

Shirley G. Moore

- B.A. in Psychology (1946) University of Chicago, M.A. in Developmental Psychology and Preschool Education (1953) and Ph.D. in Developmental Psychology (1960) both at The University of Iowa



Major Employment

- Professor Emeritus, Institute of Child Development, University of Minnesota: 1987-present
- Assistant Professor/Associate Professor/Professor, Institute of Child Development, University of Minnesota: 1960-1987
- Director and Co-Director, Center for Early Education and Development, University of Minnesota: 1973-1987
- Director, Laboratory Nursery School, University of Minnesota: 1960-1973

Major Areas of Work

- Social development, peer relations, parent-child relations, educational intervention programs, curiosity

SRCD Affiliation

- Social Policy Committee (1981-1985)

SRCD ORAL HISTORY INTERVIEW

Shirley Moore

Interviewed by Willard Hartup
At the University of Minnesota

Hartup: This is Bill Hartup and I am sitting in my office room 104A Child Development Building at the University of Minnesota with Shirley Moore. This was once Shirley's office, it has been my office for a long time and I am really very pleased to be interviewing Shirley for the SRCD Oral History Project. She and I have been colleagues for 38 years and there is nobody for whom I would rather perform this service than for Shirley.

Let start at the beginning Shirley. I think it would be nice to hear something about your roots, your family, any event that you trace your interest in children to and then some of your early educational experiences that might tell us how you got interested in kids, how you got interested in child development research and so on.

Moore: Okay, I am pleased to be interviewed by you too Bill. I can't think of anybody I'd rather have a chat with for however long it takes. One thing about my background, I felt as though it is quite different from most of my colleagues because I grew up in a neighborhood that was middle class, maybe a little bit to the lower middle class. Very adequate, very nurturant. My father was a skilled laborer. He was a tool and die maker. Nobody in my family among my cousins, except the younger ones, quite a bit younger than me, went to college. My brother was gifted in art and he went to art school not college. He made good on that, he became a commercial artist but among my friends hardly anybody went to college, just a few. I was thinking about that the other day, I can think of about 3 out of about 13 or 14, you know 3 of us went to college. That was the influence of my mother. My father's only response to the idea that I should go to college is that I must learn to type so that I could at least earn a living. He was right for the wrong reason; I mean I did earn a living between classes typing to get by.

Hartup: Yes, my mother did that for me, too.

Moore: Somebody has to do that for everybody. But my mother had wanted to be a teacher and never got that training. She didn't talk about that a lot or mourn that or anything but I think she just was more educationally oriented than my father. My father was a smart man but he was a person of the times. It just wasn't necessary for me to go to college, my brother had to be able to make a living and I had to be able to make a living somehow or other but my mother had that idea. I was not that promising a high school student. I really didn't like school very much until I got to college. But my mother just, you know, kind of felt that that was the thing to do. I went to a junior college for a year and a half and then I transferred to the University of Chicago. So my degree is from the University of Chicago but I started out at a place called Morgan Park Junior College which turned out just totally by accident, (we didn't quite know what we were doing) but it was an excellent Junior college. I kind of blossomed there. I never was a fantastic scholar but the further along I got the better I was. So I did all right as a freshman and that kind of wired me a little bit and I started to perform pretty well, you know well enough. Well enough to transfer to the University at a given time. A person there that was kind of important to me was one woman who was an English Lit. teacher and we had to write compositions for her all the time. I was an awful speller. I think I may have had a mild reading problem as a child because I was never a fast reader, I'm still not a fast reader but I do well enough that it is not much of a handicap. But I think it was a handicap enough to be a little embarrassing and I didn't like school partly for that reason. But I was a lousy speller and I got A's on her compositions with all kinds of nice comments and she said to me, forget about spelling, don't worry about spelling it isn't correlated with any other academic characteristic that we know of. I don't know whether that was true or not but that really-- that was a very high impact experience to do with her. And I did write good essays and I have liked writing ever since. I work hard at it but I enjoy it. So that was important to me. The other person that I think as an adolescent in that period of time was a minister of our church. He was a young man, half of us were in love with him, a very charming, nice looking guy. (Such a contrast to what we had before, when he came) and he was the person who supervised the young people's group; it was called Christian Fellowship I think at that time. He had a curriculum, we met every Sunday night and then we did serious things for 45 minutes and then we romped and played and went to ice cream parlors and things like that. He brought in little bits of information, excerpts from the great philosophers and we talked about it. That was the first time I pondered things like, what the heck are we doing here anyway. He was very encouraging about my going to school and I always felt he was a person I could talk to.

Hartup: The period that we are talking about it the late 1930's?

Moore: Yea, actually 1941 is when I started school (college).

Hartup: When did you declare a major or what was your major?

Moore: Well I declared a major when I went into the University I was able to do that. I guess that would have been 1944, something like that. Helen Koch was my mentor, not really my advisor but she was the person I talked to most. And as far as my getting into Child Development is concerned, it was not really a noble gesture or calling by any sense of the word. I was a psychology major and I did that partly because I sort of thought, I didn't want to be a teacher but I wanted to somehow be in that area. I didn't want to be a physicist either or a biologist or something. So I thought psychology was a nice basic major, and it was. Not very much child development there at that time but a little bit. And I thought at one time, what am I going to do with this when I get out; I'll be typing like my father said I would.

Hartup: Did you take a course from Helen?

Moore: Yes, I had--I took a course from her and also got her advice about taking a course from Olga Adams who was a marvelous kindergarten teacher there--the only early childhood person, you know, that was really on the faculty. But she also told me to go over to the lab school and low and behold the person there was Mary Elizabeth Keister who was really kind of acting principal of the school. She

was the main person on site and just a marvelous teacher too. I really saw some excellent teaching there. Phyllis Richards was another person there who later went to the University of Texas and I was in her group for a while. So when I went into that place I wasn't so sure what I wanted. I did my share of babysitting and all that kind of stuff and I liked kids but I never really thought very much about what kind of career I should have. I was kind of dead headed about that. But I just loved that place. I really got hooked on it. I spent a lot of time there. That was the way you learned to be an early childhood teacher. There was no training program there or any place else. There was no licensing or anything like that. Child development, it turned out, and maybe more generally Psychology and a little Sociology, was the way to go, plus whatever you could get from education which was usually kindergarten.

Hartup: If there was no training program at the University of Chicago, what was the laboratory school used for? Was it mainly for research?

Moore: Yes, there was research going on and I'm not so sure--it may have had as much a service orientation. You know there wasn't such a budget crunch; there were lots of places where their lab schools kind of hung on, they were not particularly integrated into the academic programs but they were maintained. A lot of faculty families went, so it was kind of a fringe benefit--more so than it is here. It was really kind of a fringe benefit for that reason but there were students in and out of it. There were Social Work students that came in, a couple of Pediatricians would come in and kind of apprentice there. That was a good experience for me.

Hartup: So was Helen your advisor?

Moore: Actually a man named Kingsley was my advisor. He was an older man and he was very nice but she was the person that I felt I could go in and say, "what should I be doing here". I think she advised me very well and I went right into day care from that.

Hartup: Well then were you, other than your experience at the lab school did you have any work experience that related to children or did that come right after you went to college?

