as the children were concerned, although Bird Jr. was not interested and he wasn't around much of the time, but Beth Wellman's mother and a sister came over from Waterloo and set up a home. Now the Institute, however, that's a very different situation. George Stoddard at that time was just about getting his Ph.D. in the College of Education, but I'm not sure about the date. It certainly wasn't after he became director because he had his PhD before then. He had been doing some teaching and had been working in statistics, but he was extremely interested in the possibilities of the Child Welfare Station and took over very quickly and very comfortably to the appointment of people. I never was sure just when Laura Spellman funds were granted, but I think that the whole thing was set up financially before Dr. Baldwin's death. I was a graduate student at the time, but I do remember the people who came for the scholarships came from different fields. There was one in education, one in psychology, someone in nursing—that one came from New Orleans. A home economics person who came from Minnesota and there were others. I think there was someone from Pennsylvania who was in the teaching of French and she did a study on teaching language to young children. I think that they were to come for just one year and I think that this was a problem. I think that probably some of them came with the idea that they would be supported for more than one year, but they found out when they got here that no, those were just one-year scholarships.

Plumert: They were students when they came or were they—

Updegraff: These were students. They came to study. Now some of them I think had already gotten master's degrees, but they came to study. There was one—well, I'm thinking of one who came from Seattle, a nutritionist, and she very much wanted to stay and the one from Minnesota did too, and she was mad that she couldn't stay. She eventually got her Ph.D. at Minnesota, though I can't remember her name. I could find out easily enough, but I don't think it's probably important. They got started here and then some of them then went somewhere else and got their degrees.

At this time there were problems as far as the groups were concerned because here were the young children in this one building, then we had the three-year-olds in the home laboratory. One of the first difficulties had to do with the fact Ms. Daniels wanted them to eat everything on their plates. They had to eat the food that was there and they had to eat it all and, of course, this was not very well accepted. That's the kind of thing, you know, where one person will make the arrangements and doesn't realize what the problems are and then somebody else has to try to work it out. But at any rate there were the three-year-olds who were in the lab, the children who didn't want to take naps, who didn't take naps at home—why should they take them at school? And the place where they would get these naps and so forth had to be, of course, a building. It was wonderful. It was fine. It was all planned and there was a whole addition put on the building at the back. The nap room was there, below it were more testing rooms. Everything was very well done, but it was taking time and it had to be managed and it had to be done in a variety of ways. At the same time, there were people trying to do research in the field and I was one of them. I had already started on my own research on visual perception and was doing that in the basement of the room where Dr. Daniels' laboratory was up above. And at the same time, I was trying to work with four-year-olds who were up at the University elementary school for part of the time, and then by this period we had a group of between 15 and 20 children under three—no, they could be three. They tried having 18-month-old children for six months, a small group of them at 10 East Market Street, and finally decided that it was not a good idea, that they were just too much. Very practical problems that had to be worked out and it was hard on the children, but then there were children that were three-year-olds when they started and then they became four. Then there were the ones who started at four and then there were the ones who started later. Now there was a combination group of children who were already four and going into their fifth year that was combined with the University College of Education, a University elementary school, they had a special room. There were special testing rooms there planned because of the Child Welfare Station wanting them to do research, and the total number of children at that time then came up to somewhere between 70 and 80 children every day. One group, being an all-day group, then from time to time as the Child Welfare Station went on, there would be times when a building was used in the morning for one group and then in the afternoon for another, so that would double the amount of research. It also made it possible for some children and families to stay through the noon hour to eat and then be taken home, or come early and eat and then nap afterwards and then be picked up between 4:00 and 5:00. The rooms were used all of the time and people were working with the children. Now then there had to be a period of training of people to do whatever it was that they were doing. So there were a lot of different activities that had to go on in relation to the kind of research that was being done and in relation to the demand for that research. Over this period of developing these buildings the main office of the Child Welfare Station was moved over to what is now called Seashore Hall, the fifth and sixth and seventh floors and the director was there. Well, all the major staff members had their offices there. It was only Dr. Daniels who had an office that was over at 10 East Market Street.

