

Bettye M. Caldwell

- B.A. (1945) Baylor University, M.A. (1946) University of Iowa, Ph.D. (1951) Washington University

Major Employment

- Professor of Pediatrics, Child Development and Education, University of Arkansas: 1993-present
- Donaghey Distinguished Professor of Education, University of Arkansas at Little Rock: 1978-1993
- Professor of Education and Director, Center for Child Development and Education, University of Arkansas at Little Rock: 1974-1982
- Professor of Elementary Education, University of Arkansas at Fayetteville: 1969-1974
- Research Associate, Department of Pediatrics, Upstate Medical Center, State University of New York: 1959-1966



SRCD Affiliation

- Governing Council Member (1975-81), *Child Development* Editor (1968-71)

SRCD Oral History Project

Bettye Caldwell

Interviewed by Robert Bradley and Judy Brisby
1993

Bradley: Well, we're here this afternoon to do what I think will be a very enjoyable interview with Dr. Bettye Caldwell. The purpose of this interview is to allow Bettye to provide some thoughts and insights about a career in child development that spans some 40 years now. I have been fortunate to spend about the last half of this career with her as a colleague so it should be especially enjoyable for me. Judy Brisby, the other person who will be involved in the interview, has spent about the last quarter of Bettye's career with her so we thought it would be enjoyable for both of us to do this together. Bettye, we are looking forward to what you have to offer in terms of insights and thoughts about your career.

Caldwell: Thank you, I'm honored that SRCD wanted to include me in this group.

Brisby: One of the things, Bettye, that I'm asked anytime I'm out in a group of people, especially people who are being trained for the HOME Inventory, is, "What is Bettye Caldwell really like?" I tell them roughly how old you are and also tell them that you've got as much energy as three three-year-olds.

Caldwell: Well, I'll be 70 years old a week and a half from this interview, and that's worth putting in at the outset.

Brisby: I wonder if you would tell us about your early childhood and your family experiences and give us a little bit of a hint of what might have led you to some of the theories that you have developed throughout the years.

Caldwell: Well, I'm a Depression-era child. I was born just before the Great Depression hit. My father worked for the railroad and was one of the youngest members of the railroad staff. He was let go and became "unemployed" as we would say in today's world. I was very young, so I grew up very poor, poorer, I tell everybody, than it was fashionable to be. I lived in a very small town, we lived in a Smithville house my first few years, but when daddy totally lost his job we moved to what seemed like

the country. I grew up always a little ashamed of being from the country. In today's world it would be a very special thing because we had ten acres of land purchased when the first home loans became available. I know my dad bought that land for \$100 an acre and we had ten acres so we were not big land-holders. The area that I grew up in was farming and railroading country, and the railroad was really the only industry in that part of Missouri-Kansas-Texas. The people in Smithville, the men who were not cut off during the Depression, seemed like very wealthy people. They probably made \$200 a month, you understand, but they lived very, very well in that period. An awful lot of people were out of work.

Both my parents grew up in what would be little satellite towns that were in about a ten mile radius of Smithville. Where they were from seemed very far from Smithville in the days of clay roads and old, old cars. It seemed to take forever to get to my grandmother's. I'm the younger of two daughters and apparently I was a big disappointment that I was not a boy because they certainly wanted one for the second. It's interesting in today's world birth rate. One of the early things I can remember about mothers is how terrified they were at the thought of having another baby, another mouth to feed. So I was another mouth to feed, a very big mouth. I've always had a very big, hardy appetite. Even though my sex was a disappointment, my nature was not. I was a very happy child. I had flaming orange hair and very curly at first and was called Red, things like that, which I absolutely hated all of my life. I was very skinny and had freckles that were almost the color of that tape box. There were no sunscreens in those days, so I grew up with a lot of sunburns because I was very, very active. I supposedly had "a wonderful disposition."

When I grew up and read the *Grapes of Wrath* about the Depression I thought, I want to write a story about what it was like to be happy during the Depression, because certainly we experienced it. I think it was very hard on my parents (on my dad in particular). Dad had all the macho feelings that he must totally take care of his family; it was very, very hard for him to be unable to do it. My father -- I've called him daddy, dad, and now father -- was a remarkable man. After my dad was cut off the railroad he worked as a carpenter -- I'd liken it in today's world to say builder or contractor -- but he worked as a carpenter for anybody and everybody that he could and he taught himself the building business from the ground up. This is a good example of what the Depression did to people like that. He taught himself wiring, electricity; he could do plumbing; he could do bricks; he learned to draw blue prints. He won, at one point in the heart of the Depression, two prizes for barn siding, which is now no longer allowed for remodeling a house. Well, when World War II started he was Smithville's number one builder and could have made a lot of money, but the railroads began to move again and his need for security was so great, he gave up the building, but he never really gave it up. My house is full of dressers he built that would hardly go in this room. He always built them like houses.

My mother was a hard woman in lots of ways but she was the glue that held our family together. She always seemed so much more a disciplinarian than my dad but they both expected a great deal of their girls. My sister is three and a half or four years older than I am, and the MacDonald girls were in everything, especially the little MacDonald girl, that's me. An interesting thing about me is that I was abnormally small until I went to college. I was under five feet and they grew them big down in Texas, as you know, so I was always known as the little red-headed MacDonald girl and the town was so incredibly good to me. I loved school from day one and I think it was a good school. I don't know how now, as an educator, I would evaluate it. My birthday is Christmas Eve and that meant that I didn't get to start to school when the other children did because you had to be six by the first of September and somehow the superintendent's daughter's birthday was December 29th so that school board passed a new regulation then that allowed you to go to first grade. Now this again will tell you something about my parents though because the depression had hit but they managed somehow to scrape up the little tuition that they had to do for that. So I started school six weeks late and am famous for a story that my mother had already taught me to read, all those things that I've had to tell students for the last several years you're not supposed to do, and supposedly on the first day when I went to school the teacher held up a -- whose name was Mrs. Winston I remember vividly -- a flash card and it said, "Good Morning" and I got up and read it and curtsied to the class; so I was teased about that. We had excellent teachers, excellent teachers. I also took piano lessons, not for too long and not too much

because the teacher said I couldn't sit still on the bench. I was very hyperactive as a child, although I loved the intellectual things, I loved recess most and had good, good grounding in things like math and history and so on all the way through school. I don't know where those teachers came from in the era but they were excellent and I was a good student. All the contests were who would come in second and third, it was always assumed that the little red-headed MacDonald girl would come in first.

Texas had a lot of interesting things during that period that were very influential in my life. They had, I don't even know if they still have it, a thing called interscholastic league, and this is really a modern version of the old Olympic Games where you had contests in every conceivable thing. What we think of as contests and just being athletic and I was in something every year. I loved the zest and the competition of that kind of thing. We'd have to work hard and in my senior year in high school I did something that no other Smithville student had done, I went to the state meet in what they called extemporaneous speaking; this is good for my history, I was disqualified for first place because I spoke overtime! The judge relented and he said that since I had been evaluated as first place and actually there was a rule that you could finish a sentence, noticed the way I used "that" and "and," thought I was finishing a sentence, so they ended up giving me third place instead of first place. But I was the only Smithville student that had ever done that. And I will also never forget what my coach said to me, his immortal words were, "How could you do that to me?" Also, another very important thing in my life in school was the band. Smithville got a band when I was in the eighth grade and I had been pretty much self-taught in most everything I had ever done. We couldn't afford for me to buy an instrument so I had to play whatever instrument the band furnished, and there were three and I played them all. They furnished drums. If people ask me what is the thing that in my life I have done the best I wish I could say it's been a child development scientist but I would have to say it's being a baton twirler because I probably did that better than I've ever done anything in my whole life. Things like that for kids from a little town open up windows that you can't imagine. That's how I chose Baylor, I went to a band contest there. Again, there was nobody to teach you and I had a book called *How to Spin a Baton* and was able to read those diagrams and, being hyperactive, it was natural for me. So being in that band and being in those interscholastic league contests, because I met children from other parts of the state, was a big, big part of my high school. I still remember the names of most of my teachers and I had some excellent ones. So growing up poor in a small town in that era was a wonderful experience.

