Equity and Justice
by Lonnie Sherrod
SRCD Executive Director

Committees are the lifeblood of an organization, providing the infrastructure to accomplish its goals and create new initiatives. This is certainly true for the Society for Research in Child Development (SRCD). SRCD has operational committees (Audit, Finance, Program, and Publications) which contribute to the administrative functions of the organization, as well as programmatic committees which serve the membership by enhancing research, scholarship, and teaching activities. The programmatic committees are listed on the SRCD website, with information about membership, but briefly they are: Equity and Justice, Ethnic and Racial Issues, International, Interdisciplinary, Policy and Communications, Student and Early Career, and Teaching. The committees have different longevities: one of the oldest committees, the History Committee, is undergoing re-examination; the SRCD Governing Council (GC) requested a Task Force to reassess the charge of the committee. The Policy and Communications Committee is also one of the oldest, whereas others, like the Interdisciplinary Committee, were formed following the SRCD Governing Council’s strategic planning process several years ago. The strategic planning process identified goals for the organization, which included becoming more international, interdisciplinary, and more diverse.

As Director, I initiated an annual meeting of the Chairs of the committees. The goal of the annual meeting is to discuss the committee charges, topics of mutual interest, foster collaborations, and determine areas of cross-over interests. The most recent meeting was held on November 18th, 2011 in Ann Arbor. Committees are appointed or reappointed at the spring GC meeting concurrent with the Biennial Meeting. SRCD members are encouraged to express their interest in a committee and nominate themselves for membership. Unfortunately, the membership of the Society is far greater than can be represented on committees so the GC Nominations Committee has to determine committee membership; not all self-nominations can be approved.

The newest committee to be added to the roster is the Committee on Equity and Justice, chaired by Melanie Killen, University of Maryland. This new Committee was approved and appointed at the spring 2011 meeting of GC following a yearlong appointed Task Force on Diversity, which was initiated to determine how SRCD can further its goals of diversity. In this article, I describe this new SRCD committee.

The Committee on Equity and Justice was formed to address areas of diversity that were not able to be fully met by the existing SRCD committees. The Ethnic and Racial Issues Committee (currently chaired by Natasha Cabrera, University of Maryland) is one of the longstanding SRCD committees. The focus of the Ethnic and Racial Issues committee is on ethnic minority children in the U.S. SRCD also assists the Asian, Black, and Hispanic caucuses, though not formerly part of the organization. During the GC strategic plan-
ning process, the discussion highlighted the importance of several dimensions of diversity other than race and ethnicity for child development research. However, the Ethnic and Racial Issues Committee understandably did not believe it could expand its focus. GC continued to believe, however, that diversity was a topic that demanded concerted effort by the Society. Hence, another task force was formed, charged with coming up with a recommendation of what SRCD should be doing to address diversity more broadly defined than race and ethnicity. Melanie Killen, then a member of GC, agreed to chair the task force. The task force deliberated for about a year, holding numerous conference calls, conferring with several experts in the field, and holding one in-person meeting. This work led to a recommendation to form the Committee on Equity and Justice which was unanimously approved by GC in April 2011.

The task force concluded that the most productive way to pursue diversity from a scientific perspective would be by attending to issues of prejudice, discrimination, equity, justice, rights, and intergroup relations. As the world becomes more global and children grow up in increasingly heterogeneous communities, research on issues of equity and justice becomes even more important. Hence, the charge of the Committee on Equity and Justice is to address the legitimacy of research on prejudice, discrimination, social justice, equity, intergroup relations, and rights within the field of developmental science, under the purview of SRCD.

The Committee will also foster the coherence of research by bringing together people in the field who work on different topics under the rubric of prejudice and discrimination so as to better inform researchers within the field about different methodologies and theories. An effective and productive way to promote visibility of the field within the SRCD organization and membership is to facilitate communication among researchers who work on the same set of problems but have few opportunities to exchange information about their research programs. The Committee will also work to ensure that social science research informs policy and practice around these issues and that research exists that can inform policy and practice.

Finally, most academic professional organizations have an activity concerned with human rights or social justice. For example, the American Association for the Advancement of Science has a coalition on human rights in which SRCD participates. Hence another objective of the new committee is to promote equality and justice within developmental science.

