The Importance of Multiple Disciplines in Developmental Science

by Lonnie Sherrod

SRCD has a long history of incorporating multiple disciplines into developmental science and of promoting interdisciplinary research on development. Attention to and involvement of multiple disciplines is one of the five parts of the strategic plan (the others being diversity, international, policy, and membership). We have a multidisciplinary committee currently chaired by Linda Mayes, Yale University. And SRCD’s by-laws require that for every third presidential election the candidates be from a discipline other than psychology. This applies to the election this fall 2012, which is why I address this issue in this newsletter article.

Bronfenbrenner’s Ecological Systems Theory, which is a major conceptual framework for developmental science, suggests the importance of multiple disciplines for research on human development. Culture, social structure, neighborhoods, and proximal settings such as classrooms or families are addressed in part by involving in developmental research a wide range of disciplines specializing in those systems and settings. Disciplines also often use different methods, such as ethnographies in anthropology and statistical models in psychology. These bring different levels of analysis to the study of development. Sociologists are interested in social structure, biologists in phenomena inside the skin of the organism, economists in decision making, and psychologists often, though not exclusively by any means, in individual behavior. We need this wide range of perspectives for research on topics as complex as those we study in human development.

Whereas multidisciplinary research brings a diverse perspective to developmental science through the accumulation of knowledge, interdisciplinary research simultaneously brings to bear the perspectives of different disciplines to research on a topic, and is therefore especially important. It often requires a “big science” approach with multi-site studies, but interdisciplinary research involving collaboration among colleagues can, of course, occur at any scale. Large, multi-site studies have become the norm in other fields sometimes due to the complexity of the phenomena studied. Developmental topics are equally complex so that our field also needs to adopt this “big science” approach in order to be competitive with these other fields. There are already a few examples: the NICHD Study of Early Child Care and Youth Development (SECCYD) may be the one with which most members are familiar.

Currently about 80% of SRCD members self-identify as being from psychology. One historic and institutional reason for this is that, unlike most other social sciences, psychology has the subfield of developmental psychology. I know of no other social science discipline for which this is true, though other social science fields have interest groups and other strong collaborations for studying children, parents, and families. Fields explicitly concerned with children such as pediatrics and child psychiatry have been involved in SRCD since its inception. Other social behavioral science fields often have some type of focus on children or development, but it is not a subfield in...
which people are trained in large numbers of academic departments around the world to the same extent as is true in developmental psychology. Sociology, for example, has a section on children, and current Governing Council (GC) member Rob Crosnoe has been its president. Political science had a task force on civics education. Anthropology has had a strong concern for the study of culture and development represented in the work of scholars such as Robert LeVine, Richard Shweder, David Lancy, Carol Worthman, and current GC member Tom Weisner; and Anthropology has a Children and Youth Interest Group nearly a thousand strong. Yet in most fields other than psychology, you are a member of your field first and a student of development second. That is less true for psychologists due to the fact that developmental psychologists have the identity of being a developmental psychologist with training for that field, including academic and other research positions in hundreds of departments and institutes. Furthermore, development is not the primary focus of either the American Psychological Association (APA) or the Association for Psychological Science (APS). APA Divisions 7 and 37 are important to the field and APS attends to development, but they are minor parts of the overall organizations—unlike organizations such as SRCD where development is the sole focus. Hence developmental psychologists see SRCD, the International Society for Infant Studies (ISIS) or the Society for Research on Adolescence (SRA) as the locus of their professional identity. Sociologists, however, likely see the ASA (American Sociological Association) as their main affiliation.

SRCD is a governing member of the Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA). COSSA was formed 30 years ago to represent the social, behavioral, and economic sciences at the federal level when they were under attack by the administration. Each of the disciplinary associations except for Anthropology is represented. COSSA has been quite successful at representing the social sciences, and SRCD’s participation ensures that developmental science is one of them. SRCD’s participation also allows us to keep in touch with and learn from the other disciplines. SRCD is one of several organizations working with the Jacobs Foundation in Zurich, Switzerland to form an International Consortium of Developmental Science Organizations to do its part at a global level for developmental science what COSSA has done for the social sciences in the US.

Because of these professional career, identity, funding, and disciplinary differences, organizations such as SRCD will probably always be comprised mostly of psychologists. Yet SRCD can and should promote greater interdisciplinary collaboration in the development of theory, in methods and research designs, in the diversity of our samples, and in the reach of our findings into policy and practice. What this means is that we have to work hard to make sure that developmental science in fields other than psychology is included in SRCD’s publications, meetings, and all other activities of the organization. This is why our strategic plan, our interdisciplinary committee, and our by-laws include other disciplines in our governance and why this remains so important for the future of the science of human development.

And if you do not already collaborate with developmental scientists from other disciplines or adopt an interdisciplinary perspective on your research topics, consider how other disciplines might contribute to your research interests.
Washington Words and Worries: Sequestration and What it Means for Us
by Martha Zaslow, Sarah Mancoll and Sarah Mandell

Washington introduces us to new vocabulary and acronyms. In fact, our new SRCD Fellows receive a list of these as part of their orientation. One Washington word that we urgently need to come to terms with is “sequestration.” This off-putting word has serious implications both for research on children and for policies and programs for children. The purpose of this column is to translate this Washington word and to indicate why it is also a major Washington worry that should be a major national worry as well.