This asks about early work experience. I think I was one of the world's first babysitters. I use to babysit and cat-sit and things like that and then I used to do jobs. I actually picked cotton once -- and this should go into my record -- and I fainted! I would do anything for money and our next door neighbor had a bigger piece of land and grew cotton and I got a job picking cotton for them and it was so hot in that Texas sun that I fainted and I went home at noon. So my cotton picking career was one half day.

Brisby: Did you ever teach anyone twirling?

Caldwell: That's the first real money I made. You talk about having a knack for something, I can still sit here and twirl. The world went crazy for it about that time and I'm here to tell you I was good, and every little girl in Smithville wanted to learn. So each summer from the time I was a sophomore and I went to high school at age 12 -- I graduated at 16 -- I had anywhere from 10 to 20 students teaching them. I've been doing that all my life, teaching things that I'm not "qualified" to teach. I bought all the clothes I bought when I went away to college with money from that. It was a great experience and my little group won all sorts of awards in those contests. It was sort of early chorus line stuff, if you will. We wore long skirts, you understand; as a matter of fact, I never wore those little short skirts, the things that the Dallas Cowboy Cheerleaders wear now. That's really quite an art. My mother is convinced that it was because of twirling that I developed the breast cancer at an early age because, believe me, I hit myself many, many times. I loved it. I went to Baylor on a double scholarship: I had a band scholarship and I had a Texas one. At that time every valedictorian of any high school could go to any college in the state, and I went to Baylor on a band scholarship as a twirler and all at once became very ashamed of it. Quit at the end of one year. Would never touch it again except to teach a little child how to do it. One grows out of those things.

Brisby: What were some of your early adult experiences that were important to you in your development?

Caldwell: I think that my first adult intellectual experience of a real serious nature occurred at the University of Iowa where I went first as a graduate student after I graduated from Baylor. I thought I had at least three professors at Baylor who were very powerful people probably in my life and then I had a woman that I worked for. I had a job in the Dean's office as a secretary. I taught myself to type at about 12. My sister got a typewriter for Christmas when she was about 16, so I would have been 12 and had been typing ever since. I also learned shorthand in high school -- things like that that people don't know anymore. So I worked in the Dean's office and I had a lot of rough edges, and there was a woman who worked there who was very important to me as an intellectual whose name was Grace Scutter who took me under her wing. She was a character, she had access to all of the entrance scores and she picked me out because I made all these high scores on things, and got me that job in the Dean's office, and she taught me to quit saying ma'am and sir. "Yes, would be quite adequate," she would say. So to this day I say yes and no. And also she helped me be more aware of how you should dress and things like that. It was very interesting. At that time of my life I articulated that I wanted to grow up and run a school for poor children. She was a real elitist and said, "Are you sure that's what you want to do? Don't you want to run a school for outstanding students?" In terms of the poor, that did not come from my own poverty because we weren't in poverty, we were just poor. I never really felt poor (as I said), but I grew up with absolutely no awareness of where black children went to school. I was totally segregated. There weren't, in that part of the state, as many blacks as there were in some parts, and they lived in a different part of town. And we were too poor to have servants or anybody with cleaning and laundry, so I knew very little bit about that, but I had this perception that poor children somehow needed extra things. You know in those small town schools in those days the teachers intuitively did a lot of things that are big movements now, like tutoring. I worked as an assistant teacher all through high school and I got a tremendous amount out of it. By that I mean Miss Winston the algebra teacher would say, "Bettye Ruth will you work with Wayne and see if you can help him do this?" and it was tremendously valuable. The kids accepted it. At any rate, I was talking about Baylor though, and this woman, Grace Scutter, was a very important person. She made me articulate things. I kind of always had the feeling that, you know, God was going to tap me on the shoulder and show me what I needed to do, and she made me think about what it was that I ought to do.

I also had a good teacher of psychology, a man named Lloyd Roland whose greatest fame on campus was that he could hypnotize you by snapping his fingers; students loved that. And I had a very powerful English teacher, Baylor's most distinguished professor who was a Browning Scholar, and I used to work for Dr. Armstrong, this English teacher. And, since I've been engaged in raising money for a lot of organizations since, I have to say I learned a lot from Dr. Armstrong. He was a real character and was definitely passed his prime, as I am now, when I was his student, but his greatest desire was to find a student who would come to work at 5:30 in the morning and my greatest desire as a Baylorite was to hang out and since I always had jobs I never got to hang out at the corner store. So I went to work or the coffee shop, though I didn't drink coffee then. I went to work for Dr. Armstrong at 5:30 in the morning and was through at 8:30 and the rest of the day I could hang out with the rich kids. I thought that was great, but he was a very, very powerful intellectual figure and he wrote me kind of a funny letter that had a major impact on me about my future, saying something to the effect that I had a great future.

The woman, Sarah Lowry, was the best teacher I had at Baylor and she was instrumental in alienation on my part from Baylor. I had a strange illness when I was a little girl. I always had strange illnesses; when I was six I had the measles. I didn't go to the doctor but maybe twice in my whole life till I was about 25 and lost my voice. When I was very tiny I apparently had had a very, very fine soprano voice and I was scheduled to be the lead in some school play and when I came back no other little girl could learn the words so they persuaded me to go ahead and try and be in this play. I strained my voice trying to do that and for ten years of my life my voice was lower in register than Bob's here. My career in singing was over. In fact, I sang tenor in high school and Miss Lowry -- this was the early days when

you had phonographs, you had to make a record. Everybody had to take Speech 101, or whatever it was called, and she heard me talk and looked me in the eye and said, "You know, you don't have to talk like that." I've never forgotten that and I said, "Well, how am I going to talk?" or words to that effect, and she was a great one on intercostular diaphragmatic breathing and she just kind of taught me to relax and in the course of time I think I have a fairly normal voice now. But she was a very, very powerful influence in terms of making me think about what I wanted to do. She also -- all these teachers that I'm talking about -- made me feel special. That's a very, very good feeling.