Task Force members appointed to the committee include: Melanie Killen (Chair), University of Maryland; Stacey Horn, University of Illinois, Chicago; Martin Ruck, Graduate Center of the City University of New York; Steven Russell, University of Arizona; Carola Suarez-Orozco, New York University; Adam Rutland, University of Kent, Canterbury, United Kingdom; and Elliot Turiel, University of California, Berkeley. The Chair of Ethnic and Racial Issues will serve as a liaison to the committee; Natasha Cabrera, the current chair, was fully involved with the task force. Andrew Fuligni, UCLA, participated in the task force but was unable to join the committee. The Committee also has a liaison from GC (Lynn Liben, Pennsylvania State University) and a member representing SECC (Russell Toomey, Arizona State University).

The Committee will hold its first meeting in early January 2012 in Washington DC. Interested SRCD members are invited to send comments and ideas to info@srcd.org.
In April of 2011, we reported in this column that Congress had not been able to pass a Fiscal Year (FY) 2011 budget and had resorted to passing a number of Continuing Resolutions (CRs) to keep the federal government running. One positive development since April is that Congress did eventually pass an FY 2011 budget. Unfortunately, we entered FY 2012 on October 1 and do not yet have an FY 2012 budget. Even as deliberations on the FY 2012 budget continue, major decisions are being made about the FY 2013 budget. In this column we provide an update on developments in both budgets and report on recent assessments of their implications for programs for children and families as well as for research on child development.

Where are we on the fiscal year 2012 federal budget?

Federal agencies—including federal research budgets and many programs that serve children and families—are funded through the annual congressional appropriations process. When Congress was not able to pass a budget before the start of the new fiscal year in October, it passed a CR. The CR funded agencies and programs on a temporary basis, giving both chambers more time to negotiate budget levels. In mid-November, Congress passed a miniature omnibus bill or “Minibus” containing three of the twelve annual appropriations bills. The bill included funding for a number of federal agencies that support research and are of interest to SRCD members, including the National Science Foundation (which received $7 billion for FY 2012, a 2.5 percent increase from its FY 2011 budget level), the Census Bureau, the Department of Justice, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Department of Agriculture.1

The programs and agencies of the federal government not included in the Minibus (including the Department of Health and Human Services) will continue to function temporarily under a CR through December 16th. Congress must pass another CR or omnibus bill by this deadline in order to keep these agencies operating.

Background on the debt ceiling crisis and implications for the FY 2013 budget

Congressional debates over raising the national debt ceiling (the amount of money the government can borrow to pay its bills) and reducing the national debt is providing the framework for budget negotiations for the FY 2013 budget. In past years, Congress allowed the debt ceiling to rise automatically with the passage of each annual federal budget. The House repealed this rule in January of 2011. Several months later, Congress narrowly prevented the U.S. from defaulting on its debt by passing the Budget Control Act of 2011.

The Budget Control Act raised the debt ceiling and established the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction or the “Super Committee.” The Super Committee, comprised of twelve members of Congress, six from each chamber, was charged with coming up with a bipartisan agreement that would reduce the federal deficit by $1.5 trillion over 10 years.

The Super Committee was given a deadline of November 21st, and an alternative in case an agreement had not been reached: In lieu of a Super Committee agreement, across-the-board cuts would be triggered beginning in FY 2013. Half of these cuts would come from defense programs, while the other half would come from discretionary spending.2 Some programs would be exempted from spending cuts, including the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), Medicaid, and the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program. However, other programs serving children and families would be vulnerable to cuts. Research budgets would also be vulnerable.

1 For more information on appropriations made to the National Science Foundation and other agencies through the Minibus, go to the newsletter of the Consortium of Social Science Associations.
2 Discretionary spending is any type of government spending allowed through an appropriations act. This includes public health and medical research, the Mental Health Block Grant, community Health Centers, Head Start, WIC, most education and education-related training, the Community Services Block Grant, subsidized housing and heating aid, and environmental protection, among other programs.
Where are we now on the FY 2013 budget?

On November 21st, members of the Super Committee announced that they were unable to reach an agreement. At this point, we may well be facing the across-the-board cuts described in the Budget Control Act. However, Congress may still pass a bill with partial cuts/savings. Such a bill would nevertheless trigger some across-the-board cuts at a fixed percentage.