What does sequestration mean?
Sequestration refers to automatic across-the-board spending cuts to meet budget policy goals. The term was first introduced in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act). Sequestration is now scheduled to be activated on January 2, 2013 as stipulated by the Budget Control Act of 2011 (see description below). An Office of Management and Budget (OMB) analysis of how these cuts would affect specific programs released on September 14th, called the planned cuts: “deeply destructive to national security, domestic investments, and core government functions.”

Why is there a law calling for sequestration now?
The Budget Control Act of 2011, which became law on August 2, 2011, made it possible for the President to raise the limit on the national debt by 2.1 trillion. It simultaneously called for counterbalancing efforts to control the debt. More specifically, it:

- Established limits (“caps”) on how much could be appropriated on discretionary programs (those that are not funded through mandatory spending on entitlements) through 2021 of more than $1 trillion.
- Made it a requirement that the House and Senate would vote on a Constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget (since been voted on and defeated by both houses).
- Created the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction or “Supercommittee” to develop legislation that would reduce deficits beyond the caps noted above by at least an additional $1.2 trillion through 2021.

In the event that the Supercommittee could not reach agreement on a legislative proposal for further deficit reduction, the law called for across-the-board cuts through sequestration to take effect on January 2, 2013. In November, the Supercommittee co-chairs announced that they had been unable to reach agreement on the additional cuts, and consequently, that sequestration would result.

Is the possibility of sequestration real or is this another instance of “the sky is falling”?
Congress still has several more months before sequestration takes effect. Until then, it is still possible that Congress can reach an agreement on a way to reduce the deficit, extend the date when sequestration will begin, or give itself more time to deliberate.

But given the uncertainty, federal agencies are taking the possibility of sequestration very seriously. They cannot be taken by surprise on January 2 by a requirement for cuts of more than eight percent. They need to plan for how these will be carried out. They are quietly setting about this planning.

Are all programs equally affected?
Sequestration affects both mandatory/entitlement programs like Medicare, and discretionary programs (programs for which Congress provides funding through the appropriations process each year), including both defense and non-defense programs. But specific mandatory programs aimed at low income families are exempt. These include Social Security, Medicaid, CHIP, SNAP, and refundable tax credits.

What would sequestration mean for researchers?
The OMB report referred to above indicates that in 2013, science programs funded by the U.S. government would experience cuts of 8.2 percent. This would mean a decrease in authorized spending of about $2.5 billion at NIH and of $586 million at NSF. At agencies that fund developmental science research, planning for sequestration means deciding on whether cuts will need to be made to existing grants as well as new grants. Unfortunately, cuts to grant funding at NIH will come on top of flat funding in recent years.

(cont. on p. 4)
The President of the Association of American Universities released a statement saying that “A budget sequester in January would have a terrible short- and long-term impact on the nation’s investments in scientific research and education, investments that are essential for long-term economic growth and prosperity.”

What would sequestration mean for programs for children and families?
The OMB report did not provide estimates of cuts to such specific programs as Head Start or child care subsidies. But an earlier set of estimates by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), using a somewhat less harsh estimate of budget cuts than the OMB report, provided such projections. For example, the CBO estimated that under sequestration there would be a reduction in the number of children who could participate in Head Start of up to 100,000 and that about 80,000 fewer children would have access to child care subsidies.

Evidence on the effects of child care subsidies on parental employment and on the return on investment of high quality early care and education\(^1\), raises questions about how these cuts would affect the intended broader U.S. economic outcomes.

What can you do?
Further information and resources on responding to sequestration cuts specifically in non-defense discretionary (NDD) spending programs are available on the website of the Coalition for Health Funding at [www.publichealth-funding.org](http://www.publichealth-funding.org).

Why the focus especially on NDD (a Washington acronym if not word)?
There is widespread interest now in Congress to exempt defense spending from cuts under sequestration. This would result in even more severe cuts for NDD. Given that both research and many programs for children are included in NDD, information on how to voice concern about cuts in NDD may be particularly useful to our members.

(Endnotes)
1 For more detailed information on the sequestration, see the report by the Congressional Research Service on “Budget ‘Sequestration’ and Selected Program Exemptions and Special Rules” and a report by the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities on “How the Across-the-Board Cuts in the Budget Control Act Will Work.”
2 The law calls for a different set of cuts in 2013 and between 2014 and subsequent years, and there are specific guidelines for how the cuts would be made to mandatory, defense and non-defense discretionary spending.
3 For more information on the potential economic effects of programs for children, see “Parent Employment and the Use of Child Care Subsidies” (Schaefer, Kreader, & Collins, 2006) and “Age 26 Cost-Benefit Analysis of the Child-Parent Center Early Education Program” (Reynolds, Temple, White, Ou, & Robertson, 2011).
Mentoring: Not Just for Research Anymore
by Karen Brakke, Spelman College, SRCD Teaching Committee Chair

Mentoring has been recognized as an important component of professional development for generations; indeed, historical practices of apprenticeship often relied on this relationship for training in a variety of professions. In academia, mentorship has typically been incorporated into research training. For those of us who have earned Ph.D.s, it is difficult to imagine getting through graduate school without at least one strong research mentor. We may also identify other mentors along the way who help us navigate our professional and personal lives.