In 1930, I think it was, there were three professional appointments made. They were Arvis Irwin, to do psychological work with infants; Ralph Ojemann to work in parent education; and I can't remember his first name, but it was Anderson. I kept thinking and I think maybe it was John, but you know it doesn't sound right, so I just can't remember what it was. John Anderson belongs in Minnesota. At any rate, at this time there was a strengthening, there was a more specific recognition of the need for cooperating with other departments or at least have other departments know what was going on as far as the children were concerned and have them realize that there was something there that they could

use if they wanted to and it was a very good time for cooperation. For instance, in medicine I can remember one of the doctors in pediatrics describing some of the work that he was particularly doing with a group of staff members in the Child Welfare Research Station. I think that the work with psychology was going on because the students in the Institute, so many of them were taking courses in the Psychology Department. And the Department of Physical Growth was very soon formulated, and there was cooperation with the Medical School in relation to that, and Idele Pile was still working on the staff, particularly, in orthopedics over at Children's Hospital. There was good cooperation here and there had been in the field of home economics to some extent. Some of the people who had come on a scholarship at the Institute were home economists but were not studying home economics at the University of Iowa. Most of them were working in the field of nutrition. We now have quite a good many offices and we have children from the ages of two-and-a-half to six in preschool research laboratories. We have research going on with all of them. We also are having a certain amount of research going on in relation to tests for children who have been in preschools, but who now were in other schools in Iowa City. Not very much then because the Iowa City schools were not too interested in having University people at that time doing research in them.

The relationship between the psychology and the Child Welfare Research Station, of course, had been very strong because of Dean Seashore. The Department of Philosophy under Starbook and psychology were strong and there were many of the students, and I'll include myself here in this, who were constantly in with those students. There was the Philosophy Club which met every month on an evening and there was either a paper of some kind or there was something else that everybody was going to participate in. In other words, there were good student relationships between the departments. There was not that much relationship with the College of Education. Of course, one of the things that was characteristic as far as the organization of the Child Welfare Station is concerned is that it was not under a dean. It was under the President and the money came from the state, it didn't come from the state appropriation and then given to the University of Iowa. For instance, at the commencements, the Director of the Station walked with the Deans and it was a different kind of relationship. This I think is something that was probably difficult for the Child Welfare Station and that made problems. Like the fact that our appointments were all 12-month appointments with one month's vacation and we were paid, as far as I could see, no more because of having put in that time. I don't think that it was very easy to go somewhere else for a summer. It wasn't very easy for people to have summer school. It was a difference and I think that the fact of the source of the money and the fact that the appointments ran on a different basis made it very important that there be good cooperation with the heads of the departments that the Director of the Station had to work with. And I think it wasn't as easy to manage and I think also there was one other factor. See, we already lost Dr. Baldwin, and Dr. Jessup, who was a strong supporter, died suddenly. The appointment of a new Dean of the Graduate College became necessary when Dean Seashore was not so well and that appointment went to Dr. Stoddard. So for a time George Stoddard was both the Director of the Station and the Dean of the Graduate College. I think that that probably had its disadvantages. I think that probably there are other Deans who thought that they might have been appointed instead of George Stoddard. Of course, George Stoddard learned very quickly, I mean, he so very quickly picked up the idea of the Station and what its needs were. He was excellent at making his talks all over the country as situations started here and there, and this made him very well known. It was about this time that the Depression started and before it was over that George Stoddard was brought to Washington for a period of six months. So he had contacts all over and this was very good, it perfected my work in the Station.

Well, I am trying to keep myself out of this because I think that whatever role I'm playing at the time, whether it is a graduate student or whether it had something to do with preschools or with the research I was doing and so forth, it was kind of hard to keep it—it was intertwined with so much and also with so many people, but I think that the fact that the Depression came brought in a lot more interest in preschool education than would have developed otherwise. Strangely enough, and it was too bad, but what they really were doing in trying to counteract the effects of the Depression with the teaching profession was getting teachers to teach preschool when they didn't know anything about it, and this made it difficult in some places. We managed. We set up here a set of 20 training days. We were just told that so and so was going to come for training to be a preschool teacher and they would

be here for 20 training days and then they would go back to a situation which was all ready, they were told, in their own state. We had a good many teachers come from Missouri and they would start in on whatever day they arrived, if they happened to be on the seventh day, they would start on the seventh day of training and go to whatever was on that day and they'd go on through and then they'd come back and do the others later. They were people who were badly in need, some of them. Some of them were very interested, some of them came with very little—they had practically no shelter, they had no clothing with them. They got sick and had to be taken care of here at the University. There were all sorts of things that went on. Well, this gave all of us, but particularly George Stoddard and me, quite a lot of contact over the situation and that affected all that I knew about what was going on. Of course, it is true that something that was going on at the same time of the building up of the Institute (which all the time was the Child Welfare Station), there was the starting of Institutes in other places. And I think I mentioned the last time that John Anderson came down to Iowa City to find out just what was happening. Got information from Dr. Baldwin, but it was during this time that work started at the University of Michigan. It started at Cornell University. It started in both UCLA and the University of California. These were places then who were among the earlier ones that were getting together, were realizing that they had common problems. Oh, I left out Merrill Palmer, which was not a university, and was not using money from Laura Spellman Fund, at least as far as I know. The Ford Foundation was supporting them. These were people who were interested in getting together, and here we get into the beginning of their need to know what the others were doing and that was how we knew about the others. Also at the same time, there was a sense to me in Iowa, and I'm sure that it was shared by some other people, of an awareness in the preschool field of the fact the people in and around the state of New York and in the east had ways of communicating much more easily with each other than we had of communicating to them. And California, I think, was equally bad, but the people in New York—well, it started with Spock and people were talking about Spock and so forth—they knew each other. They'd get together for one reason or another, but they had that sense of being together. I felt it was much harder to get to know what was going on with them or with the people in California unless there were people who came to Iowa as students and I could find out about them and so forth, but I think that that made it more interesting in some ways but more difficult in ways.