Moore: That came right after. I had not had--except teaching volunteering for summer Sunday School, something like that.

Hartup: Well I know that your experience right after that was very interesting so why don't you talk about that.

Moore: Yes, well I think, for about five years I think it was--before I went to the University of Iowa--I was in day care. I was in day care at the time that the Lanham Act was supporting day care so that mothers could get into the work force, you know the war industry. But also the non-war industry because the men weren't there. And those funds were drying up kind of during the first couple of years that I was out there. The war wasn't over but some guys were coming back and the handwriting was on the wall. I just felt I was the "kiss of death" for these day care centers. I'd be there for about six months and their funds would run out, they'd close.

Hartup: You mean they actually did and then you would have to find another job?

Moore: Yes, they actually did and I had to find another job. Some of them kind of hung on a little bit. The one that hung on was called the Daughters of Zion, it was a Jewish supported one and I thought afterwards, reflecting; I would think they might be the ones that would hang on the longest because they wanted that program for their children. But it just really decimated the day care. Of course a lot of the mothers were going back home too. But what I did the last three years of that five year period was live in a Settlement. I took a job running a lab school, (not a lab school, a day care center) in a Settlement House; the Mary McDougall Settlement House on 47th and Ashland in Chicago. It was called Back of the Yard; it was south of the stock yards and the odor from the slaughter of the animals was

just so oppressive. You had to stay there, if you came and went it was more than you could take so I moved in out of sheer necessity. I couldn't keep coming and going, no I didn't do that, I wanted to move in. But that was a fascinating job because I was involved in the whole community. It was a Mexican and Chicano and Polish community. They didn't get along too well with each other but that was part of the scene. And I ran the day care center and I apprenticed a lot of young people. I got a letter this Christmas from a woman who said she's finishing up her career now and how grateful she was that she started out teaching in my day care center. She said she doesn't think she has seen any better.

Hartup: She was an assistant?

Moore: Yes, she was just a relatively young woman, a young girl, younger than me.

Hartup: So how many different centers then did you work in?

Moore: Well I think I was in three before that one. That one I was in then for a long time. That was a well put together one that stayed. Another interesting part of that job was that I ran a program for mothers and children; activities for mothers and children. And part of it was a summer camp program where children under six and their mothers came. That was fascinating because the mothers worked an hour a day on child rearing stuff and someone else had the kids, the rest of the time they did things together. That was a nice activity and a nice opportunity for me to work with mothers more than I would otherwise have.

Hartup: Were there any particular things about that experience that shaped either your sort of philosophy about early childhood education or your goals so far as child development in later years. That is do you trace back to that experience particular views or outlooks or beginnings of things that were defined later?

Moore: One impression that I had about that neighborhood and that facility was that it was an extremely supportive important environment for all of the young people in that community and the best of the young people aspired to be on the settlement house staff as junior counselors. And if they stayed out of trouble they had a pretty good chance of it. If they looked promising for going to school and needed the money they had a good chance of it. Now that excluded some kids too, but in general it was a very positive influence on that community and I sort of had the feeling that that was an important source of influence on the lives of those kids who often didn't have a heck of a lot going for them. The staff were educated so they wanted to go to college. Those young people--and some of them were in the day care center I mean they were in other parts of the program as well--but they aspired to go to college. That was what they wanted to do more than anything and I think that without that Settlement they would not have been able to do that.

Hartup: If I remember correctly parents didn't have to pay anything for attendance or did they?

Moore: Very, very little yes. They paid a token.

Hartup: Subsidy essentially came from the government and from the...

Moore: From the settlement house. Actually the board of directors of that settlement house was drawn very largely from faculty members, and wives of faculty members, of the University of Chicago.

Hartup: I see.

Moore: That had been true for many, many years and they would come in their furs--I mean just great people they did such a service to us--but it really was a contrast of the haves' and the have nots'. They were pretty well heeled, very sort of sophisticated people.

Hartup: What led you to stop that line of work temporarily and go to Iowa?

Moore: You know every time I finished a degree, you know like the bachelors and masters I had no intention whatever of going on, none what so ever. But I just sort of out grew jobs. At the Settlement House I met a number of people--it was a residential place too and everybody there was, you know interesting people--all professional in one way or another and I just liked hob knobbing with those people. And I just felt I wanted to take more responsibility. I knew I could run a darn good day care center; I had total confidence in that but I thought I wanted to try something that would give me a wider range of job possibilities. So that's what caused me to go back, I was just ready for something new. I felt reasonably confident academically because of my background, I thought well I can probably do it, it's just do I want to you know.

Hartup: Why did you choose Iowa?

Moore: Well, that's an interesting story also, I'll make it short. Mary Elizabeth Keister was why (but not solely) because she told me, if you want to stay in the Midwest (and I thought well I don't too much) but she said two of the best places in the country were Minnesota and Iowa--at that time (1950) I think. I'm not so sure she was right about this place because I think there was a little bit of a dip and it was not as visible as Iowa was in the field. And I was kind of aware of that from some associations I had with Chicago people that maybe Iowa would be the better place to go. But I did apply to both of them. Minnesota turned me down as a student! I got back at them by coming back as a faculty member. Didn't I ever tell you that?

Hartup: No, I don't think I knew that!

Moore: No kidding, I wrote that in that piece for CEED'S Newsletter when I retired. Yes, I got a nice little note saying "I'm sorry, but..." Minnesota welcomed me with open arms, (I mean Iowa welcomed me) and when I got there to Iowa and met with Ruth Updegraff and, you know, as I got into that place and met you and Boyd McCandless (and John McDavid was there part of that time) I just, I was very pleased with it. I didn't feel I made a mistake at all. I was also very pleased with the academic program despite that it wasn't very user friendly for people, you know, with interests of my kind. But I sort of felt that I knew a lot about early childhood education now I want to learn the child development part.

Hartup: Did you start with an appointment as head teacher in the nursery school?

Moore: No I didn't. I started with a job in the book store and within a few days Ruth Updegraff invited me to come into the office. And she had a position open as a teaching assistant and she asked me what my philosophy was and I was absolutely tongue tied. I didn't know what the heck my philosophy was and I said to her, well I sure like the way Mary Elizabeth Keister teaches, and she says you're hired!

Hartup: She had been a student of Ruth's.

Moore: Yes right, so that got me in. That was a good experience too.

Hartup: So you were an assistant teacher for what, a couple years?

Moore: Yes, I got my master's degree. It was a two year program and then I stayed on as a head teacher for four years and then went into the graduate program again.

Hartup: So you must have been just beginning your job as a head teacher when I came because I wasn't there while you were taking your MA. I was there while you were working on your Ph.D.

Moore: Yes right. I was glad to see you come because it was so learning oriented and it was so Hullian (it wasn't social learning) and I just kind of felt this is a friendly person here. This is a person who is going to...be good to work with.

Hartup: Why don't you talk a little bit about the Iowa years? We don't want to go too long on that but sort of what it gave you and what the place was like at that point. I think that the history of that institution or that unit will not appear a lot in these oral histories, so why don't you just talk about those years maybe as a whole or you know what was sort of being developed there. What you got from it that you took away from it.