I mentioned that my first real intellectual awakening though was when I went to the University of Iowa. I had just turned 20 and when I was a junior at Baylor, because of Miss Lowry and my coming back voice, I took all these speech courses. I never thought of myself as a speech major, Lord knows it's good that I did having made my living for the last 20 years giving speeches. But at any rate, I ended up sort of with a double major, almost three because I almost had an English major also. Baylor had a little radio station -- and now I'm about to get to child development -- and I took a powerful little 5000 watt or something like that. I had a regular program on that station when I was a junior and senior in college reading stories to children throughout the state, and one of my best friends, boyfriends, was an incredibly talented musician and he improvised music on the organ to illustrate these stories; this was obviously long before TV. Well, when I was a junior at Baylor I read an ad, I didn't know where the University of Iowa was. To me, the "university" was Texas-Austin. It was 50 miles from where I grew up, advertising the Radio Child Study Club. Now you talk about something that forecasts things, I thought, my gosh, I love radio, I want to work with children, so the Radio Child Study Club is for me. Well, I wrote a letter to the -- typed it I'm sure in the Dean's office -- to the head of what was at that time called the Iowa Child Welfare Research Station, it later was called the Iowa Institute of Behavior and Development. Lou Lipsitt is a few years behind me in having his doctorate there. The head of it at that time was kind of the young turk darling of child development in America named Robert R. Sears. He wrote back a very sweet letter saying, "It's wonderful to have somebody interested in her future." That's probably the first thing I ever did about my future, come to think of it, without waiting for that tap on the shoulder. He said, "But we have to wait until after you're a senior and see your grades." Of course my grades were so beautiful he didn't need to wait on that; they called me "B+ Bettye" at Baylor because once in high school I made a B+. At any rate, the Radio Child Study Club was what the world has discovered in the last ten years, namely parent education. So when I went to Iowa I went as the graduate student working for the Radio Child Study Club. The head of it will be a man whose name you've never heard and a lot of people in SRCD have never heard of him, Ralph H. Ojeman. Dr. Ojeman had been a professor there and believed strongly in the outreach to parents and also was convinced that what America was teaching its children at that time -- I didn't understand a lot of what he was saying when I first went there, you understand, it was too cut and dry -- he said that children didn't understand human behavior, that they didn't know how to identify causes. He called his theory a causal approach to human behavior. Well, the rest of the people in the Institute laughed at Ojeman. You know, graduate students very quickly pick up that it's very bad to be the graduate student of a professor who's out. But I did that for a year and always had great respect for him; always was the subject for a lot of teasing from the other graduate students, but I've kind of been teased all my life for either the red hair or my Texas accent and whatever. Being Ojeman's graduate student -- but it's an interesting thing, in fact it's one of the nicest things that's ever happened to me. I thought we were supposed to make these programs better, but they told me that what they'd always done before is that one week a professor from Iowa City would read something and the next week a professor at Ames would read something. Well, the Iowa State PTA coordinated all of this and during the summer I had to send out hundreds and hundreds of things announcing what the topics were going to be, and you understand I didn't know the first thing about what I was doing but I knew how to put on a radio program. I didn't have any way of evaluating the merits of what these professors were sending to me. Well, in my naiveté I took them and I'd write radio scripts, fade in and fade out, announcer this, and I got some kids -- Iowa had a campus school then -- I had a little crew of children who were my actors who would read lines. And one of the professors at Ames eventually complained at who was this kid over there in Iowa City who was changing his scripts that were being sent in. But the interesting thing is that at the end of that year WSUI offered me a job in radio. You see, I've had all these missed opportunities in my life. The next year they used the same scripts. That was one of the nicest things

that has ever happened and it certainly did help me. But I learned about Extension. I learned about parent education and it was a wonderful experience for me, but I didn't want to do it again.

The second year I knew which professors were in and which were not and the second year research -- again you talk about things that fit, what I've done, if those two things haven't. The second year my job was research assistant to the preschools. The Iowa preschools were the greatest in the country. They were among the first established by the Rockefeller Foundation. You signed up for them when you were pregnant; and, interestingly enough, they had a program for two year olds that became strictly outré a few years after that. But my job was just mainly three things. One is I was the person you had to get reliability with if you were doing a dissertation and you did an observation system. And one of the first observation systems that I had anything to do with was done by a woman named Barbara Merrill-Bishop which had a lot of things in it similar to the approach that we are doing now. So I learned a lot from that. The second thing: they had some children that had behavior problems and I might be assigned to follow -- this is a wonderful thing -- a given child for two weeks and just observe and write up what I observed. Well of course that gave me all kinds of literary license. Again I didn't know what I was doing. The third thing I did saved my life. I was a substitute teacher. Whenever a teacher was absent I was a sub, so that meant I had some teaching, the only teaching experience I ever had outside of what I got at Kramer and what I've done in college with 2s, 3s, 4s and 5s. So that was a very, very productive year for me.

And the graduate students, I thought they were the most amazing people that I'd ever met in my life. They all seemed so bright. Probably Jack is being archived in this. Jack and I arrived -- we were just about the same age, we were both younger than most the students because at that time most of the men were coming back from the war. Most of the male students were five, six, seven years older, had families, but some of us were very young like that. I think I felt I knew what anxiety was, maybe for the first time in my life because I didn't know anything in relation. They talked in such sophisticated terms and then we'd have a test and I'd make a 95 and those that seemed to know everything would make 79. I got a lot of confidence, but it was a hard, hard time for me and I entered into this period of being very negative to Baylor. I felt Baylor taught me nothing. I didn't know what science was, I didn't know what the research method was. I only knew that I wanted to help people, especially to help children. That hostility to Baylor lasted for maybe ten, maybe 15 years, by which time I was mature enough to know that Baylor taught me everything I was able to learn and maybe a few things extra. But my first really intellectual awakening came at the University of Iowa, and though I have only the two years of graduate study there they were so much more important than my last year which was at Washington University, and my degree is from Washington U.

The next thing is who are my research mentors; do you want me to deal with that?

Brisby: Yes, if you'd like to.

Caldwell: When I read this I didn't know how to do it and I told Bob because there were different ones at different periods. I mentioned Ojeman and Sears. I left Iowa after two years. I got married to my Baylor sweetheart. He was a freshman medical student and we had several hard years where I just had to make the living. I really had not been out of poverty at that point in my life, I would like to add that, and my folks didn't approve of my going to graduate school at all, gave me no help at all. I'm from the last generation maybe that can say I worked my way through school. Now it's so expensive nobody can possibly do it. Before I left Iowa, the Dean at Iowa at that time was a man named Carlisle Jacobson, a member of APA. He was a psychologist but he had been in the Department of Psychiatry at Washington University Medical School. Washington U Medical School is one of the greatest in the world, was then and still is. I made an appointment with him and talked to him about what I might do. I said I was going to be living in St. Louis and he gave me a name, he said, "The person you need to talk to is Frances Graham." He said nobody else down there is any good (or words to that effect) and Jacobson and Sears, whom I had already mentioned and a few others like Dollard and Miller, had all been part of a little enclave at Yale. Jacobson had kind of gone into administration and was at that time the Dean of the Graduate School at Iowa. He had been at Washington University Medical School.

Well, I went to St. Louis, then I looked up Frances Graham who is exactly ten years older than I am, one inch shorter, ten IQ points higher probably, wealthy. We were the opposite in many, many ways. I'm sure she has been archived. Fran's an ex-president of SRCD and she took to me like a duck to water. She was married and had two children at that time. Her husband was the son of the head of surgery at Washington U and was in internal medicine. She felt cut off from people who were "in", who were, as she used to say, "Young and bright". I don't know how Fran has done as she's gotten old, but Sears and all these people at Washington U were mad for people who were young and bright. At any rate, she was a very powerful figure in my life at that time. It took me a long time to call her Fran; I called her Dr. Graham. I'm nearly 70 now and these kids over at the day care call me Bettye! It's a little bit hard for me to understand some of this, but she was very happy sort of to keep that distance.

Probably the most significant thing I'm telling now is getting ready to happen here because Washington U changed my directions totally. It deflected me for a long time because they had nothing that had to do with children. I really didn't know what I was going to do. In fact, when I went to St. Louis the plan was that I would do a dissertation with Sears and that I would collect the data in St. Louis and go back and forth to Iowa City and so on. That plan didn't really work out for a number of reasons. One thing was that Sears went to Harvard. Another is that we couldn't have afforded the gas for me to go back and forth to Iowa City. And for another thing, the medical school setting was totally clinical. I don't think I knew what a clinical psychologist was -- I have a lot of trouble with it now and I certainly never had any desire to be a clinical psychologist. I went through a period from I guess 1947 to 1951 (when I finally got my Ph.D.) of being transformed temporarily into a clinician, but it was interesting: I did not transform. That again may be the first time in my life that somebody had tapped me on the shoulder and I resisted a little bit. I never lost the desire to work with children; and Fran worked as a psychologist part-time in the Department of Psychiatry -- I mentioned all of her connections. She was very highly connected in the medical school and that made it quite different from me, but she was very good to me in terms of seeing to it that people knew what I was doing and so on. They all identified me as somebody who was young and bright who was going to do something, but I never was really all that comfortable in that environment. The head of psychology had just come there. His name was Robert I. Watson. He's dead now and Fran was very negative to him. That little group had an arrogance to it. That always made me a little uncomfortable and they were very quick to point out flaws and so on, so I think Fran kind of tried to see to it that I didn't go with Watson intellectually or what have you. Though he was my boss, she kind of supervised me -- but he was really my boss.