Potential implications for children, families, and child development research

A letter from the House Appropriations Committee Democrats to the Super Committee sent on October 14th provides details regarding the implications of the across-the-board cuts in the Budget Control Act. For example, the letter indicates that such cuts would reduce the number of low-income children of working parents who receive child care and development block grant assistance by 35,000. Grants to Title I schools, or schools with a high percentage of low-income students, would be cut by more than $1 billion. Additionally, 100,000 fewer children nationwide would be enrolled in Head Start and more than 30,000 Head Start employees could lose their jobs. The letter also stated that across-the-board cuts would reduce the National Institutes of Health (NIH) by nearly 8 percent in 2013. Up to 2,700 fewer NIH research grants would be awarded. Funding for the National Science Foundation (NSF) would be cut by $530 million below its FY 2011 budget level, including $67 million from science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education programs. At this budget level, NSF would fund nearly 1,500 fewer research and education grants.

As this column is written, there is still uncertainty about both the current budget and the budget for the coming fiscal year. It is clear, however, that across-the-board cuts would have implications for many children and families who rely on federal support as well as the community of researchers who study children and families.

NEW BOOKS BY SRCD MEMBERS


The group of chapters presented in this volume represents ten years of involvement of a group of eight core therapists, working originally with approximately forty families who suffered the loss of husbands and fathers on September 11, 2001. The project focuses on the families of women who were pregnant and widowed in the disaster, or of women who were widowed with an infant born in the previous year.


The Neonatal Behavioral Assessment Scale (NBAS) was first published in 1973 and has been used in clinical and research settings around the world for more than 35 years to examine the effects of a wide range of pre- and perinatal variables. The 4th edition presents new guidelines and numerous refinements in administration and scoring, and a section describing advances in our understanding of motor behaviour. The book is available to order from the Wiley website.


Rothbart, M.K. Becoming Who We Are: Temperament and Personality in Development. Guilford Press.

Dr. Rothbart’s book examines the role of temperament in the development of personality and psychopathology, and offers new insights on “difficult” children.
The Society for Research in Child Development
is pleased to announce the 2011 Recipient of the
Victoria S. Levin Award
For Early Career Success in Young Children’s Mental Health Research

Anna Gassman-Pines, Ph.D.
Sanford School of Public Policy
Duke University

In 30 years of distinguished service at the National Institutes of Health (NIH), Vicki Levin had a special interest in scientific research that addressed young children’s mental health. The Victoria S. Levin Award for Early Career Success in Young Children’s Mental Health Research, established to honor and carry forward this special focus of Vicki’s life’s work, was made possible by the donations of hundreds of her friends, colleagues and family members. Its aim is to heighten the chances of early success in achieving federal funding for developmentally-informed research that addresses the early foundations of children’s mental health and well-being. Broadly defined, such research addresses all aspects of the early development of competence and risk for children from all types of backgrounds.

We are very pleased to announce that Dr. Anna Gassman-Pines is the first recipient of the Victoria S. Levin Award. Dr. Gassman-Pines is an Assistant Professor of Public Policy and Psychology and Neuroscience at the Sanford School of Public Policy at Duke University. She is also a Faculty Fellow of Duke’s Center for Child and Family Policy. Dr. Gassman-Pines received her BA with distinction in Psychology from Yale University and her PhD in Community and Developmental Psychology from New York University. Her interdisciplinary work focuses on the effects of welfare and employment policies on the well-being of young children and their mothers in low income families. In addition to the importance of these issues, the work is distinguished by the use of innovative, sophisticated methods to assess the effects of public policy on young children’s and mothers’ daily functioning.

Please visit www.srcd.org for more details about the award and applicant eligibility. Applications for the 2012 award will be available on the SRCD website on July 1, 2012. The deadline for applications is September 1, 2012; the award of up to $25,000 will be announced in November 2012.
2012 Themed Meetings Update:

*Developmental Methodology and Positive Development of Minority Children*, the first two themed meetings, are ready to go in Tampa, Florida at the Tampa Marriott Waterside Hotel & Marina, February 9 - 11, 2012. The programs are available on our website at [www.srcd.org](http://www.srcd.org). We look forward to meeting in sunny Tampa!