Although teaching is one of the primary responsibilities that many of us have, historically our training has included little formal guidance in pedagogy or classroom management. In recent years this has changed at some graduate institutions, with programs providing graduate students or postdoctoral fellows with mentored teaching experience and other activities that prepare the participants for life in the classroom. However, such experiences still are not typical. Yet, translating Developmental Science in the classroom is an important role of a teacher, requiring the ability to understand the science as well to cultivate the skills to communicate it accurately and facilitate learning. Within the current atmosphere of accountability and focus on student learning outcomes demanding more attention to high-quality teaching in broader and broader contexts, the need for greater access to teaching mentorship becomes even more important. These are but a few of the circumstances that prompted the SRCD Teaching Committee, in cooperation with the Student and Early Career Council (SECC), to develop the Teaching Mentorship Program. SRCD launched the Teaching Mentorship Program in August 2012, inviting graduate students and novice teachers to enroll as mentees, and recruiting more experienced faculty to serve as mentors. During the first month that the online application was available, over 100 people have thus far applied to participate. This group includes virtually even numbers of potential mentors and mentees from a variety of institutions across the country and around the world. Mentee applicants expressed great interest in having guidance in balancing the different aspects of faculty life, creating effective activities and assessments for the classroom, diversity issues, and more. Potential mentors have offered to bring their years and variety of experiences to help guide mentees in these areas through the next year and perhaps beyond.

Mentors and mentees will communicate regularly over the course of the next year, and mentees will have the opportunity to get guidance from more experienced teachers, as well as to have their teaching observed either in real-time or via video recording. The 2013 Teaching Institute will include a special meet-and-greet session for mentor/mentee pairs, and we are arranging a ‘dine-around’ opportunity for individual dinners during the Biennial Meeting. Other opportunities for additional programming are under consideration as well.

If you have registered for the Teaching Mentorship Program, you should be matched with a mentor or mentee by the time you read this (or shortly thereafter). If you missed the first round of the program, we hope that you will be part of the next cohort in 2013. More information on the SRCD Teaching Mentoring Program, including guidelines and contacts, can be found here.

Teachers’ Corner is moderated by David Daniel
Data collection can be both a beneficial and worthwhile—but also time consuming and frustrating—endeavor. The decision to collect your own data is therefore an important one in your graduate career. Before making this decision, here are some important considerations that should help you to make an informed decision that best fits your specific needs.

**Future employment**: Are you going to be employed in a position that requires completing IRB forms and collecting data on your own in the future (i.e., academia, research institution, etc.)? If so, it might be nice to have some guidance your first time through the process. Your advisor (as well as others in your graduate program) will likely be very helpful in this capacity. It is definitely beneficial to have undertaken this difficult task in an educational setting before having to do it on your own when the stakes may be higher (i.e., when your job depends on it).

**Time**: Do you have the time to collect your own data? Data collection takes a lot of time and effort. You have to be able to fill out forms and communicate with the IRB, visit sites, go through the consent process, collect the data and then transfer it to useable form, all before you can answer your research questions. Not only does it take time to complete each individual step in the process, but also the completion of some of the tasks is outside of your control. For example, you will need to plan to have time for the IRB to make decisions, for sites to respond, for participants to complete both consent forms and protocol. All of this takes a lot of time (often longer than you think), and should be considered in your decision.

**Advisor**: What does your advisor think? Some advisors are feel strongly that going through the process of data collection is an important component of your graduate training. Other advisors might be sitting on a stockpile of usable data and feel that it is more important for you to complete your program of study in a timely fashion. It is important for you and your advisor to come to a consensus about which decision makes the most sense for you in your program.

**Funding**: How much will your data collection cost? How will you fund it? If your protocol is difficult or time consuming, you may have to provide compensation to your participants. You may need to requisition the assistance of others to help you complete the project. Often there are scholarships and grants available to help you fund your data collection as well as other institutional or departmental procedures in place to help you with this undertaking. Talk to your advisor about ways to reduce the costs of your data collection (for example, enlisting the help of undergraduate research assistants is mutually beneficial as you receive inexpensive assistance on your project and they receive research experience).

**Your Project**: Can you complete your project effectively without collecting your own data? Are your research questions able to be answered with existing and accessible data? A major benefit of collecting your own data is that it is more closely tailored to answer the questions you are supremely interested in with the sample you need. This is a tremendous benefit. Further, you are an expert in how these data were collected which will be beneficial when interpreting your results. Lastly, you now have your own stockpile of data which you can use to answer future research questions. However, sometimes you do not need this level of “intimacy” to complete your project. If not, consider whether or not you want to begin this endeavor when a simpler and faster strategy (using existing data) might be similarly tailored to answer your research question.

As you can see, there are many issues to consider before making the decision to collect your own data. Although data collection takes a lot of time and resources, things that may be of the essence to you as a graduate student, it also allows the benefit of experience as well as a deeper understanding of the data with which you will work. Consider each of these aspects and then communicate with your advisor to help develop a strategy that will allow you to get the most out of your graduate school training.
SRCD POLICY FELLOWSHIPS 2013-2014

Application Deadline: December 15, 2012

SRCD is seeking applications for upcoming Policy Fellowships for 2013-2014. There are two types of Fellowships: Congressional and Executive Branch. Both provide Fellows with exciting opportunities to come to Washington, DC and use their research skills in child development outside of an academic setting to inform public policy. Fellows work as resident scholars within their federal agency or Congressional office placements.

The goals of these fellowships are:

1. to contribute to the effective use of scientific knowledge in developing public policy,
2. to educate the scientific community about the development of public policy, and
3. to establish a more effective liaison between scientists and federal policy-making mechanisms.

The career stages of SRCD Fellows vary; some are early in their careers and some are more advanced. Further, their career paths following the Fellowship are diverse. Approximately half of SRCD Fellows begin or return to academia following their fellowship. Others continue to work at the interface of research and policy in both government and the private sector.