Plumert: So you felt Iowa was more isolated?

Updegraff: Well, no, I wouldn't use the word *isolated*. It was possible to know what was going on and to know people if you went to meetings, but when you went there you tended to find people who already knew each other and knew what was going on there. No, I didn't feel isolated. Actually, maybe it is true in some fields more than in others, I don't know, but people tend to have personal relationships as well as professional ones and they are much easier. Now, because my home was in Philadelphia I knew the psychology people, but the people who were interested in psychology to begin with weren't so interested in children, which would've been nice, but the people in the State Department of Education were interested, such as Bruce Ambrose. Of course, I expect that this all could have influenced George Stoddard. When he left Iowa in 1940, he went to be President of the University of the State of New York which was an administrative position, as you know, and you don't have a specific institution to work with. I don't think we felt isolated, but I don't know how to describe it otherwise.

Plumert: But there were certain networks—

Updegraff: For instance, right now I think it would be different because you can fly, but you have to have money to make a train. You have to have a train to go on, you have to have the time to go, and so you just don't see things.

Plumert: But people were also coming to Iowa to visit.

Updegraff: Yes, people were coming to Iowa. Well, people who were interested in research were coming to Iowa. I don't know how many people were coming to Iowa to know what was going on in

certain aspects of the field. And, of course, it's the psychologists who were coming here. For the most part it wasn't the educators who were coming.

Plumert: That's interesting. Even within the University of Iowa your ties to psychology and philosophy were tighter than those to education, which would have seemed a more natural tie to the Child Welfare Station.

Updegraff: Yes. Well, now I think that with your background at Minnesota, as you have known it with Dr. Hartup there and with Shirley Moore and Charles Wirth, I think that it is more closely tied, as far as the administration is concerned, with education. This wasn't. This was just by itself, the Child Welfare Station. I think that it makes a very great difference. The personalities that are directing these departments make a difference and I think it seems to me it's not abnormal. I think it probably happens in most places, but it might be pretty critical as far as some and I think that the very way in which it was set up to begin with, with the President deciding and Seashore deciding and Seashore being in psychology and then being succeeded by Spence and, of course, philosophy became very different when Usdock was here. I think that the picture changes, but I think just the way that it was set up and, as far as I can see, it might have happened differently with different people. You can't tell. I think that, so far as I know, that Dean Packard, who was the Dean of Education at the time, and then his successor Dean Peterson, neither of them had been very interested in the part of young children nor, as far as I know, hadn't been particularly interested in the elementary school from the standpoint of what it was doing for children. I think that that made a difference as far as the Institute was concerned.

Plumert: If the Institute would have been a regular department on the campus the way everybody else was, how do you think that would have changed things? What impact would that have had?

Updegraff: Well, I suppose I think it might have if the Dean had wanted to have it that way. I mean, if the Dean of Education had wanted to have it, and was interested in it, then it would have made a big difference, but in that case, it wouldn't have had a director at the Child Welfare Station. It would just be something that was organized under the Dean.

Plumert: So you would have thought maybe that education would have taken it as one of its departments?

Updegraff: Yes.

Plumert: The way that at Minnesota the Institute is under the College of Education?

Updegraff: Yes. I think that this is one of the things that maybe, as I have thought—and I have thought of this for some time—the fact that it was very important that departments that shared work together should be doing it. And I think that there wasn't a lot of enthusiasm. You see, unfortunately too, I don't know that Dr. Stoddard was very interested as far as the older children were concerned, excepting as his children got older, but he was extremely interested in preschool and he was very interested as far as the curriculum in preschools in relation to research, and his whole attitude was that education should be as close as possible to research and research should be close to education. So his attitude was right and I think he was right. He was a good person to be doing that. Now, of course, there was something else that happened. Toward the end of his time here, Lewin came from Germany and for the last two years that Stoddard was here, Kurt was here. This made quite a difference, and then after that, you see, then Sears. Sears' interests were much more clinical than either of the other two. That made quite a problem—I mean, I shouldn't say a problem. It changed—it made the situation very different.