Moore: Well, you know prior to the time you came Bill, you would have looked at that history from a different (or the same from a different vantage point) because you were inside looking out, I was kind of outside looking in. I felt that there was a fair amount of tension there between the hard line researchers who were Hullian and nothing else--and almost anybody else. It was very hard for anybody else to be very acceptable. For some funny reason I felt that I was low enough on the totem pole that I wasn't necessarily expected to have any expertise in those areas or be responsible for any part of it. But I was very interested in it and reasonably eager to do well and so I had a good feeling...

Hartup: You were intellectually competitive and you see that's hard for other people to put down.

Moore: Yes, well the thing is I had the feeling that everybody was surprised anytime I achieved something because I was an early childhood person. That was kind of fun. It was like it wasn't all that expected of me so it wasn't all that bad if I didn't, but you know I did reasonably well there. I mentioned this to you at one point too--the course I had from Charles Spiker. One of the first courses I had. Everybody had to take it and everybody groused about the early childhood people. The people who weren't all that into Hullian learning and the like were upset about that. But it was really an introduction to child psychology but also was really a philosophy of science course and I was just fascinated with that. I had vague recollections of that kind of stuff from my undergraduate work, but that was so long ago you know. I was just fascinated with the idea of studying children in this much more systematic way. I don't know how much I implemented all of that later but I really appreciated that and found it exciting and fun to do--and a whole new ball game. You know I knew enough of the practice, I didn't have to kind of worry about that and work on that. I could go into the Lab school and get by very nicely but this was just a whole other way of looking at children and I just really took to that. I enjoyed so much anytime I talked with people.

Hartup: Well certainly in my view Iowa had a lot to do with shaping the sort of theoretical orientation which has marked your later work. I believe it was based in learning theory and social applications of learning theory. Then of course the other thing was what you obviously drew from that situation in terms of early childhood because Ruth really ran an interesting program.

Moore: Yes, very interesting program. That was a marvelous lab school.

Hartup: How would you describe it in three sentences?

Moore: Described what?

Hartup: Ruth. What Ruth's mentoring, what she stood for in terms of objective and aims in early childhood education.

Moore: She was a very creative early childhood educator. She felt that children needed to feel very confident in their abilities to do things. She wasn't a hard disciplinarian although she left it to the staff to keep reasonable order (and I think if you hadn't, that might not have been too swift) but as long as you did that was fine. She was very curriculum oriented. They had this marvelous block room, I've never seen anything like it before or since. One great big room totally ringed with blocks and all kinds of stuff. And the kids would build these marvelous things. I got, you know, a sense of how really

powerful good curriculum was for children for purposes of learning; playing too but for purposes of learning. That was, she thought they should hear good music. She wasn't that impressed with children's music she wanted them to hear good music but interesting music so Peter and the Wolf and things like that were what she felt they ought to have. She also thought that every child should have something that as an older child one would call a hobby, but with a younger child it would be an area of expertise, and you helped that. Now we didn't implement that like a "learning goal" (the way one would now perhaps and say "well what's yours, kid?" or "let's get you one"), but you fostered that anytime you had an opportunity.

Hartup: Isn't it also the case that there was a marked concern for the individual child in his or her development? That is the curriculum must accommodate the individual in her thinking. Was that her ...

Moore: Yes, I think she also felt that the children had some obligation to the group, and part of that was accommodating to each other.

Hartup: Another area was the staff meetings where you talked about individual children, as though you are reviewing case presentations and grand rounds or something.

Moore: Oh absolutely, in fact we used to kind of tease about that--that if he didn't have a problem before, we'd give him one when we talked in the staff meeting--because you know here is this perfectly healthy normal kid. We didn't do any damage to kids in that way but we would take a kid who is perfectly healthy (because we talked about them whether they were problems or not) and we'd say, well he could be a little better in this or a little better in that. Pretty soon we'd feel that we needed to intervene in some way with this child! That was helpful for me though because I got the feeling that you need to look at kids in more detail.

Hartup: Well now to turn to another topic just a little bit. Your first research application was with Ruth wasn't it? Tell us just a little bit about that and what influences were at work here.

Moore: You know Bill actually I think, I believe this is true. I believe the first one was with you, it was that study on avoidance of inappropriate sex typing.

Hartup: No that was later.

Moore: Well, I think one was 1963 and I think the sociometric one was published in 1964. It was done earlier.

Hartup: You didn't publish that sociometrics study?

Moore: Yes, in 1964 with Ruth Updegraff. I believe, I think that is true.

Hartup: Why I didn't know that, I guess I had thought that the sociometric work had come earlier.

Moore: I think it did come earlier but I think it got published in 64.

Hartup: Boyd McCandless must have had something to do with that.

Moore: Yes, Boyd did as a matter of fact. One thing that always kind of embarrassed me about that is that I got credited in the reviews and things for putting together the picture board method of sociometrics and I borrowed it from Boyd, I told him one time, "I didn't tell them that!" But that was a fun thing to do, I enjoyed that and in some ways I got as much mileage out of that one little study as almost any one that I did.

Hartup: It was a very important study. It made a very significant methodological point. Methodological come theoretical. It was about the positive and negative choices and how they should or should not be combined.

Moore: Yes I think it did. The other reason that I think it had an impact is that it was early in that field's blossoming. And you helped in time, starting getting it going when there wasn't that much. There were very many measures. Certainly the ones that were there were not very effective--the ones that were used with older children--were not very good the younger kids.

Hartup: I think people sometimes lose sight of what was going on in the study of children's social interactions, that is with each other, prior to about 1962-63. Because there was considerable activity in that field. Boyd was working in that field, George Thompson worked in that field earlier at Iowa and then of course before World War II there was a lot of activity that was focused in that area. So it wasn't that people discovered the field of peer relations about 1965, it just wasn't true.

Moore: No, but you know things kind of ebb and flow and I think it was maybe time for a new awakening of that. We do tend to leave the old literature behind which is too bad. I mean I think of some of the intervention studies that were done at Iowa like Mary Elizabeth Keister's work with frustration in children and Lois Jack, Marjorie Page, Gertie Chittenden. I think that early research is timely. I think it's a paradigm that's a good one. That kind of a training program (and the training procedures) was really quite elegant and very effective. But that stuff's dropped out of the literature completely.

Hartup: It has and it hasn't. I just looked the other day at a new review of the social intervention literature and you know the coaching and the other kinds of studies like that. You are correct there isn't a lot going on in that area now. There was a flurry of activity about 10 years ago and I think people are not sure where to go with studies right now.

Well, you did however after the methodological work on sociometric status, and you did that study that focused on the extent to which avoidance might be involved in children's preference for sex typed toys.

Moore: The interesting thing in that study was the adult absent/adult present condition, remember that? With boys being more restrained with an adult present whereas for girls it didn't matter. I think that fits rather nicely with the rest of what we know.

Hartup: I think that's true. But you then did an experimental thesis -- you were after all an Iowan.

Moore: Yes, that's right. That was my legacy. Yes, I did feel I must do that.

Hartup: Why don't you talk just a second about that because you did some other studies on that later?