Fellowships are full-time immersion experiences and run from September 1st through August 31st. Following a two-week science policy orientation program sponsored by the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), Fellows receive an SRCD orientation to child development and public policy. The SRCD Office for Policy and Communications in Washington facilitates the Fellows' experience and is available as a resource throughout the year.

Application Requirements: Applicants must have a doctoral-level degree in any relevant discipline (e.g., Ph.D., M.D.), must demonstrate exceptional competence in an area of child development research, and must be a member of SRCD. Both early-career and advanced professionals are encouraged to apply. More information about the Fellowships is available online at www.srcd.org under the Policy and Communications tab, or email policyfellowships@srcd.org.

SEEKING NOMINATIONS FOR CHILD DEVELOPMENT EDITOR

The Publications Committee of the Society for Research in Child Development is conducting an international search for an editor of Child Development to succeed Jeffrey Lockman, whose editorship will end with the 2014 volume. Child Development is consistently among the most highly ranked journals in the field, with significant improvements in its impact factor reported in the latest ISI report. The search committee is interested in an editor with innovative ideas, vision, and leadership who will continue to expand the journal’s high impact and visibility. Important qualifications for a new editor include breadth of knowledge of the multiple disciplines represented in the Society; interest in diverse methodological approaches, including qualitative methods; knowledge of developmental science and childhoods around the world; appreciation for the importance of diversity in the field; a significant record of publications; willingness to take risks to include interesting new work; and ideas about the future course of the journal and the field.

The search committee is especially interested in candidates who will enhance the journal’s contributions to the pursuit of key elements of SRCD’s five part strategic plan—including the contributions of interdisciplinary and international perspectives, cultural and contextual diversity, and the centrality of research for practice, policy, and public understanding. Child Development editors have the freedom to implement their vision for the journal and guide the journal in innovative ways. Prior editorial and/or managerial experience is essential. The editorship requires a substantial time commitment, has a term of six years, and includes an honorarium. The appointee will become Incoming Editor on July 1, 2013; the first volume of Child Development under the new editor will publish in 2015. Nominations (including self-nominations), along with a brief description of qualifications of the nominated person and his or her CV, should be sent to Nancy E. Hill, Chair of the Search Committee, hillna@gse.harvard.edu by October 15, 2012.
The Teaching Institute will be held on Wednesday, April 17, 2013, in Seattle, Washington.

The Teaching Institute is designed for teachers of developmental science courses at all levels who wish to develop strategies for engaging students, to explore new ideas, to update their knowledge base, and to share ideas and perspectives with like-minded professionals.

The Teaching Institute is now accepting posters, roundtable discussions, and workshops for 2013.

More information and example abstracts are available on the SRCD website.

Submissions Deadline: February 1, 2013 (11:59pm EST)

Questions? Contact teachinginstitute@srcd.org or (734) 926-0612.
SRCD 2013 Biennial Meeting

Join Us in Seattle!
April 18 - 20
Seattle, Washington, USA

The 2013 SRCD Biennial Meeting is only 6 months away! SRCD invites you to join us in Seattle for what promises to be an exciting program. All sessions and events will be held at either the Washington State Convention Center or the Sheraton Seattle Hotel. Click here to explore fun things to see and do while visiting Seattle.

The Invited Program theme is “A changing technology and how it affects children around the world.” Program co-chairs Judy Garber and Sandra Graham have invited prominent speakers from different areas of research to address this important topic.

The SRCD Awards Ceremony on Thursday evening will be followed by the Business Meeting and a Global Reception for all attendees. The Presidential Address by Ann S. Masten and the Presidential Reception will be held on Friday evening. All attendees are encouraged to come. The SECC will host another Student and Early Career Hospitality Lounge for a place to relax, network, store posters and enjoy scheduled sessions. SRCD will again sponsor two “Lunch with the Leaders” events to be held Friday and Saturday. This is an opportunity for student and early career attendees to meet with leaders in the field of child development.

Preconference events will be held on Wednesday, April 17. These include the Developmental Science Teaching Institute and the Frances Degen Horowitz Millennium Scholars Program sponsored by SRCD. Applications for the Millennium Scholars Program will be accepted until December 7, 2012. The Teaching Institute is accepting submissions until February 1, 2013, and registration is required to attend this day-long event. SRCD is also sponsoring another day-long preconference event: Interventions for Children and Youth in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: New Opportunities and Challenges for Developmental Science. Registration for this event will also be required.

Interested in hosting a preconference or special event while in Seattle? Click here for more information. Once again, SRCD will have small networking rooms available for small group meetings. The reservation sheet for these rooms will be posted soon.

Registration and hotel links will open in early January. Book your room through the SRCD housing site by March 25, 2013 for a chance to win a $500 American Express Gift Card or one of 2 Delta Airlines vouchers!

The Biennial Meeting submission website is now closed. Thank you to all who submitted presentations for consideration. We are excited to see the results of a new submissions format. SRCD accepted individually submitted papers to be considered for presentation in a Paper Session composed of up to 6 Individual Paper Presentations. Individual papers that are highly rated but cannot be accepted for a Paper Session have the opportunity to become Individual Poster Presentations. Submissions are currently under review and decision emails will be sent mid-January 2013 to all participants.

SRCD continues to go green! We are excited to announce that SRCD will be utilizing a mobile app in Seattle in lieu of a printed program book. More information will be forthcoming about how to download the app to your mobile device so that the most updated program information is always at your fingertips.