The third person at Washington University who really may have been (other than Fran) the most important factor in my life was Alexis F. Hartman. He was clearly the start of the trajectory as to where I am right now. He was the Head of Pediatrics. I was 22 at the time, so I am talking about when I was 22 and 23. I thought he was an absolutely incredible man and he liked me. He was the head of a big department. The medical students loved him. His residents loved him. But I believe he was the shiest man I have ever known in my life. For some strange reason, maybe my Texas background, Dr. Hartman could talk to me and nothing pleased him more than for me to have some reason to come knock on the door of his office. He had a big red leather chair with a hassock and he always told me to put my feet up on that hassock. I don't know, ladies in Texas didn't do that, I was always a little bit embarrassed to do that; but there was nothing but wholesomeness in this, don't miss understand that. He used to talk to me about psychological tests. He said, "You know, they are good but they sort of bother me." He started wanting me to go on regular pediatric rounds and speak up and say what I thought about the children. I was as shy in that kind of a setting as Dr. Hartman was; but he was a specialist in the treatment of what's now famous: diabetes, also hypoglycemia. Well, Dr. Hartman had a little patient named Donna and he had asked, I think, Fran to do a psychological work-up on her. She had done one very summarily and said this child was retarded (or something like that). He asked me to see her. This little girl ended up raising at least \$100,000 for St. Louis Children's Hospital. Well, one of the talents -- I'm supposed to tell about my strengths -- that I always had is intuitiveness. I could see that this little girl, yes she was slow, but there was more there. You could just tell it. So, on my own -- I don't know what made me do this as I've never done it before or since -- I started coming back about every three hours and giving her a Cattel. Well, I had scores that just went all over the map. One time she might be 95 and the next time she's down here at 68 and the next time she'd

be at 74 or what have you. Well I went to show this to Dr. Hartman and said, "You know, I don't really know what to make of this." He said, "Well I don't either, but let's get her blood sugar at all those points." So we started a new pattern and this actually, if you will, is the beginning of APPROACH. I said, "I can't keep giving this same test because the practice effect comes in and so on. I've got to find other things that I can ask Donna to do" -- I've forgotten her last name. That would be 1950 that I first became interested in measures that show not stability but fluctuation. Well at any rate I did this little thing, probably testing her like twelve times and it really was beautiful. We got a correlation with her blood sugar that you wouldn't believe. And at that time there was a group of businessmen, mainly wealthy Jewish businessmen, who had formed something called the Children's Research Foundation in St. Louis. They raised money mainly for Dr. Hartman's research and this was the first big speech I ever gave in my life. He wanted me to talk to this group, this fund raising group, probably 1000 people in the audience. Apart from my contest in Texas, that was probably the last big speech that I had had to give. At any rate, I sketched out all of this and I think I had it interesting and they raised \$100,000 that night. Well, the reason I tell that story is Dr. Hartman then said, "We have to get some research money to look at what it is. We didn't know what this little girl was like before she developed this severe hypoglycemia," and said, "We really need to look into these things early in life."

That was really the beginning of my research career. We did get a small grant then with Dr. Hartman clearly being the principle investigator. On it there was an obstetrician who worked with us named Marion Benoyer. I've neglected to mention that during this period Fran and David Graham had gone somewhere back to the east where he took some training. So it was a lot easier for me to be kind of a senior person on this. I did not quite have my Ph.D. but I was close. Washington University accepted every credit that I had earned at Iowa which was amazing. In those days a full time job was Monday through Friday from 8-5 and Saturday 8-12 and so I got paid only 7/8ths time because I asked for permission to be able to take a course like 4:30 to 7:30. I mean you were there at those hours, so it took me a long time to finish it up.

Another very interesting thing: I mention this man, Robert I. Watson who was an important influence in my life. I don't give him enough attention probably, enough recognition. Very few people know that my dissertation is in gerontology. Now, I've mentioned that we had absolutely no money. During this time we lived with a family. The rent control had sort of gone off right after World War II and we lived with family near the medical school that had a little four-year-old girl, bright red hair. I was 22 and she was four. People thought I had had her early on. We had a room on the third floor, a room and a bath and an improvised kitchen in the basement of this house. We lived there for three years until Fred was out of medical school. I had always to have jobs. Well there was an internist at the medical school named Kountz, and a totally unknown OB-GYN man named William A. Masters. If I said it was Masters and Johnson, you'd recognize it right away. We're doing a study with older people at that time; and they were convinced that by administering the sex hormones that are now kind of standard they not only saw changes in the endometrium of the uterus (and maybe activity level), but they thought they saw psychological changes as well. So they went to this man Bob Watson and said, "Do you have somebody who could really check this out?" It was a half time job and, as I recall, paid \$3,000 and for half time. \$3,000 sounded like a lot of money to me at that time. So I took it as a job and that was the first study I ever really designed. Now when I say I designed it, I could say we must have a placebo group, things like that. Dr. Kountz and Dr. Masters were split totally during this. We're the ones who arranged for the hormones and all that, and we did this study in the City Home for the Aging. I had never set foot inside one in my life; and all my work I, you know, wanted it to be with children. Well, this was a job. My other job, at that time was in the Washington University Child Guidance Clinic and all my heart was in that particular job. At the end of the first phase of the study we found some profound differences between the groups. I read a report of a similar study, oh about four or five years ago, acting as though this were brand new and I was simply amazed at it. Bob Watson did the kindest thing anybody has ever done to me. He said, "There's no reason this can't be your dissertation. You planned the study; you did every bit of it." So I submitted that to Washington University. I had somehow assumed that you couldn't be paid for your dissertation. I sailed through and I got my Ph.D. Now my breast thing slowed me down so I actually finished the degree in 1951.

I continued to work with that project half time for another year then left it totally because by then Dr. Hartman had gotten this money that paid for me. Just as we got that proposal ready Fred got called up into the army. This happens and I had great hopes that he'd be stationed over in Europe. I had all kinds of ambitious ideas about that, resigned from my job, had learned that Frances Graham was coming back and had talked her up to Dr. Hartman so that he would hire Fran. So I've repaid my debt to Frances Graham and it really became her most significant work, certainly at that period. They actually got a grant to study effects of pre- and perinatal trauma of all kinds. It's funny, I've sort of forgotten where that grant came from. It was from a private foundation plus money from that Children's Research Foundation. I was gone for two years and taught at Northwestern during that time, did absolutely no research. Tried to analyze one study that I had done on my own in that child guidance clinic. It looked at the ability of children and mothers to predict what the other was going to say. Never have been able to make heads or tails out of the data. Then, when I went back to St. Louis, Dr. Hartman's research was already underway and Fran had been moved into the position that had been planned for me. But Dr. Hartman said, "We have to have Dr. Caldwell in this project." See how a pediatrician has always looked after me? That's really the truth when I think about it. So I was given a part-time job on that. For the other part, by that time I was getting old (I was 29) and these people from the Children's Research Foundation and the Association for Retarded Children had gotten some money together to establish a clinic for mentally retarded children and their families. I was tapped to be the first director of that clinic. And here, as I said, I had sort of run from clinical things. But this was different, this was something that I liked. It was probably the first time in my life that what I did got a lot of attention because I was at the Washington University School of Medicine and I was a Ph.D., not an M.D., had a long red pony tail, was 29 and headed this clinic. Not everybody received that with a great deal of enthusiasm I'm sure. That was a very important part of my life, running that little clinic. It was an early bit of experience in what some might call responsibility without authority because there was a quarter-time neurologist (a hateful, hateful man who hated children) and a quarter-time pediatrician who were assigned to work us. The pediatrician was wonderful and very, very helpful, but if I were to tell this neurologist that he needed to repeat something that he had done you can imagine that it did not go over very well. He didn't want to come to staff meetings. It was my first experience at having somebody see something like this as a perk he should have. This should just pay his salary but he shouldn't have anything that he had to do in it. I also had a full-time social worker who was a native Israeli, Asabra, and I have since seen her in Jerusalem. It was a wonderful introduction to me for advocacy. I made my first trip to a state capitol in that capacity. The person who was most responsible for getting the money was a wonderful man named Frank Akerman who was quite old. He had an adult Down's Syndrome son and had worked tirelessly over the years for facilities for the retarded particularly. And I remember the first time we took a special train from St. Louis to Jefferson City to lobby for things for the handicapped, and I remember I had a state senator say, "Well, Dr. Caldwell, what is the IQ anyway?" and I gave an impromptu five minute speech on IQ. He said something like, "Well I think I really understand it now." I don't know whether we got our law passed, but at any rate that was my first introduction to the work of advocacy and the importance of that in getting services for children.