Plumert: In the sense that the research direction of the Institute changed?

Updegraff: To some extent. When you said *direction* what did you mean?

Plumert: You were saying that when these different personalities came in things changed, and I was wondering what changed.

Updegraff: I think that perhaps the problems that people became interested in were more clinical and particularly because there hadn't been as much clinical work involved. There wasn't—the clinical work here in Iowa was a lot of it done over at the hospital on the other side of the river. Our students weren't getting as much and the staff wasn't having as much and this was, to some extent, the fault, in fact, very possibly of one or two of the people on the Station staff, but when you didn't know, well, I think that it's a difference in direction of what was wanted and what wasn't wanted. Now then, we haven't talked about parent education now at all.

Plumert: Yes, I'm sort of wondering kind of the chronological order. The Welfare Station started out thinking about the welfare of children in a broad sense?

Updegraff: Yes.

Plumert: Because one thing I do want to ask you a little bit about was this very multidisciplinary focus. You talked about nutritionists coming in and people who studied all different aspects of the child. That's interesting.

Updegraff: Yes. Well, and then, of course, we haven't talked at all about parent education and that came very soon and there was quite a good deal in that. Of course, Dr. Ojemann was appointed in parent education in 1930, but Mrs. Hughes had been there already and there were several people in the department and they went all over the state. There was in the planning and the carrying out of the plans the responsibility of the Institute for what was going on at Ames and at Cedar Falls in terms of knowing what was going on and of having certain decisional problems. The fact—what was being taught there would make a difference in either place and it was certainly added to the job and the job had enough in it already. At the time—I can't remember which director it was, but there were three of us acting in place of the director and had to go to Ames because Ames said that they wanted to give a Ph.D. degree and we felt—I mean, we were trying to study what would be the basis of it, and this is a problem because they really didn't have the staff to do it. But the parent education idea was carried out in Iowa by getting people out over the state and by having weekly news messages to people in the state about childhood and about children. We also had a radio program, and one of the best things that I can remember as far as parent education is concerned, and the University education too, is the annual week of the Child Development Program in the summer and it was great. We had people from all over that came and talked as lecturers. The Child Development Program at Iowa City was something everybody knew about. The only time I ever saw Piaget was the time that he came here, but Spock was here several times and people from Canada and also people from all over the United States.

Plumert: It's interesting that the original Child Welfare Station had this integration of the research as well as outreach.

Updegraff: Yes.

Plumert: And I think that's interesting and I wonder if you could comment on sort of the good parts and the bad parts of that and how that has changed in the field or whether you think it has changed or if that's important to do those two things together or not.

Updegraff: Well, it seems that as far as doing them together, and if you are teaching children now—teaching adult students getting degrees they need to be exposed to both parent education and the—but psychology doesn't have to take the nutrition. They need to know something. They should I think. I felt most of what I knew about nutrition and know now I learned from Amy Daniels, but not because I took the course with her. I think that it's good for the graduate students. I think it's good for the—if

it's done well it's good for the purpose, but I think that it is very difficult to carry out and I think it needs a staff to do it. I think that much of the load for carrying the participation with the University was on the director's shoulders and it was more than it should be. I think that the directors—I think Sears, I think McCandless, and Stoddard—all wanted to be related to these relative departments in the University, but there wasn't much time to do it.

Plumert: Yes. Another thing I was curious about is you were trying to get parents educated about child development and sending out these news releases and so on based on your research. Did you ever feel that you didn't know enough about children from the research to make any statements to parents or was the research always—

Updegraff: No, I don't think that what went out to the parents was based on the research that we were doing. I think that what went out was—it might be research that other people were doing. It was material that was being told to parents on the basis of the research that has been done, but it was supposed to be a very readable report about what we know about childhood. Does this answer your question?

Plumert: Yes. So based on what the Institute at Iowa was doing and what the people at Minnesota were doing and so on, you came up with information for parents that you thought would be helpful to them?

Updegraff: Yes. Well, I suppose they did. I mean, I think that there is a lot to be known about children that parents don't know and it's not too hard to get information written about children to raise some questions about children and to give information about some of the questions that researchers would like the answers to. It is just to keep people interested in knowing about their own children.

Plumert: It is interesting because when I think about how the field is approached now, often it seems to me it's approached that we are studying problems of, say, how the mind develops. Almost from a very abstract point of view that's more philosophical and psychological rather than with an end goal in mind of finding out things that then could be passed on to parents or educators that would be useful.