Moore: That was the study of displacement of aggression in young children and Ruth Updegraff was my mentor and was very helpful to me. And McCandless was also helpful--particularly I think in kind of setting the task. But I used a game kind of situation and had children play. Young girls and boys play a game with a figure that was dressed in a shirt (a striped shirt that varied from a plain shirt to a fully striped shirt) and had kids win and lose respectively to either the plain figure or the totally striped figure. And then afterwards, whether they won or lost or who they lost to, I let them play a target game where they could shoot darts at these figures. In a word the boys were more inclined to aggress directly to the figure they lost to and the girls were more inclined to generalize their aggression to figures less like the target kid. In the target game the target child itself wasn't there it was just a generalization so they didn't have that choice. Afterwards I let them shoot the target child if they wanted and again the boys shot more than the girls.

Hartup: I forget were the training figures were they male or female? Or was it...

Moore: They were the sex of the child.

Hartup: The sex of the child.

Moore: Yes.

Hartup: Well, why don't you now maybe talk kind of generally about your research career from the beginning to up to the present and kind of the directions it took and sort of why you took them and so on?

Moore: Actually...

Hartup: One of the things I think people will be interested in is knowing particularly what you feel were the most satisfying research contributions, which papers you liked the best or you thought really...

Moore: One of the things that when I was looking at this interview schedule, and this section is describe your contributions to research. One of the first thoughts that I had is that I guess I really think that the contribution to research that I think has had most impact (was not more rewarded, but very rewarding for me, I wouldn't have wanted to have changed it) and that supplied me with a niche in the field that some of my other colleagues around the country had (but not too many of them) was that of disseminator of research. From the beginning as soon as I got involved with the lab school I wanted the lab school to play a role nationally that it had not for many years. I wanted people to want to come here and see it and want to invite us to things and see us as people who could present at meetings and had something to say to them. I liked from early on--really even at Iowa I liked very much talking with people out in the field and I liked talking with parents about research. So I just feel as though a big part of my activity was not necessarily talking about my research, although usually it was always in areas that, my research was always in: the social learning general area, adult/child interactions and peer interactions, relationships. So it was easy to find literature that went with that and so that was my area of expertise. I didn't talk as much about curriculum. I didn't talk as much about materials and things like that. I talked more about relationships and the social aspects of the social development of children and the adult/child interactions and my research was in that area too. But I felt like I was able to do that I need to keep up with those areas for both reasons because that was what I wanted to talk with people outside about and help them make the bridge between their research and practice.

Hartup: Would you reflect on your research dissemination career? I don't really like the word dissemination very well because it implies sort of like you just scatter seeds around. But I'm particularly interested in, you engaged in a wide range of activities, been really one of the most interesting range of activities for doing that kind of thing where I can think of anybody I've ever known from the classroom to big formal programs. But could you give an idea of what that range is like and ones that have been particularly satisfying to you. Maybe ones that didn't work and were frustrating to you.

Moore: Well, you know there were always the somewhat formal things, you know the presentations at meetings and things like that. I kind of like workshops because I like the interchange one has with audiences although I did a lot of the other stuff too. I think I probably enjoyed the situations where you could really have interchanges directly with people and talk about how things could be implemented and where you could use anecdotes very heavily. I enjoyed that part of it although I did enjoy more formal presentations as well. One of the things, I think one aspect of that work that I liked a lot around here was that I went out to day care centers and talked to their staff a lot and helped them work on some type of curriculum or particular children but often it had to do with the sort of

translation of some area of research to their program and they would maybe hear something or read something in one of the newsletters or whatever and call and say would you come and talk to us about that.

Hartup: See that is what I find very interesting because you were involved very actively at that level, in doing that, and your exchanges with parents and parent groups were always informed by research. Everyone that I ever heard. But you also stood for that kind of effort in your activities with State and regional and national organizations. Talk a little bit about that if you would.

Moore: NAEYC was, I mean it still is, the premier organization for early childhood people and you know you were a role model in that. You were a role model in so many things.

Hartup: You were too, we really stood for the same kind of thing.

Moore: Yes, we did but you know there weren't too many other colleagues that I had that did that. Ruth Updegraff did but I appreciated that--and then you know you are a fine researcher besides and that combination doesn't come about all that often. But I did, I made it a point to get to NAEYC but I also enjoyed working with that group. But over the years I was on the board (after you were, long after you were) and I was treasurer one time. I was a candidate for the presidency once and Barbara Bowman was elected president at that time. There is always a little irony when I get rejected for something because that time what I did the very next year was that third book of research reviews with Cathy Cooper and that was a nice book of some good reviews. I was very proud of that book and I thought, at that time, there's no way I could have been doing that that year if I had been going out to all the affiliate groups and making these ceremonial visits.

Hartup: But you see that is one of the big areas, from my point of view where you had an impact on NAEYC. Not only did you edit that book but you contributed to other research. Your contribution to the first of that series which had to do with sociometric measuring is still cited.

Moore: Yes, it is. I still send reprints out on that one once in a while.

Hartup: You were research editor of the journal for a long period of time and you will have to tell the number of times that you contributed to programs of the organization that were research transmissions as a major focus.

Moore: There were a lot of times. Actually one of the things that is happening with NAEYC right now that I think is interesting (it will be fun for the people that are just working into it now) is that they now have a group for more advanced professionals--for college people and university people and researchers that are also interested. I'm always afraid that then they will splinter off from the other group and they won't hob knob any more with the classroom teacher and the local people that come to NAEYC--but it was needed. It's a huge organization now. I remember when it was like, I don't know what, how many hundred members, six hundred members I think.

Hartup: Oh, less than that.

Moore: Well maybe when I was on the board it might have been six hundred and now it is sixty thousand or something! It's just incredible what has happened to that organization.

Hartup: But you know the journal and other things, activities of that organization it's still built with very close ties to child development research and I just don't think that would have happened without people like you and Ruth before and other who represent this...

Moore: and you Bill...

Hartup: This is your interview.

Moore: I know but it was at a critical time. I think it was a critical time that you were on the Board, some decisions were made at that time--but they were made you know all along. One thing that I did do that I was pleased about. We had those earlier reviews of research and they were based on occasional articles in the journal and what I started when I became research editor, I decided that we needed to have one every issue. We needed to have people looking for that every issue. They didn't need to be so long and I wrote the first I think 8 or 9 of them myself until I ran out of areas. (I wasn't going to do it in an area that I didn't have the expertise in) but I really felt, okay this many areas I can do it.

Hartup: Those were good.

Moore: I think they were good. I sent out, oh so many of those things and people wanted the whole stack and all that kind of stuff. Then it was easy to recruit people (authors) because by then they'd seen them, you know anybody that was looking for them, or knew people who was using the journal saw one every time. I think that was a good thing to do. I think it would have been hard to get people, you know get twelve of them a year. That comes up twelve times a year.

Hartup: Can I just shift the organizational emphasis a little? Would you just kind of reflect generally both on your involvement and how you perceived the history of interest in SRCD in child development and early education combined?

Moore: Well...

Hartup: Is it timely enough to mention? There are a lot of people who belong to SRCD who are also very committed or involved with research in early childhood education.