Bradley: Bettye, I was wondering if I could change directions just a bit because I think that you've kind of reached a point in telling us a lot about the things that shaped you and how you got to be kind of where you were, particularly up to the early part of your career. I think that one of the reasons that SRCDC selected you to be a person archived is on the other side of that: what you have done, the contributions that have helped to shape the field of child development. I can certainly say that having worked with you for 20 years that I think I have some special insights in what those contributions have been. Certainly, as a professional, I'm aware that on several occasions people have actually surveyed those in the field and asked them to list those persons who have most impacted their thinking about early child care and early development. Almost without exception your name is one of the top five that is mentioned. So clearly I think you're acknowledged as a person who has shaped the thinking of many people about early child care. One special thing (and I think Judy would partly recognize this too) is I've had the privilege in many cases of following in your footsteps (but following them at some distance in time) and have gone back to some places where you have been, a place where you had either been a consultant, given a speech, served on

an advisory panel or something. When I walked through there long after you did, I have seen the actual impact of those contributions in action.

Caldwell: That's nice to hear.

Bradley: Well, but it's true. I can certainly talk about the general acknowledgment of your contributions in two key areas. One certainly has been in shaping policy, which you just began to mention, and how you got into that advocacy role. SRCD has already recognized you for your lifetime contributions in policy and advocacy, but I think you've also made a contribution to the research and to the intellectual history of our field as well.

Caldwell: A lot of that's due to you.

Bradley: Well, but I think it started way before I came. Importantly, I think you can offer some special insights. There's a lot of facets to what you have done in terms of your intellectual contribution. There have been trajectories that different ones of us know to be sure, but I think it would be helpful to the field for you to kind of move through and talk about what you think have been your most lasting contributions of an intellectual and research nature. Maybe give some insights as to, not only what they are, but also why you particularly think they have been so important to the field.

Caldwell: Well, I think that's good. I tend to ramble on these things. I was just really getting to what is still probably the most significant period of my life, my Syracuse years. I have to bring in Julius Richmond because my professional life has been tied with him even though I've lived in Little Rock for 25 years (or however many) and he has been in Boston. For the first time my interests and my professional opportunities came together in Syracuse and everything really changed and sort of permanized. That period began with me in 1960. I had had a wonderful pair of twins just as we left St. Louis in 1958 and hardly left the house for a year. Dr. Richmond I had met in St. Louis. He had looked at a job there and I had just met him briefly but I did not really know him. He called me, oh when my children were four or five months old, something like that, and said, "We must get together. I want you to know about this research. We could use you." I didn't want to work at that time, so he called again and several months went by. Shortly after the children were a year old I went to work on his project. Now the project that was underway at the time was funded by the Commonwealth Fund, and it was a very open-ended kind of study on mothers and children with essentially a lot of concern with what can happen in the well-child clinic that can give you clues about the mothering and so on. There was clearly far more interest on the mothering side than on the children even though this was a project in the Department of Pediatrics. I mentioned Commonwealth; they also had some Ford money. So Dr. Richmond asked me if I would come to work part-time with that project and build up the child side of this study, that was my assignment. Well it was really like God tapping me on the shoulder because, as I said, it was the first time that the interests that I had started out with were part of my research. I certainly can't claim to have started out wanting to be "a researcher". No, I wanted to help children. Well, in my inimical style I found many problems with that study. I came to work on it and went through a period of I wonder why we are not doing this, and I wonder why we haven't done that, and so on. It was the most remarkable group of people, absolutely remarkable -- several of them are dead now. Juli and I are still going strong, but they accepted that. I never have kind of gotten over that most people are so resentful, my coming in with ideas like that. I've got six ideas for everything, always had, and always will until Alzheimer's takes over. They were absolutely wonderful but the study, which was of a poor sample -- and this was kind of serendipitous -- they hadn't started out to study poor women. This was just the study that they were doing. I looked at the family situations and they were absolute chaos. I found myself thinking -- because I was in love with John Bowlby in that period and very impressed with his stuff on maternal deprivation. I had a fit if I might be three minutes late in getting home even though my children couldn't keep time and such things as that. I'd coined neologism, two of them really, to say that we had a small group of monomatric families there, one mother, very small and most of them were polymatric. Those children were growing up with multiple figures serving as their mothers; and some of them, they called three and four different

people “mama”. I also noted how, when I came into the study, the first group (the Ford Commonwealth group) had paid attention mainly to the mothers. They had given various personality tests -- the same kinds of things that we are using in our study today -- to the women prenatally and all along the way. Elaborate ratings of the mothers and children in the well-child room had been made as well. I started using not the Cattell but old Griffith’s Infant Intelligence Scale because I also liked that. I noticed the drop in IQ; I have drawn attention to this in many a speech. The children while they were still young were within the normal range, but by the time they were 18 months they were beginning to drop. When they were two, these children had been taken in the study and they were well below average IQ. I said to Dr. Richmond, “We didn’t pay enough attention to cognitive development in the early days of the study and I think we need to start a new longitudinal group.” Anybody who starts as many longitudinal studies as I have in my life is insane. Believe me, it’s pure insanity to do it. Well -- and Juli loves to tease me, he would want this in this archive -- I said I would like to write a small grant proposal that would allow me to have a half-time secretary. When he introduces me for a speech he always tells that story.

So here you’re not in it, Bob, for another ten years, but I wrote a proposal called *Infant Learning and Patterns of Family Care*. In that -- and here’s where all this other stuff that I had done fit in -- I originally wanted to do a parent education component. I wanted to divide my sample into two and have somebody making home visits. Of course none of us had heard of one another at that time. I didn’t know Ira Gordon existed and that other people were doing it. But two years before this, Orville Brim, who later headed the Russell Sage Foundation, had written a book. I forget the exact title of it, but it was about parent education, the effects of parent education. It was a very pessimistic book, said that it doesn’t really have any major effects. So Dr. Richmond said to me, “Well you know, I don’t think this should be our main experimental group,” which I had kind of designed. He said, “If we end up showing no difference, we won’t know whether the mothers didn’t do what we were recommending or whether you can’t really modify it. We need a setting in which we,” this became my term, “can control the input to the children.” So here is where I guess the next person who has been very important in my life came in, a man named Charles Gershenson. Charles Gershenson at that time was the head of the Children’s Bureau and was a very wise man. The Children’s Bureau was (and still is) basically a watch-dog organization. It’s supposed to make sure that children get a break in life. But it has a small research division and he headed that; and this is now 1963 or 4 and already the things like monomatric, polymatric families that we were describing, people were beginning to be aware that they were there. So, the first draft of a proposal I wrote to do this enrichment called for an infant school. Well, the notion of separating infants from their mothers was so unpopular at that time that we were turned down saying, “No, we would not allow you to do this. However, if you do this with children who are already in some kind of substitute care we would consider it.” Well, that meant daycare, a word I had never heard at that time, but Juli had because he had been active with the Child Welfare League and daycare was, at that time, totally a social service job. So Dr. Gershenson and his daycare expert came up to Syracuse and met us. Charles Gershenson knew Juli, and everybody adores Dr. Richmond. He’s the nicest man in the world but he didn’t know me from Adam and probably I sounded a little like an upstart in that proposal or something, but he was convinced that I was a good person at heart and that this was a good idea because this man had literally been trying to get people to consider doing this. It was -- our word now is politically correct -- it was so politically incorrect in terms of both politics and the science of that time that most people wouldn’t touch it. I went into it thinking I was going to be a young turk heroine; and for five years I was a young turk villain, literally vilified by a lot of well-meaning people who still see me as advocating daycare, wanting to get all children in daycare; they have totally misunderstood the theme.