Updegraff: Yes.

Plumert: And I find that's a really interesting shift from how it sounds like it started out at Iowa.

Updegraff: I think so. I think it would be pretty difficult to pass this philosophical point of view over to parents, to have them listen. I think they have to talk about their children. They have to have some questions, but we still are trying to find out what are some of the basic things that we need to know about a child and I think that this is one of our big problems.

Plumert: In assessing what? The problems we should be studying?

Updegraff: Yes. Well, for instance, think about—I mean, parents were interested—I think many parents—and would cause them to think more about what they're doing, but they wouldn't necessarily have to do it just the way Skinner did it.

I think that when Stoddard was director of the Station he had many unusual abilities in communicating and connecting with people as he talked. For instance, in giving a lecture somewhere he would talk about the Station and about what interested him, and in this particular period he was also quite active in the Federal Government and was—I think I have mentioned perhaps that he was there for a period of months to direct some of the activities that had to do with young children. I think that his being interested in this way and also his being interested in research sort of pointed research toward young children. It also pointed the desirability of having persons in a variety of disciplines together talking

about children, but it was children and it just happened that way that he was interested and what he was doing was promoting the study of children as being important in their growth. In other words, if we knew more about children, what we would be doing with them in working with them would be hopefully related to that and supported by it. I think that his ability to talk and to analyze aspects of the situation was probably responsible for the fact that he became more and more interested perhaps in the scope of his activities as they spread, and going where he would have more to administer than he did at that time. And it accounted for the fact that he went from here to the University of the State of New York, which really wasn't a university. It was just a collection of a lot of higher education situations that he was responsible for working with in the state of New York. This continued the fact at the Institute that the Institute was interested in children, but, of course, the administration had been in the background for him, but it was not in the background here.

The fact that he left and he was to be replaced brought up the matter of who would be—what kind of a director would we have? And along with that, there was the realization that the financial support was not from the University really. The interest had been supported right from the beginning from the University, but what work had been done had been to encourage the promotion of the legislation, and the money had come from the Legislature on the theory that this was a sound state matter. That's the way it was continued from the standpoint of the University budget. And the University—when the budget needed to be bigger, when there was an intent to promote work at the Station, there was more money needed and the University was not interested necessarily as a whole in accepting that. There were departments that were really by the way that they'd been set up, but the University as a whole was very interested in the Station, but not in a financial way. This also was a matter of where in the University the emphasis would be. You see, medicine was involved to some extent, really quite a good deal through Dr. Irwin particularly, the contact there. Psychology had been right from the beginning; Stoddard's background and the background of the majority of the staff had been a psychological background. Dr. Daniels was there. That came through medicine, but her real interest was one which was, for the most part, in other places connected with either biological medicine or with home economics. So that brought in another group and it became difficult for Dr. Daniels to get what she wanted because she needed more money and the question was who else was interested? The College of Education was another matter at which I think the extent of the activity of the children who had been in preschool and who went on to the University school and the interest of a good many people because of that and their involvement and I think the question as to where the influence in the University should be or would be, and there might be a certain amount of rivalry here. I don't know. I think it's very possible. And it also was not happening at the most favorable time because the death of Seashore, who had been interested in psychology in the Station in the first place, had been sort of continued by the fact that he was also the Director of Graduate Education—Dean of Education they called him. And Dr. Stoddard was appointed in his place and that gave Stoddard more of a status there and put psychology some there. So there was a question as to where the Institute would be—but at the same time there were problems that were related to getting the money and the money also, you see, had to come through the President because the President was the only person to whom, as far as the organization was concerned between the director of the Station, to whom he was responsible. But the President was working with all the other departments in the University about the budget, and this was a problem.

I'm not sure. It was right along in there, I think, around 1938 that Kurt Lewin came to this country. He left Germany. Took everything he had away from Germany and brought his family and he moved here to the United States, but I don't really know where the support for him came from other than from the University, but I wondered whether it was. I'm sure he would be. Anyone who was looking could find out, but this brought in another whole factor because this brought in other matters of philosophical interests and agreement or disagreement into the total situation. And then after that—Kurt Lewin was not here very long, he brought some post-graduate students. There were a couple, two or three, who came to work with him and also then there were some young people who worked with him. Kurt Lewin did not work much—was not interested. His family was interested in preschool, but not he. So I think that this again sort of scattered the situation and when it came to get a new director there was the question of how it should be selected. I can remember at one time that the man who then became—