Moore: Yes, you know the thing that, the movement that comes to mind immediately was the brain drain from NAEYC to SRCD. Not what happened to SRCD but what happened to NAEYC I think.

Hartup: What do you mean by the brain drain?

Moore: Well, what I mean is as NAEYC got bigger and bigger and more practitioner-oriented the research people withdrew from it. The research people found there wasn't enough for them. There was too much survival stuff and you know that it just didn't have that core of research people. You know what I found (my own personal response to that) was that I stopped being recognized after a while and it was partly my friends were all, you know we were all getting a bit older. But the number of people that didn't know you anymore even proportionately was much greater than it had been earlier. Sometimes if you had your name tag on and you had been writing something recently they would say, oh that's who you are! But if you didn't have your name tag, forget it. But the researchers actually were dropping out too. I mean people were, they were going to AERA. At that time the Early Education and Child Development SIG. group started and a number of people, I'd say at least 10 or 11 were involved in that.

Hartup: You were one of those.

Moore: I was one of those but I didn't drop out of NAEYC as some of those people did. Yes I was a part of that group, and that I felt more connected with in a sense of what happened to that organization vis-a-vis early childhood education. I felt more connected to that (with the way it happened, if it did at all at SRCD) because that splinter group (that small group wasn't a splinter group) but a small group of people really started that Special Interest Group. And up to that time AERA had almost nothing to do with Head Start or preschool education or day care or any of those movements and that group was a good core group to sort of infiltrate their AERA programs. They weren't big enough to become a division but they were a pretty visible active Special Interest Group.

The question you asked about SRCD, I just can't pin it to an impression about its relation to early childhood education or the blending of those two things. The event that comes to my mind in that organization as a real milestone was the establishment of the social policy committee. That to me was something that I--it's like being a Democrat and having the right thing happen and it makes you proud to be a Democrat. I like being a part of SRCD. I've always loved SRCD but I was proud of it more when that happened and these people were saying look we go out and use research to affect policy.

Hartup: You were part of that committee.

Moore: Yes I was, I was on the committee, on the first committee that interviewed the congressional science fellows and that was fascinating. That was a super program. I just think that was a marvelous idea. Even if you, I don't know whether you could trace all kinds of things that happened because of that but I can't believe that that isn't a good kind of service both ways--for SRCD and for the congressional science fellows.

Hartup: I don't know about that committee, but I think it is pretty clear that SRCD has a kind of presence or recognition at least in some areas of Washington that would not have happened if this style of probably 15 years of activity would not have gone on.

Moore: No, I think that is absolutely right. It seems to me that there is something a little obligatory about it. I don't think that with so many people studying children (and I know that research has to sort of ripen like wine does! It shouldn't be sold before it's time as they say or something like that) but the fact of the matter is that right now with the substantive nature of the field, it is loaded with things that are important for practitioners to know. There is a lot of research and really we can't sit on it. That is just despicable. We get all the money for it. It's not our money. We are using you know. It is somebody else's money, and then we, you know, get kind of owlsh about having to do anything that gets it out. Now I have to say that that's changed a lot and also I think that (to the credit of the Institute) I think our people are really quite generous with their time. It isn't the job of other people the way it has been the job of mine to do that, but they are so willing and if I ask them to do something they will do anything. They did anything for CEED you know and if they had teachers asked them, if a parent that knows them asks them, they are very generous about that. But I don't think that is typical around the country, I think people still are dragging their heels.

Hartup: I think that's an important belief and commitment. I really like what you just put on this tape. Let me ask you about two other dissemination things and then we can move on a little bit, specific ones. Would you just describe your own activities during the time when the national effort that lead to Head Start was going on in CEED? I don't mean to ask you to review the whole history of Head Start, that's not it. I just would be interested in putting on this record what kinds of things you are doing which were also closely based in research during that time of transition.

Moore: You mean with regards to Head Start?

Hartup: Yes, the kinds of things that you contributed or participated in.

Moore: The first thing I did with regards to Head Start, a whole bunch of us were asked and I think Jimmy Hymes was one of the leaders of this movement and Keith Osborn were two of them. They put together a list of early childhood people who ought to be technical assistants (or trained technical assistants) to help people in their respective geographical areas who got Head Start grants and didn't know up from down about what they were doing about it because they were not, and rightfully so, they were not trying to be terribly selective about who got the grants. If you had a CAP (Community Action Program) Organization and that organization got together important people in the field and said, yes we will give these "in kind" services, then you were given a Head Start grant.

Hartup: You were not part of the group that sort of conceived the program and sold it to Washington.

Moore: No I was not part of that group. The part of the group that I was though--at a slightly later point was on--I was on two different committees that had to do with the evaluation of Head Start.

Hartup: Also this was a training center here was it not? A regional training center.

Moore: Yes, it was a regional training center. But the meetings that, the two committees that I was on; one was to plan, a kind of planning the evaluation of Head Start and I believe Ed Zigler was chair of that meeting. Then a later one that John McDavid was responsible for. And he had a couple of year period where he was going back and forth from Washington to home, and that one was sort of looking at the first wave of evaluations. You know I was a fairly young academic at that point, like the earlier planning ones. Let's see, I came here in February of 1960 and I think that planning, some of that was already starting to be planned at that point, I think, I don't know exactly. I know it was on the drawing board before Kennedy was assassinated.

Hartup: The legislation was 1964-65 something like that?

Moore: The legislation was, yes. But the planning was before that. I do remember going to the rose garden and trampling all the roses with thousands, (hundreds) of other people from one of these big meetings where we were being recruited to be technical assistants and the like you know. All of that was great fun. I tell you though I had some real reservations about Head Start, more than I do now to tell you the truth. I think that Head Start has gotten a little bit of--I think that we should go with it, but you know, we need to keep working on it as well. But anyway at the time I was very apprehensive about the massive doing it. You know I think Ed Zigler and Urie Bronfenbrenner and any of us that were at any of these meetings (and I was really a neophyte at that point. I felt like I was a kid observing all of these important people doing this) but I think everybody was apprehensive about mounting this big program. But the political people, Shriver and some of those people, said oh you can't have a program with four thousand people in it, you've got to have forty thousand people. So there is no way that politically it would have been better. When I look back at it now I think we could have been doing models until they came out of our ears and we still would finally have to field the thing and let it go and try to shape it up. You know we finally have to do it in a formative way and gradually go on the assumption that in the meantime you are probably not going to do a lot of harm to these kids. I don't think that happened. Everybody was so good willed about Head Start kids. I don't think they did any harm.

Hartup: Do you think we are at any disadvantage now in supporting and furthering that program because we don't have evaluation and more models. I mean we have essentially one and it's an early model.