At any rate, the question here about shifts in your life, that was a paradigm shift in my life and I really have never shifted from it. I’ve been on that trajectory ever since in one form or another. The seeds were planted for virtually every theme of any significance that I have done since in that period. I began work on the HOME Inventory -- which I called Stim originally -- in 1964, I got that first grant in 1963 and began work on this Inventory of Home Stimulation in 1964, maybe even late ’63. That was a real breakthrough idea at that time. Everybody was saying these things are important but nobody had really attempted to identify what the factors were that made a difference. Of course, it’s only been

since Bob joined me in this that it has been so improved because the early version wasn't all that great. Now going back, the reason I told that story about Dr. Hartman I was still struck by the need for procedures that were not stable, that would reflect changes in a child's life, A but B also. Somebody asked me the other day what my strength in tennis is and I finally thought of what it was. I said, "I can get to the ball." My strength in research and child development has been thinking of things that needed to be done roughly 20 years before they became important. I was sensitive at that time to what was developing of an anti-testing climate. I don't even remember where it came from, but it was actually because of that primarily that I began to work on APPROACH. I wanted something that was a "non-test" appraisal of a child's behavior, but it also went back to little Donna. I wanted something that would identify what a child could do when a child felt good, didn't feel good; so we had a big health component to that early program. That was a real paradigm shift in my life and I think that everything that I have done since then was somehow part of it. The development of Kramer, which is still the most important thing I have done, grew directly out of that and the realization that if you have this early childhood program and are totally isolated from schools you lose them and the effects are going to be dissipated. I still see on a scale of one to ten a social importance of Kramer as like a 50, but I wouldn't have conceptualized Kramer if it hadn't been for running that project at Syracuse.

One question that's asked on here is what I see as published and unpublished manuscripts which best represent my thinking about child development. I wrote three or four papers during that period, most of which are published in very obscure places that are worth resurrecting in 1994. The first paper I ever gave that got a lot of attention was really before this that was the one on critical periods. But I wrote in 1965 a paper called "What is the Optimum Learning Environment for the Young Child" and it's probably the best paper I've ever written. It's 30 years old almost and it has a little summary at the end that says probably the best learning environment for a young child is his own home with his own mother if conditions exist there that are necessary to support development, but if those conditions aren't there then that's not the optimal learning environment. I also wrote a paper about this time -- my metamorphosis into an educator was becoming pretty complete and I learned about the Deutches, I learned about Weikert, and I learned about other people, none of us knew one another at the time and suddenly there were a lot of conferences. Hal Robinson from North Carolina, you had him as a --

Bradley: I missed him. He had left North Carolina.

Caldwell: He had gone to Washington before you went there.

Bradley: Just before.

Caldwell: I gave a paper at one conference that Hal had organized called the Fourth Dimension, it was kind of like the Critical Periods paper in which I stated my conviction of the tyrannical nature of time. I don't think we have the fluidity about doing things at any given time that we intend to. Then the other paper I've written that I think is the best paper I've written is that one on children's rights. It is ten years old, ten or eleven years old now. The studies though, now those are all papers with ideas. The HOME studies are by far the most important research studies. They are the most important and they've had the most impact.

Bradley: You know Bettye, I hate to interject here, but I think that they talk about unpublished papers as well. I think that you have particular ideas in your speeches, some of which you have turned into published papers and some of which -- many, many of which -- you have not. I think you have expressed ideas, which in my mind, are very important ideas. I can state one, and I'd like your reaction to maybe this one and some others. I remember a speech that you gave -- it's just been a couple three years ago now -- on a thing that still concerns us greatly. It is about the attachments that children form to various caregivers. I think you were expressing ideas there that have now been seen by others. I wonder if you might speak to that idea; you may think that's an important one, you may not think it's an important one.

Caldwell: I think it's an important one and I'm sorry I haven't published that. I have one other unpublished paper, called "Basing Early Intervention Programs and Children's Needs" that I think is terribly important because I've said the curriculum itself doesn't matter if you meet a child's needs. In that paper I tried to say what they were. Actually, it was published somewhere in Brazil, and like some of the rest of my good ones, I don't know whatever happened to it. I intend to resurrect both of those. I'm also working on an updated version of that Children's Rights paper. I think the last paper I have written that I think has ideas that people should remember -- again a paper that has nothing to do with my research -- says that critical period is a concept that people need to internalize because it's essential that we stop thinking of infancy as an experience in a child's life that doesn't involve essentials and basics. I publish things in out of the way places so that only the ones who really work at it can find them and I never send unsolicited requests. At any rate, I think I have to single out the Syracuse era because it really has shaped me more than any period of my life, maybe I was the right age there, critical period.

Bradley: Critical period. This also leads me to wonder about the history you've had. You certainly have already mentioned two very important research projects that you had funded: the Syracuse project and then the Kramer project. But I wondered if you wanted to talk about other involvements that you've had with getting research funded, sort of the good and the bad or the whatever that has happened, and how that's effected what you've been able to do and the contributions that you've been able to make.

Caldwell: I've been incredibly lucky and blessed along those lines. We probably could have had more money than we've asked for. If we'd had graduate students we would have written more proposals and I include you in them. It seems to me that we have not ever had a totally dry period and I always tell young people this, that the secret of a happy professional life is to be in an area that gets discovered while you're in it, and believe me I have been in that. The early childhood field was nothing and nobody paid any attention to it at that time. And you have some questions here about SRCD on this. I've always had this good fortune until now; I'm over the hill now, but I have always been perceived by the leaders of this field as being somebody who had a lot of potential. I'm very grateful for that. SRCD at the time that I am talking about was not supportive of daycare particularly. I mean, after all the leading psychologists in the field and a lot of the leading pediatricians had made their names by being associated with various early childhood programs: the Arnold Giselle, Milton Sen, the Yale Institute and so on, but many of them seemed unable to see daycare and I could not understand why they couldn't see the fantastic relevance of this for the welfare of society. That puzzled me. I can remember hearing various ones (and I won't mention these names because I'd say in a pejorative way) say, "Why are you fooling with daycare, why are you so heated up about this?" I would say, "Just look at the numbers of children who are involved in this. Think about the potential impact. If you think the early childhood years are important, how can you not be concerned about it?" And yet it was a long time before people who represented the core, the "in group" if you will, of SRCD concerned it an important topic. I think that's because SRCD did carry the banner as the basic research group. The research, if you think back on our research at Kramer, couldn't have been sloppier, but you cannot do neat and elegant research when you do it in live settings. It's just next to impossible to do it that way.

Bradley: I wonder, Bettye, I think you've really touched on a terribly important thing. Daycare is a good example of something that didn't have cache I guess at the moment or didn't have the kind of credibility as a focus for research investment. You served as editor of *Child Development*. You served on the SRCD Council. You served on Maternal Child Health Research Review Committee for funding. I guess it would be useful to know the kinds of things that you did or tried to do that helped move an idea like that one or maybe some of the things you encountered while you were doing it that would enable people to get into child care as a bona fide area of research and to get funding for those kind of efforts that might give some insights into just how it works.