what was his name? Salamon—that isn't quite the right name—he went to Syracuse afterwards, but he became the Federal Director of Medicine. I can't remember what the right name of it was, but I remember when he came and I was quite enthusiastic about his being here, but I think that, you see, there were different people would see—the question is whom would he see? Would he have to go around and talk to all the people in the Station? And if so, that's a big expense. So I think that, eventually, Sears was appointed and Sears, when he came, he had a much more clinical way of proceeding than previously and this had changed for some people and it did for me. It changed quite a lot of possibilities which I couldn't follow because I either didn't know or didn't have time to try to keep up what I had been carrying on because of Stoddard's interests. And these had to do not only with the preschools, but—and how they were operating, in which I was not involved as far as supervision was concerned. The appointment was administrative supervisor, but I was involved in a lot of the national situation because of Stoddard's involvement. So I think that this made quite a difference. There was a new appointment in the Psychology Department, which was a partial appointment I think in the two departments. I'm not sure about that. I think this made probably a situation which was hard to maintain. There were so many people. It was such a staff and trying to keep the University's activity and expectations going for the Institute as a whole, and for the preschools in my situation, it was partly true, but this was partly true for Dr. Daniels whose training, whose whole background in biological medicine—she was the first woman to get a degree at Yale—she just wasn't getting the money she wanted. So eventually—she didn't leave town right away, but she resigned. Then there was Dr. Meredith who was interested in the anthropological aspects with Dr.—I can't remember the man who preceded him who went over to medicine who really had a more anatomical interest, but he was interested in medicine, in measuring, and his interest—so I get a picture as I think back over this of a variety of activities going on by people who have been trying to carry certain responsibilities. Here's parent education with Dr. Ojemann trying to develop his work with parents and Mrs. Hughes who's trying to develop her work with parents, and hers were more in terms of the state and more women and parent education groups, whereas Dr. Ojemann was interested in developing research, but this made a problem with some of the staff who were not as sympathetic to some of the approaches that he might have been tearing out. I don't want to get down to too much specifics, but there were influences in different directions and no one person to carry the problem, to work on, to describe, and so forth. I remember Dr. Sears—when he came he realized he needed to keep in touch with Ames because with the Institute having a responsibility, through the Laura Spellman Rockefeller Fund, of knowing what was going on at both Ames and Cedar Falls. The very problem of keeping the matter right here at home was terrific and so I suppose, I don't know—I only—in many ways you might say I only worked here, but it depended upon what you had been doing before, what you were doing now, what relationships you had built up with different departments, and it was difficult to promote now. I think that this made a problem for the director and Sears eventually was interested in some of the work, I think, that they were doing at Harvard and he left and then went to Ambrose who had been here at the Institute as a student and who came in with the understanding of the—I mean, he understood the fact that there was supposed to be all these different interests represented at the Institute at once and were always supposed to react as one, both here on the campus and away from here, that it was much harder to maintain than it had been before because it was more diverse and there were problems there. Now I don't know. I think that I have emphasized problems and yet I think that, at the same time, the work that was being done, some very good things, some very good contacts nationally were made, and I think that what we did as far as the government was concerned was quite probably in many ways helpful and had been—was probably to some extent politically helpful, but that doesn't necessarily get all the work pointed out, and I think the extent to which it would be possible for a director to point out a way in which the Station can go ahead, something that is as large as it was diverse is hard. Now as I try to think over some of these other Institutes, some of them that were going, Minnesota was under the College of Education, University of California I can't say specific—this would have been the same thing. I think that the government participation of Stoddard and of some of the rest of us was quite a help as far as these presidential national meetings that the President would attend and promote, and I think that this was a certain amount of help, but it didn't do everything that would help at Iowa City. It helped the government. Now I'd like to ask you what some of your responses are.

Plumert: Well, I'm interested in that. It sounded like there is so much diversity in the Institute and that the director wasn't able to keep his eye on everything or able to know everything that was going on. Is that what you are saying?

Updegraff: Yes. Well, I think that probably it would have been very difficult for anyone to keep an eye without more support from the University itself. The first president when the Institute was started was Jessup and he had been an educator and he was heartily in favor of the establishment of the Institute. I think that the others, the one who left here to go to the University of Illinois and then eventually to Pomona to the colleges there, they were interested, but I think I guess you'd say that the University administration would vary according to the interest of the president. And the University was smaller then than it is now and I think it was too bad to think of how the work in nutrition not having been organized more, but here it was going on in the College of Medicine and the College of Home Economics and in the institutes. And this was a matter, I think, of perhaps it would be true in many cases and it may, I think, have affected several of the—I won't say institutes, but the departments at various places which had started up in much smaller ways than the Institute had. For instance, at Columbia, I think that it was hard to—they were a big university, but theirs also had been organized when they were big and it would have been very difficult for anyone to handle the financial prospects. But here there were all these people who had been involved in it for some time who were, well, like myself—this was where we had put a lot of our lives and a lot of our thinking and a lot of work nationally because of what our interests were, but it was pretty hard to get right down to do the work that we wanted because we hardly had time to know what we wanted to do.