Please visit the SRCD website (www.srcd.org) for updated Biennial Meeting information.

Questions specific to the Biennial Meeting Program? (734) 926-0610 or programoffice@srcd.org.
Other questions about the Biennial Meeting? Contact (734) 926-0612 or biennialmeeting@srcd.org.
IN MEMORIAM

Christoph Heinicke 1926 - 2012

Christoph Heinicke, distinguished adjunct professor of psychiatry and biobehavioral sciences at UCLA and longtime director of the UCLA Family Development Project, died June 17, in Santa Monica, after a long and distinguished career as a teacher, researcher, and practicing psychoanalyst.

Born in Germany, Chris fled the Nazi regime with his parents, and settled in Portland, Oregon in 1936. He earned a bachelor’s degree from Reed College, a master’s from Northwestern University, and a PhD from Harvard, graduating summa cum laude. Later, he pursued child analytic training with Anna Freud and John Bowlby at the Tavistock Psychiatric Research Unit in London. He was the first person without a medical background to complete psychoanalytic clinical training.

A highly regarded psychotherapy teacher and supervisor, Chris was noted for his sensitivity to the therapeutic relationship and his commitment to teaching. He taught first at Stanford University and then at UCLA, joining the faculty there in 1972 and advancing to the level of adjunct professor in the division of child psychiatry in 1977. For many years, he coordinated the clinical practicum for child psychiatry fellows, co-directed the resident child psychotherapy clinic, and served as a clinical supervisor to trainees. He was named a “distinguished” adjunct professor, a title reserved for senior faculty members who achieved the highest levels of scholarship during their careers.

Chris was a pioneer in mother-infant attachment research. In 1987, he began a series of longitudinal studies of mothers and young children to determine the essential features of a preventive, relation-based therapeutic intervention to help foster child development. This research was ahead of its time both in identifying risk factors and in creating interventions to enhance family relationships during the transition to parenthood in low-income families. His work became the foundation of the UCLA Family Development Project, which used his academic findings to break cycles of abuse and addiction and assist at-risk mothers in Los Angeles become better parents. He continued to direct the Family Development Project for 25 years. He was a kind and generous mentor to large numbers of colleagues and a towering supportive figure in the eyes of the participants in his studies. His family fondly remembers the scores of holiday cards they would receive each year from appreciative families.

In addition to helping others be great parents, Chris was himself a devoted father and grandfather. He is survived by three sons and three grandchildren, as well as his wife, Sally Heinicke.

Chris received numerous awards, including the Bowlby-Ainsworth Award from the New York Attachment Consortium and the Lester Hofheimer Prize for best research in psychiatry from the American Psychiatric Association.

LET US KNOW YOUR NEWS!

SRCD Members:
Please share your prestigious awards and memberships with us!
Send your announcement to either Developments editor at, jonathan.santo@gmail.com or alukowsk@uci.edu.
IN MEMORIAM

Herbert L. Pick, Jr., 1930 - 2012

Herbert Pick died on his way to work following a weekend filled with family, hospitality, and psychology. For 49 years at the University of Minnesota’s Institute of Child Development, new students were greeted by an unassuming guy who rode to work on his bike, helped them carry boxes of books to their offices, and turned out to be a famous professor. Herb was a fabulous mentor and teacher, honored most recently at a Festschrift sponsored by the International Society for Infant Studies where his former students and academic admirers gave talks focused on the themes Herb championed, namely effects of experience on learning and development, organism-environment fit, environmental structure, and societal applications of research about basic psychological processes. Herb gave the final talk, focused on his ongoing research about the adaptation of locomotion to novel circumstances and the transfer of the adaptation to new motor actions. Though he had only just officially retired in September 2011, the word “retirement” was not really in Herb’s vocabulary. At the time of his death, he was helping to lead a Research Experience for Undergraduates summer program, conducting research, and planning new projects with colleagues and former students.

Herb often said the things that most interested him were learning and experience. This focus can be seen in his first publications, co-authored with Richard D. Walk, Eleanor J. Gibson and Thomas T. Tighe, which showed that 90 days of exposure to particular geometric shapes resulted in faster discrimination learning of those shapes by albino rats. His interest in learning in daily life covered a wide range of activities ranging from manipulating objects, speaking, hand-writing, wayfinding, and walking. In order to study learning, Herb generally perturbed a learner’s situation and assessed the resulting adjustments in their actions. His studies covered a wide territory—studies about perceptual learning without reinforcement and as a function of prolonged exposure to visual patterns; learning to adjust reaching and grasping to prismatic distortion; learning to adjust vocal intensity to noise and vocal distortion; learning the layout of places explored on foot during cognitive mapping; and learning to adjust the calibration of locomotion to fit with changing circumstances. In each of these, Herb focused on the generality of learning, which he probed through systematic studies of transfer of what was learned to novel actions and new situations, in order to understand the underlying organization of perception and action.

Herb was born in Newark, New Jersey, near the height of the Great Depression. He loved hard work. As a boy he shoveled the sidewalk outside his family’s house and soon was shoveling for all the neighbors on the block. He continued shoveling his neighbors’ walks through his adult life. He loved the work of memorizing poems and memorized the 620 lines of Coleridge’s Rime of the Ancient Mariner. He continued to memorize poems through his adult life and recited much of Robert Service’s (1907) The Cremation of Sam McGee on winter camping trips.