Caldwell: Well certainly research follows funding, as you know. And getting it has been a big factor in doing it. The first part of what you said: it's been interesting. I'm really not an organization woman. I don't do too well in organizations. Now, I have been on the board of how many? I've been on the

Board of Ortho, I've been on the Governing Board of SRCD and I was fairly young when I was elected to that. Then of course I've been president of NAEYC and the only reason I mention those things is the only one where I've had what I consider a following was NAEYC. I was at the national meeting last week when I got sick -- Ann has heard this story -- or I got sicker, I was sick when I went. Somebody told me the next day they introduced all the past presidents and boy did they applaud long when you were introduced and I said softly, "But I wasn't here!" She said, "Well there were 9000 people there, so nobody could know." But I was kind of heroic in that group because I brought daycare in. Most people felt like they were outcasts, but I had nothing to do with research.

When I was on the Governing Board of SRCD (and I will not mention any people on it because some of these things others would perhaps not report as accurate) but I thought the Board was very insensitive to social issues. By that I mean policy issues. A lot of the power on the Board was held by traditionalists who saw SRCD as the last bastion of basic science research. Now, in the bylaws there are certain guidelines for non-psychologists -- you know there are some directors and members of the Governing Board who are elected and some are appointed. Well since about 50% of the members have always been developmental psychologists they have always had some appointed positions for pediatricians, anthropologists, other people who are important to child development but who wouldn't have that kind of following in the field. Well, when I was first on the Board I felt that the most important thing for the Governing Board to do was to get rid of a sea of white faces. When they filled this room everybody on it was lily white and I made this point. There was also a very militant woman (whom I will not mention) who had basically called me aside and said we are about ready to blow this organization up if it stays this way. I tried to tell the Board that. Most of them were totally insensitive to it though as individuals they were all basically concerned and wanted to see things integrated and all that. I kept saying there's no reason why we can't use two of these appointed positions to get some blacks on this Board or some Spanish-speaking people. No, historically they are to be reserved for pediatricians or psychiatrists, for M.D.s. I kept saying, "Well that was one period in history, this is another and the organization needs this more." Well, I became pretty obnoxious I think on the Board and did not succeed to any great extent though they did finally appoint a minority participation subcommittee and I was the Board representative to that committee. You're on the Board six years I think, so it's a long thing but at that time -- I forget when I was on that Board, I think mid 70s. Now I think it's totally different. Of course now we have a social policy newsletter. I always enjoy reminding people when they talk about this that volume three of the *Child Development and Research*, which Henry Ricciuti and I co-headed, has a subtitle, *Child Development and Social Policy*. You know you talk about a book with beautiful architecture, that is one. We basically took every basic science issue, like the effects of early intervention, and we'd have one chapter on that and then in the next section we would have a chapter that dealt with the applied aspects of early interventions: what are the effects of part-day versus full-day programs in terms of attachment? Mary Ainsworth wrote a beautiful chapter on attachment. Then we had a social worker who wrote a chapter on children in foster homes and adoption to show how these theoretical constructs related to the real world. It is structurally speaking a beautiful sort of book. Well nobody paid any attention to that aspect of it at that time, but they do now. I am utterly delighted to see this as a change in SRCD. I think it has come a long way and I think it has come the right way now. Of course I never have felt that basic research, as we define it, is any more important than applied research; but I am curious. I'm an applied sort of person. It's just like, remember our behavior mod system at Kramer? It works beautifully in textbooks but in the school it was a fiasco. Kids stole the tokens. They had their own deals for trading them, passing them around. The applied test has got to be made.

Brisby: Bettye, I'm not as familiar with your background as Bob is and I have not been around you as long; I wondered if you would tell me a little bit about the research projects that you have been involved with.

Caldwell: They've actually been very few. They've all been these major projects. The first St. Louis one, the Effects of Pre and Perinatal Trauma on Development, led to the development of the infant scale that came to be known as the Graham, Matteratzol and Caldwell, which is the foundation for the Brazelton Scale. Incidentally, I met Berry Brazelton at that time. Judy Rosenblith came out to St. Louis

to see how we did that scale. Then there was the Syracuse work. We have not talked really much about the Kramer Project, which I said was the most important; but it would be difficult to call Kramer a research project because it was funded as research but it was almost clinical. It was almost clinical in that you couldn't control anything in that; when you tried to do something in a public school and everything was regulated by things like desegregation rulings and regulations. By law you couldn't even experiment extensively with placing children in different groups. So it was much more descriptive than you could ever say of research, but it was still the most important thing I've ever done. The work on the HOME has gone on behind the scenes for many, many years. I often tell people that it's the scientific side of me; and you've been involved in it for ten years now. I think the HOME Inventory -- I'm proud of it -- is a very significant idea. Again, somebody will come along with a better scale one of these days, and as we both know it's getting to the point where people are scared to use it because we have such social problems. People don't want to go into homes, but the notion that the home environment can be assessed and that on the basis of this you can identify areas in which a child needs additional stimulation or help. That may sound very simple but that's actually a very profound and terribly important idea and I'm very proud of that. The stuff we are doing on the APPROACH right now I think is going to turn out to be a very important bit of research because the world is looking for a method like this that can be used. Here it's so much more appropriate now in the age of the computer than it was when it first started. I think those are the main things that I have done.

Actually, when you talk about most important papers I think my most important contributions, Judy, have not been data. I think they've been ideas. I don't know whether that's right or not but as I look back on it I think maybe I never said that before, but I think that's probably accurate. I've never done any really landmark study. I've been associated with a lot of good research, take IHDP the stuff on the walls here now, that was an exemplary project. But my contributions of something like that I don't think has been as great as some of the really simple ideas I've had. People just either didn't articulate or didn't bother to live by them.

Brisby: I wonder if you would tell us a little bit about your experiences as a teacher and perhaps as a trainer for research personnel.

Caldwell: Well I think my greatest impact has been in informal settings, as you know. Like now, I think I have these girls so turned on who are working on the APPROACH. Things go a lot better that way. I have been a teacher over the years and I think my teaching went downhill from maybe 1990 on. I was happy to stop teaching. One's focus becomes narrower and if I'm interested in the development of language I don't want to spend three weeks talking about math. It's important and all that, but the survey type thing is not all that important to me. But I have enjoyed teaching. The only regret I have in my career is that I haven't had doctoral students. That's most unfortunate because it would have been nice to have someone to develop more of these ideas that float around me. I come in with one about every other week that I would like to have something done with. But I have loved teaching and I'd hear I used to be a really good teacher, but I don't think I was all that good at the time I pulled out.

Brisby: I remember a lot of the students saying, "Oh, be sure and get Dr. Caldwell's class."

Caldwell: Well, that's good. My favorite two courses to teach were the one that I designed for the UALR program: Early Childhood Education History, Trends, and Programs. Over the years as you know, I've gotten more and more interested in history. I have learned a lot about it. The other, believe it or not, favorite course of mine is Introduction to Methodology, and unfortunately or fortunately I seem to give lectures on it in our steering committee meetings.

Brisby: Speaking of that, I think the NICHD study maybe is another research project that you might mention that you're involved with that's going to be a big one.