Plumert: Yes, I got the sense of that the last time we talked that there was so much going on in all this outreach to different parts of the state with parents and stuff that you really were busy and overwhelmed almost with everything.

Updegraff: The last two years that Dr. McCandless was here he was on leave of absence. He went to Pakistan.

Plumert: Really? It's very interesting to hear this perspective because in a certain way you are focusing a little bit on the problems, but it is interesting to know that there were these organizational issues and just keeping everything financial in order was a very difficult enterprise, I think.

Updegraff: Now, I'm interested in hearing you're saying that I'm on problems. Problems—I guess because I saw them. I knew—I had been here so long that I really knew these people in terms of their desires for success in their own activities, and, yet, also criticism from some of their colleagues because we had differences of opinion about what was worthwhile and what wasn't.

Plumert: So there were all the different activities going on within the Institute and some people thought what they were doing was more worthwhile than what someone else was doing?

Updegraff: Yes.

Plumert: What's an example of that that you remember?

Updegraff: That what?

Plumert: An example of that kind of difference of opinion.

Updegraff: Well, I think Dr. Daniels' resignation—who felt that she had in her background—she had in her roots, but she wasn't getting students. She did have some of the Laura Spellman Rockefeller fellows, but they came for only a short time because they got their money for just a short time. They haven't spoken about the various—there were gifts to the Institute, as you know, and there was one period in which over a million—now we talk about trillions rather than millions, but we had a large

grant that lasted over 10 years, but then that was gone, but that was, in fact—some of these things had to be done. It was a big enterprise. I don't know whether it would've continued as it was. I think that perhaps Dr. Baldwin's death—he was a practical, scientific, realistic man and I think that he might have organized right at the very beginning. He might have realized what some of the things were leading into. I don't know. I guess I was going to say that I didn't know. Because these people meant—I knew them, the ones who were having problems and the ones who were mad at the ones who were having problems; I was perhaps close to knowing what some of the difficulties were and I was having my own problems. But I think, for instance, if you think of what's going on at Brown University and how some of the work there and at Harvard—it starts with a person and grows there and it's easier to develop that way, perhaps, than to start a department if it isn't pretty closely and enthusiastically started right from the beginning.

Plumert: That's interesting. There are a couple of questions that I wanted to ask you about, more general, too. Were you involved with the Society for Research in Child Development when it started, those meetings?

Updegraff: Yes, I was.

Plumert: Could you say a little bit about what your role was in that whole organization and any changes or things that you thought are important about it?

Updegraff: Well, all I can say is that at the very beginning, really almost before it started, there was money for that available from some source. I don't know what, but I don't believe it was from the University, although we did get our expenses paid and not everybody went. It was really someone from maybe Michigan and someone from California and from Minnesota and the people from—I think the meeting maybe was at Cleveland. I can't remember the name of the institution there, but that was interested in children, and they were there, but it was people who had a common interest in research and communicating. There were several papers given, but it was all very informal. We had a nice place to meet, not very big, but it was very well furnished and the whole thing was well organized, and I think at that time it wasn't even called a Society. It was a group of people who—and I think, as I remember, that there was—I'm sure that one would say that this was the embryo from which this association grew and it grew right away. It was almost the next year that there would've been something.

Plumert: About what year was that when you first started out do you think?

Updegraff: Well, I want to say it was in the '30s.

Plumert: So it was a small group of you kind of meeting informally. How many people about do you think were there in the beginning?

Updegraff: Oh, this is really drawing on my memory. I would have said that there might have been 30, and part of those were very much related to the particular part of the country in which the meeting was. People could get to it pretty easily, but I don't know. I can't remember.

Plumert: Yes, I was just curious because now it is so huge. I mean, two or three thousand people will go to the SRCD meeting, so it's really changed a lot it sounds like.

Updegraff: Oh, yes. I think it has grown, and again as far as I knew, in a good way, and there is an interest to having papers and discussing them and being able to get at it. But I suppose somewhere in there—but it was later than that that the difference of opinion between Minnesota and Iowa on the matter of intelligence and some of the work that Wellman and Stoddard did was a matter of knowledge.

Plumert: What was that debate about?

Updegraff: On the—

Plumert: About intelligence between Iowa and Minnesota.