Herb attended Cornell University on an ROTC scholarship. At Cornell he played tackle on the varsity football team and majored in sociology. From 1952-55 he served as Lt. JG on the cruiser USS Worcester. He worked as engineering officer, saying “it was as far from the guns as a guy could get.” He returned to Cornell in 1955, and completed his Ph.D. dissertation, A comparative study of probability learning, in 1960 supervised by Richard D. Walk. In it he compared the learning of preschool-age children, roosters, and rats.

After a two year sojourn on the psychology faculty at the University of Wisconsin, Herb accepted an offer by Harold Stevenson at the University of Minnesota’s Institute of Child Development. That became his home base, but Herb was an internationalist. He spent a year as a graduate exchange student at Moscow State University (1959-60). He returned to Moscow as a Fulbright-Hays Exchange Scholar in 1978 and as a visiting professor in 1964-65, 1970, and 1986. He continued to read and write about Russian psychology throughout his career. In addition, he was a Visiting Lecturer at Academica Sinica, Beijing (1983), Visiting Professor at Makerere University, Uganda (1969-70), Visiting Professor at Katholieke Universiteit in Nijmegen, Netherlands (1981), as well as a Fellow at the Center for Advanced Study at Stanford (1972-73).

Herb, together with his wife, Anne, was an enthusiastic and gracious host. Perhaps he learned this from his mother,
who worked in the USO (United Services Organizations) during World War II and regularly invited stranded military personnel home for a free meal, conversation, and place to stay. Many of us remember days, weeks, or months spent staying in Herb and Anne’s home, reading the news, walking the dog, biking, and talking about psychology and the news.

Herb’s door was always open. He loved conversation and he loved talking about psychology and designing experiments. He was a keen listener and at talks generally asked the question that helped the work move forward. He was an optimistic problem-solver when people told him about their personal and professional difficulties.

Herb combined his hospitality with his love of adventure. In 1966, he co-organized a winter camping trip with Mervyn Bergman. They started out going to different regions of northern Minnesota, sometimes sleeping in unheated cabins as a prelude to a hard day’s slog on snowshoes. The trip changed into a grueling 3-4 day adventure carrying heavy packs and setting up a new camp every evening. As the trip and trip leaders aged, the trip adapted and scaled down to hiking into the woods, setting up a base camp, and using topographical maps to find different destinations during daytrips. And as it aged further, it scaled down to staying in rustic heated cabins as a home base for day hikes on snowshoes. Generations of students and faculty colleagues at the University of Minnesota participated in these winter adventures. Like Herb, many came to believe that camaraderie is born of shared hardship - nothing clears the mind of the worries of everyday life better than slogging on snowshoes through deep snow while hoping you to find enough wood for a big fire that evening. These trips were filled with conversation about child development and psychological research. They were filled with conversation about the worries and victories of daily life. They were filled with adventure and friendship.

From knowing about Herb’s remarkable month-long adventures with his daughters, many of us learned to encourage our children to be brave and to participate. With daughter Cindy, Herb biked from Minneapolis to Maine, with daughter Karen, he paddled the Northwest Territories, and with daughter Gretchen, he sailed far off the northeastern coast.

Herb is missed by his wife of 50 years, Anne; his sister; his daughters and their husbands; his grandchildren; his sister in law, niece, and cousins as well as his many students, colleagues, friends, and admirers.

by John J. Rieser, Professor of Psychology and Human Development, Vanderbilt University and Jeffrey J. Lockman, Professor of Psychology, Tulane University


This practical, concise guide shows all teachers, regardless of the content area or grade they teach, what they need to know about language, how it is learned and used, and how teaching about it can be incorporated into lessons throughout the curriculum. It includes language comparison charts and hands-on materials such as checklists and sample lessons to help teachers prepare to teach all students in diverse classrooms.
IN MEMORIAM

Robert Glaser 1921 - 2012

Robert Glaser, a founder of the field of instructional psychology, passed away on February 4, 2012 at the age of 91. He was the Founding Director of the Learning Research and Development Center (LRDC) at the University of Pittsburgh, as well as Distinguished Professor of Psychology and Education there. Bob’s major contributions—scholarly research, leadership, and institution building—were all aimed at the same goal: applying psychological principles to educational practice.

Although Bob’s best-known scholarly contributions were to the cognitive science of learning and instruction, his graduate work focused on behavior analysis. He studied with B. F. Skinner, among others, and received his Ph.D. from Indiana University in 1949. After a brief period as a faculty member at the University of Illinois, he moved to Pittsburgh to join the American Institutes for Research in 1952 and then joined the University of Pittsburgh in 1956. Much of his early research was on programmed instruction; this research culminated in the well-cited volume Teaching Machines and Programmed Instruction: A Source Book (Lumsdaine & Glaser, 1960).

Despite this early success in applying principles of behavior analysis, Bob soon realized that pioneering research in artificial intelligence, conducted by Newell and Simon just down Forbes Avenue, would be useful for his goal of improving student learning. As he later reminisced, “Beginning in the late 1960s, pathbreaking artificial intelligence simulations of problem solving tasks had appeared, and soon thereafter it became clear that cognitive science, the new science of the mind, could be symbiotic with research on school learning” (Glaser, 1989).

Glaser and his colleague Bill Cooley soon applied theoretical insights from cognitive science, as well as behavior analysis, to improving school children’s learning. Their approach, which they labeled Individually Prescribed Instruction, took advantage of the potential of computer programs to keep records of children’s learning history and to present material and problems that were neither redundant with what the child already knew nor too far ahead of the child’s existing knowledge to be understood (Cooley & Glaser, 1969). They implemented their program at the Oakleaf Elementary School in suburban Pittsburgh which was soon after named one of the 10 best elementary schools in the US (Rangel, in press).