*Transitions from Adolescence to Adulthood*, the final themed meeting of 2012, will be held at the same hotel October 18 - 20, 2012. This meeting will promote new ways of thinking about transitions to adulthood, and focus on eight areas: 1) education and work, 2) social relationships, 3) neurological and biological development, 4) mental health and psychopathology, 5) behavioral trajectories, 6) special populations of interest, 7) theoretical and methodological approaches, and 8) policy and politics. The Call for Submissions will go out towards the end of January. Click [here](http://www.srcd.org) for more information.

**SRCD Oral History Project Website Now Launched!**

Curious about the legends in our field? Ever wonder how those SRCD members whose work provides the content of our textbooks found the path they followed? Answers to these and many other such questions are now available through the SRCD Oral History Project.

The SRCD Oral History website is now launched with interviews from 16 of the most illustrative and influential scholars in the field of child development—and this is just the beginning. SRCD has collected over 100 interviews, which will be posted to the site in the foreseeable future.

Don’t miss out on your opportunity to take advantage of this valuable SRCD archive as an educational tool. Visit this [link](http://www.srcd.org) to view the SRCD Oral History Project website and use the history of our field to guide your current research and teaching.

**The Klaus J. Jacobs Research Prize 2011 goes to Professor Michael Tomasello, Director of the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology**

The central findings of Professor Michael Tomasello’s research show that even one-year-old children who cannot yet speak are capable of cooperating and helping other children. This behavior exists without being taught by adults. Professor Tomasello’s comparative research into communicative behaviour and learning processes of preschool-aged children on the one hand, and those of the great apes on the other, provides evidence that humans are born to cooperate – and that this is a primary difference between humans and great apes. The Klaus J. Jacobs Research Prize 2011, endowed with 1 million Swiss francs, is a spur for Professor Michael Tomasello’s future work in his research field: “The money allows you to do some research things that you wouldn’t otherwise be able to do. In particular, it allows you to plan larger research projects with a greater time horizon.” More information on this award is available at [www.jacobsfoundation.org](http://www.jacobsfoundation.org).

**Marc Bornstein awarded the APA 2011 G. Stanley Hall Award from Division 7**

Dr. Bornstein gave an address at the annual meeting entitled “Toward a Behavioral Neuroscience of Parenting.” More information on this award can be found [here](http://www.srcd.org).
As an instructor of developmental psychology, the decision to teach a course topically versus chronologically may seem arbitrary. In the chronological presentation, students learn about ontogeny related to the whole person one developmental period at a time. In the topical presentation, students learn about developmental domains and the changes within each domain across developmental periods in a more focused manner. To give a concrete example, when teaching about stage theories, such as those proposed by Erikson or Piaget, students in a topical class would learn about the entire theory presented cohesively in one or two classes; in a chronological class, the various stages of the theory would be segmented across developmental periods. Many instructors may favor a topical approach, believing that student comprehension may suffer when a chronological approach is used. Questions remain, however. Should all classes be taught topically in order to master the breadth of a theory? Do students learn better from the repetition that is featured in courses with a chronological organization?

Surprisingly, the effect of course organization on student learning has not been examined, despite the topical-chronological distinction being a key factor in course organization and textbook selection. As developmental psychologists and educators curious about this choice and its effects on student outcomes, we set out to determine if student outcomes varied when taught with these two contrasting pedagogical approaches. We focused on Piaget’s stage theory of cognitive development as a sample of students’ learning and presented these data at the SRCD Teaching Institute in Montreal in 2011.

We instructed two sections of developmental psychology using identical slides, videos, lecture notes, and exam questions (n = 187 students total). One class was taught about Piaget’s theory in one class period in a topical organization, whereas the other class was taught the same material spread out over four weeks in a chronological organization. After five weeks, we examined the effects of course organization on student comprehension.

Students immersed in the chronological course performed better on assessments of comprehension for each individual stage, including the free recall of both age ranges and hallmark characteristics of thought associated with each stage. We did not assess learning outcomes for different types of material, beyond Piaget’s theory. There were no differences in understanding the general aspects of the theory, such as understanding that there are differences in thought patterns as one progresses through the stages. Exam performance differed as well. Students in the chronological course were more often correct on questions relating to more complex topics such as propositional thought and abstract reasoning, whereas performance did not differ between conditions on questions examining easier concepts, such as object permanence and the age range associated with concrete operational thought. Importantly, end-of-semester exam score averages were also not significantly different, suggesting that the observed effects were not due to method of delivery, differences in instructor effectiveness, or student ability.