Moore: Yes, right. I think we need to get unhooked on the models concept because one thing we know from, I think we know as much as we can know anything from the Planned Variation Project. By the way the Planned Variation thing was one of those evaluative tools that were being bounced around at the time of these meetings. That was one where you know they took a lot of different models and implemented them in several different communities and then imposed a similar set of evaluation tools on all of them to see which ones were most effective. And of course the way it came out (of course I mean that's always easy after the fact. I don't think I really would have predicted this) but I think it makes sense now that what came out was the best of all any of the models were just fine and the poorest of all any of the models were lousy. If you had good people running them, and if you had enough resources, and if you had some training for the people and if they had, ideally if they had some kind of supervision (a kind of overarching supervisory group or something that could be helpful to them) they were more successful. You know sort of no matter what the model was. So I think that we need to know what the common denominators are in good programs and frankly I think the day care literature is doing that somewhat better than the Head Start literature does. The day care literature is saying let's look at the whole range and find out which ones seem to be doing the best job and then

what are the common denominators there. In day care it is probably very linked to the quality of relationship kids have with their caregivers.

Hartup: Let me, still sort of in this general area of dissemination I had one more question and that has to do, would you describe your contributions via CEED, the Center for Early Education and Development here. I want to come back to discussing sort of the Institute of Child Development and your relation to the Institute and its role in your career but I think this might be the point to talk just briefly about CEED. Because it's different from all the other dissemination activities in your career that you've been talking about.

Moore: Well, you know CEED came about partly because of the colleges making a priority of early childhood education and got together this interesting group of people--a task force that was to deliberate on what we could be doing and really collectively talk with a lot of people. That was the first exposure I had to Rich Weinberg and that's been a great collegial relationship. I think that maybe you two are sort of long term colleagues of mine that have been a pleasure to have. He was in Ed Psych and School Psych. And then a number of other people were represented on that committee from other places of the University too and we had to decide what we wanted to do. It could be everything from starting a new academic program. One possibility emerged, that we might be sort of a holding tank for research funds that would be applied research that would be particularly related to early childhood education. And then another possibility would be some kind of off campus or outreach training activities. I did favor the training module or mode because I thought that with the research expertise here in Child Development and in Ed. Psych as well, that we couldn't do better than they can do to get research funds for themselves; I could not imagine that we could do that better and I didn't know who else we would be getting research funds for. I had visions of people who were kind of on the fringe of things and maybe not as well prepared to do research as other people seeking funding from us or expecting us to get funds for them. So I was apprehensive about the quality of the work that would come out of any plan where we did research funding, you know where we were a holding tank for research funds. I really was apprehensive about that and I did, (partly really because I did have this dissemination side of me). I just thought it would be great to have a program where we could bring in especially leadership level people in disciplines related to child development but where people had very little knowledge of child development. Get them in at the level in their career when they are very secure in their own discipline, they are not coming to find out what to do Monday morning. They're in fact a little burned out and they want to get sort of revved up again a little bit. We presented people with a really nice alternative of continuing education that was outside of their field, yet relevant to their field, new and different and interesting and there was enough there of substance to really interest them.

Hartup: The three or four major activities of CEED over the years have been the different kinds of training programs from related professionals that you were just talking about. Those have been summer programs, they have been year or two year programs. There has been a whole variety of those. You also have done a whole long series now, twenty years' worth of round tables where you have brought together national experts and research people to address policy issues, what am I missing?

Moore: Well, you know CEED also had that on campus activity of being a sort of information gathering place for students. We put out information about all the programs, undergraduate and graduate programs, all of the courses that might be taken. We did work really with the faculty to define education.

There is one more thing that was a purpose of CEED and that was to enhance the academic community here, not just inform students and do outreach teaching. And one of the things that we were able to do with our grants is bring to the campus research scholars from around the country and we selected people that would communicate well with our audiences but also that would be nice for us to have on campus. And our contract with these people always without exception was; you do this thing for our training thing but, in addition to that, you do at least one thing on our campus. And it can be a broad

audience thing where the community can be included as well, or it can be a research seminar of a smaller kind--but you do that for us. That was a smart thing for us to do because it made CEED payoff a little bit for all of the people that were otherwise helping us--doing some teaching for us or going out to one of our sites to participate in one of our training sessions. But we in turn were bringing people in and giving them a chance to chat with them here.

Hartup: When did CEED begin?

Moore: 1971.

Hartup: 1971, and its activities are scaled back a little bit now.

Moore: They are scaled back a little bit now and CEED may kind of dissolve and work into the consortium of the efforts to do that. But there will be a transition I think.

Hartup: I think during most of that twenty year period that CEED is really novel (experimental) in applied child development because there was no other center, at least to my knowledge, quite like it. I mean there are other places in which people did outreach activities, other centers that did policy related research or other kinds of things in the applied area but none which was devoted quite as single mindedly to various forms of dissemination of child development research--teaching to a whole variety of people both local and national. It is a very important unit, really an unusual one I think in the history of the field.

Moore: I appreciate your putting that in because that might have been a little hard for me to say but I do think that is true and I think it was valued by the people that came. I think people (researchers) liked talking to those audiences; our students were bright capable people who were just good colleagues with our researchers and our staff.

Hartup: Over the twenty year period it would really be interesting to have the history of that unit written because over that twenty year period I don't think there was anybody doing that sort of basic research on early development and early education who didn't come here for one thing or another.

Moore: Yes, that is true.

Hartup: There were literally hundreds of consumers who benefited from all of that at levels ranging from the highest professional levels to the level of undergraduates in the field.

Moore: I was having lunch with several people and Henry Ricciuti was one of them and he was sitting next to, (I won't name that person) but Henry turned to him and he said "you've never done anything for CEED?" I got a kick out of that!

Hartup: That's right. Well, this I think is a good bridge for you to talk a little bit about the Institute of Child Development here with which you have been associated since 1960 and your activities and what you think about this place.

Moore: Well, I feel as much as anything else--my first thought is always what good fortune I have to be here. My good fortune started with meeting Harold the summer before I finished my graduate program.

Hartup: Harold Stevenson.

Moore: Harold Stevenson, yes. And he was on his way coming here and he was a visiting scholar of the University of Iowa for the summer. And at the end of the summer he casually said, "Why don't you come up to Minnesota when you get your degree?" I mean I didn't take any of that seriously, I thought

“a nice thing to say” you know. But I thought that would be a marvelous opportunity but I’m not going to get it. Well, the long and the short of it is that I did get it and it was a great time. I felt as though I was at Iowa at the right time and at Minnesota at the right time, when I ended up going to Iowa as a student for reasons of having that be my best option! I think that was a good time to be there--and a bit later would not have been, because that place was gradually dissolving and changing pretty drastically. This place on the other hand, was just on the verge of blossoming and Harold had visions for it and was a marvelous budget person and had a lot of persuasion with the powers that be here and the University so that he was able to take bigger salaries and break them in two and hire two young people instead of one senior person. And it was just off and running. You can’t go for a long period of time and not make some mistakes you know--both in hiring and in bringing in students. But for the most part we have had a marvelous group of faculty members that have just been--it’s been one of the most wholesome places I think for people to work. The amazing thing to me is how long that has been sustained because I think organizations do tend to have their ups and downs. And I do attribute that to a lot of things. One thing is that I think we overall have been very good at hiring faculty so we have good people who sort of live and let live. Nobody is terribly envious of anybody else. Everybody is respectful. Everybody is glad (this is glossing over but for the most part) everybody is glad to have everybody else as a colleague. I can’t imagine a place where people fundamentally have more basic respect and tolerance for one another.