Updegraff: Yes. Didn't you ever hear? There was criticism of the whole Iowa point of view about the nature of the relationship between environment and the individual and of the work that had been the sources of support that had been claimed—whether it was all done with good faith or in the spirit of science or the spirit of—

Plumert: That's interesting. Well, the other question I had was do you have any advice for the field of child development at this point when you look back on your experiences and what worked or what didn't work? Any changes you see that happened in the field over the years and if you would have any words of wisdom for the future of the field.

Updegraff: Well, I feel that the institutions which did have laboratories that had children in them, regardless of what the age of the children concerned, had a certain stability and focus of interest of something to focus on and think about, talk about, that was lost when the laboratories—now I'm not thinking of preschool laboratories or the Minnesota laboratories or anything, but the theory in having something to talk about, people to talk about, something about growing to think about, I think it was a loss. I think that these were sources of expense and I feel that this is true. It wasn't just here. I remember when the University of Michigan closed their preschool and their University school and you know it was sort of a shock, but it wasn't too long before some others closed too. I think that the presence of personality, the presence of persons adds to the study of psychology, is basic to psychology, and I think that that's living and it's living going on in environments and if we aren't interested in that, then I don't know what we are interested in.

Plumert: Yes. It's been a big loss, I think, to Iowa that we don't have our laboratory preschool anymore to be able to observe those kids and I think you are right in a sense that it does bring together more collaborative efforts from people interested in different facets of development to have that preschool lab there, because now it is much easier for us all to have our own laboratories and bring kids in and all be studying very separate things. That's an interesting point. Are there any other things, trends in the field or things that you think are important or would be important for the future of the field?

Updegraff: I think so, too, but I don't know. I just don't know what's happened to growth. I think that, as I see it, doing this amount of observation here at the Oak Knoll Health Center where there are a lot of nurse's aides, both men and women, and I've watched them, these aides, and, of course, this was during the Christmas vacation when things were upset for everybody and so there were a lot of people out and coming in who really hadn't had much experience. And then there was all the same difficulties with absentees because of the weather and there were two or three people, particularly, that had good minds and thought to some extent, but they were awfully good at talking and awfully quick at lying and they were critical of a lot of things, but their whole idea—I'd say, "Why do you want to do this," and they would say, "Well, I want to help people," and I'd say, "Well, why do you want to do that?" Well, because they wanted to make them happy. And yet between two young men particularly, both of whom are currently studying to be nurses, they are both well able to handle something much more complicated than that, but they're not. I don't know why they are doing it this way. They can get into kind of a profession, they can get money. I say, "Why are you working here now?" "I need the money right now." They developed these techniques of, for instance, they always wanted to get away early, as early as they could at night because they could go and have their own parties afterwards. So they would come and say, "When will you be ready to get ready for bed?" And I would say, "Well, maybe 8:30, 9:00." Then they would realize that I would be late and they would try to work that in, but they wouldn't tell me. They would get there early and they would say, "Well, someone didn't do the time that they thought," or they'll say, "We had a chance to go differently and

so you are coming here now," and they put you in a position in which if you're not willing to agree that you're being unjust, but the fact they are lying is—I don't know whether that's answering. It's a failure—well, I guess I'd say from my own standpoint, it's the morality that's going.

Plumert: Yes. It is interesting. I think part of what you are getting at, too, at least the way I'm interpreting it as a failure of people to reach their potential either intellectually or career wise—

Updegraff: Yes.

Plumert: —or in terms of their conscience or whatever. I think that's interesting because it seems to me that the beginning of the Child Welfare Research Station was to try to help children reach their potential and to find out what is it that produces different potential or allows children to reach potential, so that's neat. I think that's kind of a neat story to answer that question. I don't know if there are other things that you want to talk about or you think are relevant.

Updegraff: There were big differences between people in the department and differences that would be based on personality and differences that were based on philosophy, difference in activity, and the fact that you don't have time to really get behind it.

Plumert: Yes. Well, it is interesting to me because I am just starting out in my career that so many of the things that I see are very similar to what you are talking about: personalities and philosophy and the great pressure for your time and not often feeling like you can do everything you want to do as well as you want to do. Sometimes you can't do things at all because of the time pressure.

Updegraff: And you may or may not feel that they're worthwhile to do, but they have to be done for the sake of the department or the sake of the institute or the sake of the university or something.

Plumert: That's true. Well, thank you very much for doing these interviews. I'm sure Bill will appreciate it and I've learned a lot. I've really enjoyed working with you on these. I'm glad that this worked out.

Updegraff: Well, I hope that you will keep in touch with me.

Plumert: Oh, I will. See, in fact, I thought maybe at some point we can get a picture of you, too, because I think that will be nice for this to go along with the tapes.

[End of Interview]