There are many factors instructors consider when deciding to teach a course using a topical or chronological approach, such as teacher style, learning goals, and, of course, the quality of the textbook. Our data challenge the colloquial proposition that the greater focus of a topical organization enhances comprehension. Rather, we demonstrated that students instructed in the chronological approach had a better understanding of Piaget’s stages of cognitive development. Of course, we are not able to determine if the benefit of the chronological organization generalizes to other topics. It may be the case, for example, that different sorts of material have advantages by organization. What is clear, however, is the argument that student comprehension is negatively impacted by a chronological organization was not supported. In fact, it may be quite the opposite.
**Time Management for Graduate Students**  
*by Alexandra Kale, University of Nebraska at Omaha*

Graduate school is challenging—we all know this. But what makes it so challenging? I would argue that the answer to this question is time management. Part of graduate school is being stretched—there will always be another paper to work on or article to read. And what to do when your classmates suggest going out for a beer after class? How do you choose? The good news is that there are ways to manage your time such that going out with friends after class does not cause you wracking guilt over homework that is not done.

**The Foundation: Make a Weekly Schedule**

Time management starts with your weekly schedule, which acts as a frame for your day to day activities. Start by compiling a list of activities you know are set in stone: class times, meetings with advisors, research groups, etc. Also, determine how much sleep you want every night and plan to eat at least one meal away from your work (it is OK to take breaks!). Write these events in a planner or make an Excel spreadsheet so that you know when your “free” time is. Next, decide how much time you want to put toward specific classes or projects each week. For example, if you know it takes you 45 minutes to read a journal article and one of your classes assigns four articles per meeting, build in three hours of time devoted specifically to reading for that class. Make sure to write these in as events in your schedule—if it is not in there, you will not get it done! Lastly, think of some fun activities to build into your schedule. Exercise classes, non-school book clubs, intramural teams, ballroom dancing—whatever you want, just write it in! These little oases in your schedule will give you something to look forward to each week and may prevent you from becoming too overwhelmed.

**Make Timelines**

When you get your course syllabi, you know exactly what is expected of you for the rest of the semester. Use that knowledge to your advantage. Put your syllabi into your planner, paying attention to due dates. Be especially attentive to projects that are due on or near the same day. Once you know what is due when, you can break projects into chunks and assign due dates. Be firm about sticking to these due dates: writing a research proposal in ten weeks is much less stressful than writing it in ten days! Procrastination only causes you more work and more stress.

**Give Tasks a Time Limit**

Work expands to fill the time it is given. Assign tasks specific chunks of time and write them in your schedule. The hardest part about this process is sticking to the imposed time limits! Be firm about quitting and moving on to the next task, but also be realistic about how much you can accomplish. Using the earlier example, if you know it takes you 45 minutes to read an article, do not try to make yourself finish three articles in one hour. You will only accomplish two things: reading one article and making yourself feel like you are behind.

Remember, grad school is not your life—it is your job. Treat it like one. Keep time for yourself to do things that are important to you or bring you happiness. If you have taken care of yourself, you will be better able to take care of your work.
Student Reflections on the SRCD Summer Research Experience for Undergraduate Members of Psi Chi
by Michael Cortese, University of Nebraska at Omaha

Undergraduate students often inquire about ways in which they can increase their chances of being accepted into a top graduate program. Of course, admittance committees look at GRE scores, GPA, and letters of recommendation. However, the students admitted will also have documented research experience, and they will likely be members of an honorary society such as Psi Chi. The SRCD Summer Research Experience for Undergraduate Members of Psi Chi provides students with an excellent opportunity to improve their research capabilities by working with a faculty affiliate of SRCD on a specified research project during the summer. What follows are two accounts from students who have recently participated in this program.

Additional information about this summer research experience can be found by clicking here.

Kelly F. Miller (Sponsor: Dr. Michael J. Crowley)
Project Title: The Physiology of Worry: Measuring EEG Gamma-Band Activity in Anxious Children

Last summer, I investigated the physiological correlates of worry in anxious and non-anxious children at the Yale Child Study Center under the guidance of Dr. Michael Crowley. I was interested in this area of research because of the potential to identify a biomarker of worry in children and to provide physiological evidence that the experience of worry in those with anxiety disorders may be quantitatively but not qualitatively different from that experienced by the general population. In addition, the findings of this research may have important implications for therapeutic interventions. This research built upon my prior experiences investigating childhood emotion in a relational context. In addition, I learned to administer an electrophysiology protocol and analyze EEG data.