Hartup: There have been a few places and times along the way where we have had our disagreements and some of them have been deeply fraught but I think I agree with what you are saying.

Moore: But you recover, you know it is sort of like families that stick together, you recover. I think that’s true. I think the amazing part of it is the recovery I think. You can say, you know, you are going to have those disagreements and when money gets tight there are a lot of hassles. It’s just been amazing to me that it can continue to be such a good place to work. What I appreciate about it from my own standpoint is first of all I really appreciated coming here with the role I had to play. Because this is the kind of a job I would have looked for and Harold knew that. He called me because Evelyn Helgerson who was running the lab school quit. She wanted to quit and Marsha Edwards who was one of the Deans talked her out of it because she didn’t want to face Harold with that vacancy immediately. And when Harold came he said, well I think maybe I could manage. I talked to Evelyn many months later and she said, oh that’s why he didn’t mind. All of a sudden it was all right for her to quit. And she really wanted to do that, she was very upset that she was talked into staying so it was fine. But we had this funny conversation where we were both chuckling about how that worked out.

Hartup: Harold was also a very astute student of laboratory school programs. He knew what a good laboratory school was like and he knew that this one needed some work and so that’s what he brought here. You were the first appointment I believe.

Moore: Yes, in fact I came about six months after he did, in the middle of the year. It’s just been a marvelous place for me to work because I have been able to kind of split my research career in a funny way. There is no way that I could do as much research as a lot of people do here. I’ve always done it (and I guess I’m pleased with what I have done in that area) but I always had to split the time with the administrative time for the lab school, and then CEED, and what dissemination activities kind of went along with that and I loved teaching. I mean I loved every part of that. I just would have liked to have more time for every part of it.

Hartup: Is there any part of the way your job was carved up over the years or any particular track things took that you wish you hadn’t, sort of?

Moore: I guess no, partly because I don’t know what I would have given up. I would have organized or managed my own research career a little differently. I would have made that programmatic and not quite so responsive to the students that were around. My first thought is I spent much of my career putting practice into theory. I started with, “I think this is true about children” and then I thought

“How do you formalize that”. How do you put that in a form where you can test it empirically--more than my personal hunch, my naive theory?

Hartup: You not only did that, I'll offer a gratuitous comment here, but you did that with respect to your own activities but that was one of the things that hundreds of students and colleagues who have been here at the Institute have profited from--their interactions with you I mean just tremendous number of contributions that practice into theory made to their research.

Moore: Well, that's nice. I love to talk to people about research and I'm interested in their research too so that's a two way street.

Hartup: I just think that the thousands of hours that you've spent doing that kind of thing for students and your colleagues needs to get on this record.

Moore: Well, that's nice, thank you.

Hartup: Well, anything else about the Institute?

Moore: Yes, there is one more thing about the Institute; I think that the thing that pleases me about being associated with Minnesota is how loyal students are. For example, how much they gravitate toward one another and support one another. And I'm sure you could find exceptions to that but we have hundreds of students out there and when we go to the SRCD they get together in droves and they wouldn't miss it. Some of them have become associated with each other--they didn't even overlap but yet they are good friends and good colleagues. They stay in touch with their mentors here and the faculty as a whole. I feel very close to many of those students; many of whom I never worked with. They never even took a course from me. I never did any research with them, but you get to know them. It's such an unisolated place in that way and I think that's a very elusive characteristic. I don't know how you could sort of describe it or deliberately create it. I think you could work at it but I think it happened partly because at that upper level, at the faculty level, it was a civilized place to be and a comfortable place to be and a supportive place to be, I think that filtered down and I think it served the field very well.

Hartup: I think so too. Obviously otherwise I wouldn't have stayed here all these years. But at the same time I can--so far as you are concerned I think your own contributions to the training of research workers, which is what you are talking about, that is in which it certainly produced a large number of people who have remained in the field and who are making important contributions to it. Whatever else you say about them, you made an important contribution to them and I think that's one of the most satisfying kinds of things that one can point out, because your contributions are very different from those of other people, faculty.

Moore: Well, they've made a big contribution to me too.

Hartup: Anything more about the Institute?

Moore: No, I don't think so.

Hartup: Okay well, Shirley why don't we talk just a little bit about your impressions of the field. You have been in this field for more than 40 years. You go back to the time when you actually were doing your work at the day care--it's closer almost to 50 years. What are your impressions of the changes that have taken place?

Moore: Well one of the major ones (and this is sort of how it relates to child development and research) is the gradual blurring of the distinction between applied and basic research. And to me I find that a very exciting trend and a very hopeful kind of trend because I think that it just means, all the more, we are going to be able to do the applications of research to practice and serve children and

families better than we were before. It seems to me that I remember as a student--and I can't remember why I did this, it was some kind of assignment--but I looked through the (I think it was the SRCD Child Development Journal and an SRCD program) for things that I would be interested in as a practitioner and I think it was something like 22%. I remember about a 1/5 of them would be interesting to me. Well I did that for another purpose. I sampled every 10th page of one of the SRCD programs a couple of years ago, I wanted to do some quoting of that in a paper I was giving and it was something like 70% that really, if you looked at the title and the description there is no question whatever, that that is material (not that particular study because all of that stuff needs to filter through, needs to be replicated, needs to stand the scrutiny of the field and it needs to prevail over time) but it is the kind of stuff that when it does that whatever we have to say will be valuable information for the practitioners. I think the dilemma is going to be how to do it, how to...

Hartup: Can you be more precise about when you did those two surveys? What's the date on the 22%?

Moore: Of the 22%?

Hartup: 1965.

Moore: No, I think it was earlier than that. I think it was probably, I believe it was when I was a master's student.

Hartup: Okay so the early 50's.

Moore: Yea, I believe so.

Hartup: And the date of the 75% or 70%?

Moore: About '89. Now I'm not sure whether I'd even make that same judgment about those same things but it was really a surprise to me. I wouldn't have thought that there were that many topics that would be really that relevant to practice. I do think that the problems--researchers can't, it isn't the case that it's their obligation to go out and talk to people, day care people or school people or clinicians or whom ever, social workers, families. It isn't necessarily that they must do that. They sometimes don't have the expertise to do that. If they're talking about a school classroom they may or may not have the expertise to implement that. But we have to do something. I didn't use to approve of the notion of science writers as much, I mean I thought it's okay but there must be a better way than that. But I think that really well prepared science writers might be helpful.

Hartup: When did you go to your first SRCD meeting?

Moore: You know I think the first meeting I went to was one that was at Iowa City. Wasn't there one in Iowa City?

Hartup: Yes, that was in 1957. That was the first one that I went to. I thought you had gone to one there or some place before, was that not true? That may have been a field trip that I remember you talking about.

Moore: Yes, maybe so. One thing I remember interestingly enough about the one that I (and I think it must have been the one at Iowa City) was Mildred Templin talked. And I'm going to interview her for this project!

Hartup: I have an early memory of Mildred too. It wasn't at that meeting it was the 1959 meeting just two years after the one at Iowa City. That's when I had dinner with Mildred, it was the Society's dinner and Roger Barker was the speaker. I fell off my chair when I was talking to the woman! We had had just a little bit too much to drink!