More generally, this combination of theoretical and applied work using psychological principles to improve education led Bob and his longtime colleague Lauren Resnick to help found the area of instructional psychology (Glaser & Resnick, 1972). As Alan Lesgold, Bob’s longtime colleague at LRDC and now Dean of University of Pittsburgh’s School of Education put it, “He was a great scientist and a great engineer. Starting in behaviorism, he readily moved into cognitive science. But, he did so without abandoning the aspects of behavior theory that were empirically grounded. Similarly, when he attacked instructional problems, he used whichever aspects of theory were most relevant and best supported empirically. In a world where there has been almost religious conflict between earlier and more recent theoretical approaches, Bob was data driven, in a much deeper way than that term means in education today.”

Later, Bob’s interests turned to the study of expertise, as the ideal end point of instruction. Two of his best-known articles were studies of physics expertise, both conducted with Micki Chi, and both Citation Classics. One of them, Chi, Feltovich, and Glaser (1981), which examined categorization of physics problems by experts and novices, became the most cited article published in the journal Cognitive Science. The other, Chi, Bassok, Lewis, Reimann, and Glaser (1989), focused on the processes by which students acquire expertise, in particular the role of self-generated explanations in promoting deep understanding of physics texts.

Bob also had an enduring interest in assessment and the role it could play in informing instruction and evaluating its effects. His American Psychologist article “Instructional technology and the measurement of learning outcomes” (Glaser, 1963) was particularly influential in promoting the idea of criterion-referenced testing. He continued his efforts to improve assessment into the current century (Pellegrino, Chudowsky, & Glaser, 2001).

As large as his contributions have been to the fields of learning, instruction, and assessment, Bob’s contributions (cont. on p. 14)
as an institution builder might have been even greater. To realize his vision of instruction informed by psychological principles, Glaser and J. Steele Gow, the Executive Director of the Falk Foundation, raised money from the U. S. Office of Education, the Falk Foundation, and the University of Pittsburgh to become co-founders of LRDC in 1963. Glaser became Director of LRDC in 1965, a position that he held for the next 32 years. His enthusiasm, gregariousness, likability, dedication, and vision helped him attract to LRDC a remarkable group of researchers with related goals and orientations, including Micki Chi, Susan Goldman, Jim Greeno, Alan Lesgold, Jim Pellegrino, Chuck Perfetti, Lauren Resnick, Leona Schauble, and Walter Schneider. Under Bob’s leadership, and later that of Lauren Resnick and Chuck Perfetti, LRDC became a preeminent institution for studying instruction in ways informed by psychological and cognitive science principles.

In the many ceremonies honoring Bob since his passing, the most common anecdote by far was about his greeting his colleagues with the question: “What have you discovered today?” As Susan Goldman and Jim Pellegrino noted in one of the ceremonies “This was not just a throw away remark of casual conversation. He was serious and he expected an answer whether you were a first year graduate student, a wet-behind-the-ears assistant professor, or a senior colleague.” They and others also commented on Bob’s generosity in reading and editing their papers, making insightful comments, and challenging them to be intellectually all that they could be, and also his sense of fun and appreciation of the finer things in life. “A real mensch,” as Larry Erlbaum put it. I can second all of these comments from my own experience with Bob.

Bob’s achievements and positive impact on the field did not go unappreciated. He received the American Psychological Association (APA) Distinguished Scientific Contribution Award for Applications of Psychology and its Award for Lifetime Contribution to Evaluation, Measurement, and Statistics; the American Psychological Society (APS) James McKeen Cattell Fellow Award for Distinguished Scientific Contributions and Their Applications; the American Educational Research Association (AERA) Award for Distinguished Research in Education; and the Educational Testing Service (ETS) Award for Distinguished Service to Measurement. He also was elected President of AERA and of the National Academy of Education, and received honorary doctorates from five universities in four countries. His dedication to using psychological principles and research findings to improve education, his building of institutions to promote that goal on an enduring basis, and his kindness and generosity to his colleagues will continue to be an inspiration long beyond his passing.

by Robert Siegler, Teresa Heinz Professor of Psychology, Carnegie Mellon University

Doctoral Fellowships Available

Erikson Institute awards a limited number of competitive doctoral fellowships each year to qualified candidates admitted to the Ph.D. program in Child Development. Offered in conjunction with Loyola University Chicago’s Graduate School, the program includes course work at both institutions and leads to a Ph.D. in child development conferred by Loyola University.

The Ph.D. program prepares academics, applied researchers, and program developers to assume intellectual leadership in a variety of professional settings that study and/or serve young children.

For more information, please visit www.erikson.edu/phd or contact us at:

Erikson Institute
Office of Admission
451 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60654-4510
admission@erikson.edu
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Marian D. Sigman

Marian D. Sigman, Professor Emerita of Psychiatry and Psychology at UCLA, was born in New York in 1941. She passed away at her home in Los Angeles on April 30, 2012. Marian was the author of many groundbreaking studies on autism and other forms of developmental psychopathology. She was the founding co-director of the Center for Autism Research and Treatment (CART) at UCLA, the first President of the International Society for Autism Research, and the founding President of the International Society for Infant Studies. She was active in SRCD and served as Associate Editor of Child Development from 1989 to 1995. In May 2009, she received the Lifetime Achievement Award of the International Society for Autism Research.