Prior to our study, recent research had linked anxious internal states to gamma band activity, the pattern of neural oscillation between 25 and 100 Hz (e.g., Gemignani et al., 2000). Oathes and colleagues (2008) found that adults with generalized anxiety disorder and non-anxious controls each experienced increases in gamma band activity while worrying; however, these increases were greater for anxious individuals. I was interested in learning whether the same patterns of EEG activity are present in anxious and non-anxious children under conditions of worry.

To this end, I helped design and implement a study in which children with either high or low levels of anxiety participated in an EEG paradigm in which their neural oscillations were recorded under conditions of rest, relaxation, and worry. I predicted that across groups, gamma band activity would be higher in the worrying condition than in the baseline or relaxation conditions. In addition, I predicted that the difference in gamma band activity between the worrying condition and the control conditions would be greater for highly anxious children than their non-anxious counterparts. Finally, I predicted that gamma activity would increase with self-reported emotional distress. Preliminary results from our study were consistent with these predictions.

In this experience, I learned practical skills that I needed to conduct the study, but, more importantly, I gained a conceptual and theoretical understanding of this important area of research. Dr. Crowley and other lab members were especially instrumental in enriching my experience. I was welcomed whole-heartedly into the Developmental Electrophysiology Lab and treated as a junior colleague rather than a research assistant. In addition, Drs. Linda Mayes and Helena Rutherford were valuable collaborators who I thank for their generosity of time and willingness to include me in their research projects. Overall, this experience helped expand the methodologies at my disposal and provided me with the tools to conduct independent research as I plan my future career in clinical psychology.


(Cont. on p. 10)
Diana M. David (Sponsor: Dr. Stuart Marcovitch)
Project Title: Examining the Relationship between Social Judgment and Goal Neglect in Preschoolers

Last summer, I worked under the guidance of Dr. Stuart Marcovitch in the Child Development Lab at the University of North Carolina, Greensboro. My research project involved examining the relationship between working memory capacity and the ability to make social judgments. This topic of study interests me, as it is important to understand the factors that contribute to social judgments because the judgments that are made about people have real implications for the development of relationships in social settings, educational environments, and more.

To make an accurate social judgment about someone else, the person making the judgment must hold in mind multiple pieces of information about the other person. Recent studies have shown that older children are able to hold more information in mind (i.e., have greater working memory capacities) than younger children (Marcovitch, Boseovski, Knapp, & Kane, 2010). If working memory capacity is related to the ability to make accurate judgments, one might expect that older children (5.5 to 6.9 years old) would be better at making accurate social judgments than younger children (4.0 to 5.4 years old). Preliminary results from our study are mostly consistent with this hypothesis. Specifically, older children had larger working memory capacities than younger children, and they were also able to make more accurate social judgments. Independent of age, children who had larger working memory capacities also made more correct social judgments about a mean character than did children who had smaller working memory capacities. However, consistent with previous research by Boseovski and Lee (2008), younger and older children made similar judgments about a child when he/she exhibited sharing behaviors. Overall, these results suggest that the development of working memory coincides with the development of social judgment abilities.

The skills that I gained during this experience can largely be attributed to my lab mentor, Dr. Marcovitch, Dr. Janet Boseovski, and other colleagues from the Child Development Lab at the University of North Carolina, Greensboro. The generosity and encouragement of the members of the Child Development Lab helped make my experience as a researcher especially fulfilling. In addition, the hands-on experience of working with children was particularly rewarding.

I am especially grateful for having the opportunity to work with Dr. Marcovitch, as this experience opened my eyes to so many new ideas and provided me with opportunities that will shape my research career in the years to come.

The SRCD Office for Policy and Communications is interested in highlighting SRCD members and publications featured in the news media. The following are the most recent submissions:

- TV or Radio Interview
- Op-Ed Piece
- News Article
- Blog Post


MEMBERS IN THE MEDIA

Ellen Peters, J. Marianne Riksen-Walraven, Antonius H. N. Cillessen, & Carolina de Weerth. The Epoch times (International), Nu.nd (Netherlands), Tiede (Finland), PsychCentral, Stanford School of Medicine, Wissenschaft aktuell (Germany), Bem Estar (Brazil). SRCD Press Release: Friendship Makes a Difference in Stress Regulation.