Have you missed anything in connection with your activities with the Society over the years? I mean you have been members of various committees, you mentioned one, are there others?

Moore: I can't think of others, Bill.

Hartup: Well is there anything else, other successes that you want to celebrate. I remember that paper that you wrote, Celebrating Child's Successes. Any failures you want to put on the record?

Moore: Well, I wasn't going to put a failure on--not any more failures, I already put one on--that they (Minnesota) didn't let me in as a student. But I was certainly very pleased to have the lab school named after me when I retired. That was an honor, the likes of which I could hardly imagine.

Hartup: I'm sorry I didn't mention that I think that is symbolic of a lot of what you achieved here at the Institute.

Moore: The other thing that I appreciate the Institute for is letting me keep working here. I come in most days. And when I finish what I am working on now that will be the end.

Hartup: which is ...?

Moore: it's a book on social relationships with children and peers and their caregivers and teachers. It's primarily for audiences--applied audiences--and so it's sort of the culmination of a lot of things that I have done all along the way. It will be my swan song!

Hartup: Well, Shirley I think in looking back over the interview schedule that we were given for this project that we have touched on almost everything except it seems to me that we haven't talked enough about your career in research. We talked a little bit about its beginning and the studies that you were involved with at Iowa but not much after that. So would you like to talk about what you feel were the main directions, things you were trying to accomplish?

Moore: Yes. Most of my work, except for the work that I did with Bruce Henderson on curiosity which was methodological really (we put together a battery of tasks for assessing curiosity in young children, validated it and used it). But except for that most of my own research and research in which I have collaborated in with students was first of all experimental in design and secondly most of it took place in day care centers. A few bits and pieces and some pretesting occurred here in the lab school but my preference generally was to use day care populations partly because I wanted a little more diversity for the topics that we were studying. A little more diversity in the nature of the population and I also felt that it was a good thing to do to have those contacts with day care populations. The fact that it was experimental was a little problematic because we had to convince people that we should be able to randomly assign children to conditions and sometimes to a placebo condition, if it was a training kind of study. And also that they needed to be blind to a lot of it. Maybe the director didn't need to be, but they clearly couldn't know who was in a placebo group and who was in an experimental group or even what kinds of things were going on so we had to be careful about that. Again I think I mentioned, that we've done work with the day care center people and they were quite willing to participate primarily for two reasons. We always promised them a workshop at the end and any degree of help like that that they would want, virtually any degree. And the other thing was that the work we were doing was on topics of interest to them. Generally we were looking at aspects of adult-child interactions, styles of interaction or a particular feature of an adult's interaction with children that was relevant for some of the important goals that they had for their children, developmental goals and program goals. The sessions varied from 15 minutes to some, in a couple cases of training studies) where children were in curriculum activities with our project people for twenty minutes for several weeks at a time. In the good social learning tradition, our independent variables included some combination of all those things that you usually use (that you are familiar with in your work) reinforcement, modeling, instructions, some kind of feedback situation. We also used one that now is

a bit more evident in the literature but at the time I think we started using it, it was not so prominent and that is attributions, essentially telling a child that we know this characteristic about him; that this is what is true of this child. And, I find that kind of awesome because it is so persuasive. We only use positive attributions but it does seem that even school age children believe what you tell them; at least if you are creditable. With a negative attribution, that's something else again; that can be damaging in a lot of ways. But also the child might not believe it anyway, and if he does believe it is sort of a no win situation. You don't exactly want him to believe it but you don't want him not to believe it either (if you tell him he is careless or he is dumb). And I don't think that there should ever be a negative attribution but I wasn't willing to work with that. Yet I was very persuaded about the positive attributions. One of the things that was characteristic of the studies that we did (and I think it maybe one of the reasons why attributions felt kind of right about) it is that they tended not to be skill training or skill development studies, they tended to be motivational. They were kids that were low in their interest or involvement in their program, somewhat timid, withdrawn children, low in curiosity and exploratory behavior and question asking and comment making and all of those things that teachers look to for an indicator that the child is happy, secure, comfortable and learning. And I think particularly with that group of people with children where you have some evidence to think that they don't lack skills but they are just not using their skills, positive attributions work. We worked with one group of children, boys who had been rated low in language skills. And indeed they tested low in language skills, but they also talked freely with their peers but not with their teachers. They just clammed up with their teachers and we worked with that group of children. They were part of one of our training programs, using a more elaborative language style with them, including attributions in that style. Just one more thing that I want to mention, another one of these behavior modification techniques that I think we did something that I found kind of interesting. We looked at requests for compliance with a prohibition and we contrasted very simple straight forward requests or instructions to not do something that had no other informational value to them. And we contrasted that with one that had reasons and explanations imbedded in them and helped the child identify the class of behavior that was being prohibited. And then we found--this was really a mechanical little block task, actually two different kinds of tasks in different studies--but we found that the children actually could generalize that prohibition more effectively if they had those reasons and explanations. When you gave them a different set of blocks that confounded those things, they were able to figure out which ones they shouldn't use if they had been given reasons and explanations and not if they had not. I think that's kind of a nice study.

Hartup: You've talked about some of the variety in your research program from beginning to end, what would you say is the continuous theme that runs through those studies? I think there are some.

Moore: Yes, I think there are some too. I think of that work as not very programmatic and that's one thing wrong with it. I think if I had it to do over again, I'd fish or cut bait on some of those things. I tend to be kind of fickle about it you know. I think, oh gee this would be nice to demonstrate or whatever--and it again is that little bit of "practice into theory" instead of "theory into practice" I think. But I think the thread is the quality of adult/child interactions and the quality of communication. Both communication--and one could do the same things looking at skill development; I think there is some very interesting good work on skill development. But I do think motivational problems are very heavy burdens for kids who are at that low end of just about everything, and when they get into school, even the more so.

Hartup: Wouldn't you also say that what drove most of your studies was that interest in modeling the adult/child interaction with respect to behavior change.

Moore: Modeling it for the day care people.

Hartup: Another continuity that strikes me is of course one of age. I mean practically all of your work was conducted with children between the ages of 2 and 6, isn't that right?

Moore: That's true. Well actually not exactly but mostly. Others--students working with me extended it but yes, that's right, that is true.

Hartup: Which of those studies that you have mentioned do you think had a special impact that you are especially fond of; there are some that were a lot better than others?

Moore: I think that the one that I thought was a little startling was the attribution one that I did with Roger Jensen attributing two very positive attributions. Cooperation to one group of kids, competitiveness to another. Telling them they are good cooperators, "you really are good at working together with other people". And telling the other ones, "you really like winning, you know you are a good competitor". Then in a game situation, following the attributions the differences were--I don't think I've ever had non-overlapping groups of subjects, you didn't need a statistic for it. It didn't even overlap in the extent to which they showed competitiveness and cooperation.

Hartup: Well, I think that is interesting because I have always found that study significant, too. As a matter of fact it's still on the reading list for the students in the social class.

Well, anything else about research history?

Moore: No, I don't think so. I think we have taken more than our share of tape time!

Hartup: Well, on behalf of the committee and the Society as a whole I thank you very much for this interview and it has been really lots of fun to talk over all these things.

Moore: Thank you very much for asking.