Caldwell: Well, it's the most important: the NICHD study of early child care. Incidentally, I have long been interested in multi-psych research. Wrote a paper (probably 1965) in which I advocated this because that was when those of us in early intervention had kind of discovered one another. and I

thought we all had just 30 or 40 subjects. I thought, wouldn't it be wonderful if we could pool our subjects? It wasn't feasible to do that. The IHDP was the first time that I ever saw it and anybody made it work. There were a lot of collaborative studies before then that were in the child development field including one that grew out of that of St. Louis study on the Effects of Pre and Perinatal Dysfunctions. The first big collaborative project was a direct outgrowth of that study but I think certainly in this one we are learning how difficult this kind of research is. It is very, very difficult to have a multi-headed organism thinking and making decisions and so on. Even though obviously the original proposals were similar enough that they fit the RFA and therefore could get funding, but little differences can mean a tremendous amount in that kind of work. If I could do that study again - well, in the first place, I probably wouldn't do it -- I would make a much stronger case for a better balance between sight-specific and common protocol. I think that we have actually forfeited some of what could have been the beauty of the study by having so much of the effort devoted to the common protocol. Now I'm one of the ones who thought it was always going to be 75/25, don't misunderstand, but I think it would have been a better study if it had been more like 50/50.

Well I've been on all of those and have enjoyed it. The first one I was on was the Children's Bureau and the same one that funded our Syracuse project and those are terribly important positions. It's the hardest work and it is thankless work. You had a stack of proposals that high and you cannot read them quickly and superficially and be fair and I've done a lot of that for private foundations or public. I usually turn it down now. I feel that I've done my share of it and it's time for somebody else to pass it along; but it is terribly, terribly important work. You want to know about my history with SRCD?

Brisby: Yes, I was going to ask you when you first joined and what you might have done.

Caldwell: I think I joined in 1957 but I'm not sure about that. That may not be the right year. It was about that time before I would have had the money to pay the dues. I know that the first meeting I went to was in Iowa City. Marion Radke-Yarrow, who headed that lab at NIMH for many years, her husband, Leon Yarrow, and I had offices next door to one another at Iowa. Marion, I remember was pregnant, and delivered a Presidential Address and boy I felt that was just the greatest thing ever. I can remember sitting around singing with some of the big names and being very, very impressed with that. I have attended most of the SRCD biennial meetings since then. I've missed one or two probably but I've attended most of them. I used to say one of the things I liked most about the Society was that it met only every other year. I did a very important thing for the Society that we haven't talked about, I edited the journal for three years. I was happy, felt good that I was replaced with four people. I become editor at the wrong time. I think Dr. Richmond probably is the one who steered the committee toward me. I wasn't really all that well known at that time. I thought when I moved to Little Rock I'd been banished to Siberia and I was very, very sad at leaving Syracuse. That, remember, was the first time I have ever done what I had started out to do. At any rate, I was asked to become editor just when I moved (and I had to move) and getting the children adjusted. Then right after that I got the Kramer grant. Never in my life have I worked as hard, though I have always been a hard worker. I just couldn't stick out the five years. Henry and I also edited that review of *Child Development Research* during that period, but the editing of the journal is a big job and even though I resigned early, which was wise, I'm glad to have been an editor of the journal.

Brisby: What would you say are the most important changes that occurred in SRCD and maybe its activities during your association with it over the years?

Caldwell: Definitely the move toward awareness of policy implications of research and concern with it. Sometimes SRCD people to me didn't used to sound as humane as I wanted them to. They were much more concerned with hard-nosed research. I see a lot of change in that, though. I think the meetings in general are excellent and I think that I've mentioned this change now that's much more concerned with the human side of science and with all of the social issues with which we all have to deal.

Brisby: During the time over the years that you've been really involved in research and in child development, what are your views concerning importance of the issues that have changed over the years?

Caldwell: I don't think they've changed all that much. I've traced out the fact that certainly I've had a one-track mind over all these years, but I haven't ever left the track. I do think the concern about conditions for rearing children have always been important. They were as important at the time I began as they are now. I do, however, worry that political correctness has invaded SRCD. I say I'm glad that it's more concerned with policy issues now, but I think I'd like to hear somebody coming out right now, besides me, saying sure we ought to be studying this orphanage bit. But I think there is kind of an overarching fear right now, maybe more than there used to be, that you have to study the right kinds of things and you and I know (and really everybody knows) that there are some absolutely dire conditions in families now; we don't need the HOME scores to tell us that. And so I see the need to be willing to grapple with these problems. Now I would like to see SRCD concerned with the issue of welfare. What would work, what would be the effects on children if you cut mothers off after two years? These are the kinds of issues it seems to me our Society for Research in Child Development needs to deal with. I don't really care how many times children blink when you show them a triangle as oppose to showing them a square; I know it's important but I just don't care that much about it!

Brisby: Now Bettye, you've just told us so very much about yourself, which I'm sure is only the tiniest tip of the iceberg. I wonder if we might end today's session by really giving us a little bit of information about your current family life. I know that just recently your daughter married and moved away. I wonder if you'd just tell us a little bit about your family and your personal interests, as if you had all this free time to do these extra things, I'd like to know besides work what you might do.

Caldwell: Well, I have been married to the same man for some 47 years, which is kind of a record in today's world, especially when you consider the two of us! We have two fine children. They are twins, boy/girl twins who are man/woman twins now 36 years old. My son and his wife have two precious little girls, one five and the other one and a half. My daughter, who was married only this year, I'm happy to say doesn't have children. So that tells you something about our family values, if you will. I'm very close to my roots that you started me with on this. My sister lives also in this area. We're so very close to her and her two sons and one of them has two children. I'm still very close to the little town of Smithville. Just last night I filled out a form; apparently this is the 100th anniversary of Smithville High School from which I graduated. I signed up to go to something and when they asked me what I did I said I was a twirler!

Brisby: So you are actually be going back to a homecoming type situation.

Caldwell: My husband is a devoted fly fisherman, and in my old age I took up tennis and I love to play tennis. I play either three or four times a week (would play every day if I could, but I don't think my knee would hold out if I did that). Other than that, I greatly enjoy travel and I love art. I've always loved music, that never diminishes; and finally I have to say I love my work. Margaret Mead wrote years ago that the luckiest people in the world were people who always found that their work was like their hobby and I've kind of been that way. I sometimes feel that at the end of the month I should pay for the privilege of doing the things that I have done.

Talking about personal things: I didn't get to Dr. Casey and Dr. Fiser. Through them my life has really come full circle over this past year. I mentioned how my first significant work occurred in a department of pediatrics and a year ago I left my university position and joined a department of pediatrics headed at that time by a very visionary, farsighted, and energetic man named Robert Fiser. He unfortunately has become ill and is no longer the chair of a unit called CARE. I really like that even though it stands for Center for Applied Research and Evaluation, it does still spell "care", and that's headed by another pediatrician, Dr. Pat Casey. We have a very congenial group and it's been a very

good ambiance for the continuation of the child development things in which I have been interested all these years.

Brisby: Is there something about your current family and situation that has really had a bearing on your scientific interest?

Caldwell: I don't really think so. That's an interesting question. Like Mr. Akerman, that man in St. Louis, his experiences with his son lead him to help fund that project. I was interested in these things long before I had children; and I mentioned the reason I told that story about Mrs. Scutter in Baylor, I was interested in a better opportunity for poor children when I was 14 or 15 years old. So, I really don't think that my current family had a lot to do with what I do. There was more in my family of origin, although I don't remember any discussion about it. In fact I think my family thought I was a little odd that I was concerned about that, but I really don't think that having my own children was significant, with the exception of things like I went to work part-time when my children were one year old. I think women who say, "Oh there's no conflict to the situation," just aren't truthful. I have been blessed with the energy of three people by and large, and there have been times when it has ground me down to the point of where I could barely, barely function. Furthermore it's hard on the kids, and I would like, as a daycare researcher, to get in my archive that it's very hard for it not to be difficult for the children. It's difficult to have it all. I've lived a life where I've tried to have it all, if you will, not consciously, but I just mean I have a family and I have a good career and so on. But I would not be one to say for young women or men in the future that it happens without a cost. There is no such thing as a free lunch.

I think that's a good place to end!

Brisby: I want to thank you very much and we will close at this time.