Martha Zaslow. Education Week. Experts Say Social Sciences Are ‘Left Behind.’

We strongly encourage and welcome all members to report recent noteworthy mentions of their research in the media. Information may be emailed to communications@srcd.org.

LET US KNOW YOUR NEWS!

SRCD Members:
Please share your prestigious awards and memberships with us!
Feel free to share this information on the new SRCD Exchange site http://exchange.srcd.org or send your announcement to either Developments editor at, jonathan.santo@gmail.com or alukowsk@uci.edu.

SRCD Contact Information
Membership:
Tel: (734) 926-0614
Fax: (734) 926-0601
Email: aglaspie@srcd.org

Biennial Meeting Program:
Tel: (734) 926-0612
Fax: (734) 926-0601
Email: tetucker@srcd.org

Meeting Registration and Exhibits:
Tel: (734) 926-0610
Fax: (734) 926-0601
Email: aperdue@srcd.org

Website:
Email: webmaster@srcd.org
** Visit SRCD’s website (www.srcd.org) regularly. **

** Important Notice **

- Journals are not forwardable. If you do not notify the SRCD Membership Office of a change of address, you will stop receiving your journals.
- Do not send your change of address to Blackwell Publishers.
- Contact the SRCD Membership Office (Tel: (734) 926-0614; Fax: (734) 926-0601; E-mail: aglaspie@srcd.org if you have concerns or questions regarding your publications or your membership.
- Membership applications are available on the SRCD website.

** Change of Address Notification **

Name: __________________________________________________________

Mailing Address: __________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

Phone: _________________________________________________________

Fax: ___________________________________________________________

E-mail: _________________________________________________________

Effective date: ________________________________________________

Send to: SRCD Membership, 2950 S. State Street - Suite 401, Ann Arbor, MI 48104; or fax to: (734) 926-0601

** Developments’ Submission Guidelines **

Text: Provide your material in unformatted text blocks only, preferably using “Trebuchet” 10-pt font in Word or WordPerfect. Word limit for a one page article is 775 words. A photo of the author or topic or both to accompany the article would be greatly appreciated.

Photographs: 300 DPI, “tif” files only. If you do not have a scanner to produce the photo quality we need, loan us your photo; we will scan it for our use, and then return it to you. Please send materials to Jonathan Bruce Santo, jonathan.santo@gmail.com or Angela Lukowski, alukowsk@uci.edu.

Ads: Contact Amy Glaspie, aglaspie@srcd.org; 734-926-0614 for information and an order form. General ad specs:

- 1/8-page display ad is 2” x 3.5” and contains up to 75 words plus a 2-line header
- 1/4-page display ad is 3.5” x 4.5” and contains up to 175 words plus a 2-line header
- 1/2-page display ad is 4.5” x 7.25” and contains up to 325 words plus a 2-line header
- Full-page display ad is 7.25” x 8.75” and contains up to 650 words plus a 2-line header
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** SRCD Developments **

Editors
Jonathan Bruce Santo
jonathan.santo@gmail.com

Angela Lukowski
alukowsk@uci.edu

Managing Editor
Amy Glaspie
aglaspie@srcd.org

The Newsletter is published four times a year: Circulation is approximately 6,000. The newsletter is distributed to all members of the SRCD including researchers, practitioners in the field of child development, social and behavioral sciences, social workers, administrators, physicians, nurses, educators, and students.

The newsletter publishes announcements, articles, and ads that may be of interest to members of the Society, as space permits.

Copy deadlines:
December 1 for January issue
March 1 for April issue
June 1 for July issue
September 1 for October issue

For advertising rates—website display ads, classified or display ads for the newsletter—contact the SRCD Office or aglaspie@srcd.org.

** Governing Council **

President Ann Masten
Past President Greg Duncan
President-Elect Lynn Liben
Secretary Nancy Hill
Members Oscar Barbarin
Patricia Bauer
Robert Crosonoe
Kenneth Dodge
Richard Lerner
Kenneth Rubin
Elizabeth Susman
Deborah Vandell
Thomas Weisner
SECC Rep Carlos Santos
Ex Officio Lonnie Sherrod
Susan Lennon
Martha Zaslow