One of Marian’s most important research themes was her successful search for the developmental roots of enduring individual differences. But her search for stable individual differences that begin at birth, or even before, had its own developmental roots. In her chosen field, she had a downright pedigree: child psychiatrist, Dr. Stella Chess, was Marian’s older cousin. Chess and her husband, Dr. Alexander Thomas, originated the concept of infant temperament and started the New York Longitudinal Study of Child Development in 1956, the first study of its kind. Marian was very proud to have Chess and Thomas as members of her extended family and had a personal connection to their work.

Stella Chess looked for—but did not find—the biological roots of autism. Nonetheless, she argued against the “icebox mother” theory of autism—prevalent in the 1960s. At that time, autism was blamed on emotionally cold mothering.

Marian continued her cousin’s quest for the biological roots of autism—but with greater success: Marian and her colleagues at CART have identified neural and genetic markers of autism as well as behavioral markers for autism risk in infancy. Her most innovative methodological tool was the longitudinal study of infant siblings of children with autism; these infants are at heightened risk of developing autism and therefore give clues as to the earliest signs of autism. Infant sibling studies are now being conducted around the world.

Marian started her career at a time when there were no models for women combining family and career. There were no support systems, such as day care or spousal hires for two-academic-career families. While still a clinical psychology graduate student at Boston University, Marian had two children, which made graduate school difficult. However, she received a fellowship at the Radcliffe Institute. These fellowships were the first support system for career women with families; they basically consisted of babysitting money, so that women with young children could work or go to school part-time. With this help, Marian completed her doctoral work in clinical psychology.

Marian was totally devoted to her husband David and to their children, Hilary and Daniel. Marian accompanied David to Los Angeles when he became an assistant professor at UCLA—without any position or promise of a position for herself as a new PhD. She spent seven years post-Ph.D. in non-tenure-track positions—not really knowing if or how she could ever move to a tenure-track post. At her death, Marian was a high-level professor with over 200 publications and a grant history of over 30 million dollars. With these accomplishments, it is hard to imagine that she was ever academically insecure and had to overcome many barriers that disproportionately affected women. But the barriers were there and overcome them she did—in an incredibly quiet but effective way, first obtaining a tenure-track position in the UCLA Psychiatry Department and then, six years later, a joint appointment in the UCLA Psychology Department, where she made an important contribution and had many wonderful graduate students.

In the 1990s, Marian and I were both invited to a conference on the Flynn effect organized by Dick Neisser, one of the fathers of cognitive psychology. The Flynn effect is the worldwide rise in IQ performance that has been going on for more than 100 years. Along with others, we were supposed to figure out what had caused this rise. Marian’s assignment was nutrition. However, the Flynn effect had never been studied either in Africa or in a rural village; nor had it ever been assessed with children. The amazing thing was that Marian and her collaborators later actually established the Flynn effect with children in rural Africa by comparing children’s test data in the same village fourteen years apart – and finding that performance on an IQ test had risen significantly in that period of time (Daley, Whaley, Sigman, Espinosa, & Neumann, 2003).

(cont. on p. 16)
Marian was devoted to her graduate students in developmental and clinical psychology and to her postdoctoral fellows. She was named outstanding research mentor in the UCLA Department of Psychiatry in 2000. For 18 years, she served as training director for the NIMH-funded UCLA Interdisciplinary Research Training Program in Childhood Psychopathology. She mentored many of the current and future leaders in autism research and developmental psychopathology. Her former students and postdocs hold positions in top universities as far flung as Israel, Australia, Paris, New York, and Los Angeles. These students and postdocs were a source of great pride for Marian.

Very tragically, Marian became terminally ill at the height of her career; we lost her much too soon. However, her scientific legacy lives on: CART, the Center she co-founded, recently received a multimillion-dollar renewal grant from NIH. In addition to identifying genetic and neural foundations of autism, the Center uses Marian’s research on the developmental course of autism to construct and study parental interventions for children on the autism spectrum. In addition, at her festschrift in 2009, it became clear that, through her behind-the-scenes work at NIH, Marian was instrumental in stimulating funding for today’s large-scale research in the field of autism on a national level.

Because of her longitudinal research designs, a number of papers coauthored by Marian were published even after she became ill and was unable to work. Marian began the research for a 2012 publication in the late 1970s when the autistic subjects were between three and six years old. A group including students and former students tracked down 20 of these subjects when they were young adults; their assessments confirmed Marian’s central hypothesis: the ability to share attention with another in early childhood predicts communication skills, social skills, and the relative absence of autistic symptoms in adulthood (Gillespie-Lynch et al., 2012). Because the infant siblings in her more recent studies will probably be followed for decades, Marian Sigman’s co-authored papers will be coming out for years to come. This is truly a living legacy.

by Patricia M. Greenfield, Distinguished Professor of Psychology, UCLA

SRCD members with knowledge about the passing of a SRCD member please notify Alison Clarke-Stewart at acstewar@uci.edu or Ross Parke at ross.parke@ucr.edu.
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


**Cari Gillen-O’Neel, Virginia W. Huynh, & Andrew J. Fuligni.** *NPR, ABC News, TIME, The Telegraph (UK), Los Angeles Times, Newstrack India (India), Science Blog, ABC (Spain).* Press Release: *Sacrificing Sleep to Study Can Lead to Academic Problems.*


* indicates media coverage related to an SRCD publication.

**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.**
** 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 Wiley-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**

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

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

---

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.
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