

Jacqueline J. Goodnow

- Born: 11/25/1924 in Toomwoomba, Queensland, Australia
- Spouse: Bob Goodnow
- B.A. Hons. Psychology - University of Sydney. Ph.D. Department of Social Relations - Harvard University (Radcliffe).



Major Employment:

- George Washington University - 1961-1972
- Macquarie University - 1972-Present

Major Areas of Work:

- Problem solving
- Cognition
- Developmental psychology
- Two-choice learning
- Social values in families

SRCD Affiliation:

- Member since 1960
- 1997 - Award for Distinguished Scientific Contributions to Child Development

SRCD ORAL HISTORY INTERVIEW

Jacqueline J. Goodnow
Emeritus, University of Macquarie

Interviewed by Agnes Dodds
University of Melbourne

At Dr. Goodnow's home in Sydney, Australia
December 5, 2008

[On reading this transcript, Jacqueline Goodnow has asked that some short preface remarks be added, providing any reader with some indications of what they may find. It is, first of all, a long history, ranging from 1924 to the interview date (2008), with an active involvement in research still continuing (this note was added in March, 2010).

That covers more than a period of personal history. It also covers a period of changes in which SRCD played a major part: changes in the people who came into the developmental field (in my generation, most came in from a background in other areas), in concepts of development (both the conditions that influenced it and the age groups covered), in the strength of interest in social policy, and - perhaps the most striking - changes in concepts and practices related to cultural diversity and to gender. In short, it is a history that may be read with several interests in mind.]

Dodds: This is an interview with Jacqueline Goodnow, Professor Emeritus of the University of Macquarie being interviewed by Agnes Dodds at the University of Melbourne on the 5th of December, 2008 in Jacqueline Goodnow's home in Sydney. I think we can now begin.

Please describe your family background along with any childhood and adolescent experiences that may be of interest.

Goodnow: That's going back quite a way. Where to begin? Why don't I start with a question about where I was born? That was in a town that won't be recognized in the U.S., a town called Toowoomba in the state of Queensland in Australia. I grew up partly in the city and partly in the country. I started primary school in Queensland: at a very small country school and at age five. Primary school was spent partly there and partly in another town in another State--Queenbeyan, but basically they were small schools, often with combined classes. And I think that was influential. There was really not much competition. So I had from the start thought I could do pretty well in school without very much effort.

In terms of family background--well, that's complicated isn't it? I think the most important experience in terms of family background were two aspects of my parents' styles. My mother had been taken out of high school at the legal age -- which at that time was after three years of high school -- because her mother didn't believe that education was all that important for girls. She said, "No, you'll leave school and you'll go off to secretarial school," and my mother stayed as a secretary, ultimately being a secretary to my father. But she resented enormously the fact that she'd been taken out of school. Her description of that choice was that she decided "My children can go to school for as long as they like, as long as they win scholarships and they're doing well." I don't think she ever anticipated that they would all go on for as long as they did. I think she had university in mind, but not necessarily PhDs and all that. But she had the satisfying experience of seeing her 6 children do well and she had to work at it: her siblings thought all her children were getting over educated. I certainly started University with the intention or with the expectation that I would be a high school teacher in English although later I dumped the major in English, stopping after 3 years in favor of psychology.

So that was my mother's orientation: education and schooling was absolutely critical provided that you continued to do well and to win scholarships that would pay your way. You had to demonstrate that you were putting an effort in.

My father comes from a much more rural family. Actually, they both had rural backgrounds, but my mother comes off a small farm and didn't see any future in rural life. My father comes from a family that had a fair amount of land and a fair amount of money, which they lost when he was about 14, so he also was taken out of school at the earliest--after year ten. He went to work first of all as an apprentice in a bank, and later trained as an accountant. Another brother was sent off to be a clerk in a legal firm. They all had to do things that they never expected to have to do. But my father's attitude was that, Well, education was all right for people who really cared about it, but the only thing that really counted was land. That's what you really should have. And if you didn't have land then basically his attitude was that you could do what you like.

So those were two early experiences. My father's attitude was, well, you can do what you like and you should try and enjoy it, and my mother's attitude was that schooling was a marvelous thing and you should get every bit of it that you possibly can.

Dodds: No military experience? Early work experience?

Goodnow: Oh, my earliest work experience would have been over the Christmas holidays. Most students went off and found jobs like working in a department store. I did that from--oh, what was the legal age for doing that? Yes, 15 probably. I did that until I finished high school and probably in the first couple of years at university. It all seems so long ago - way back actually.

Oh, there's one other early experience that is important to me in terms of family background. When I was in third grade in this relatively small country school, I was demoted to second grade for talking too much in class. I left the school and went home and--to my enormous pleasure - my mother didn't send me back. She waited until the nuns came over from school. Then she said, "Well, she can go back, but she goes back to third grade." I think that said something about her too, that she didn't feel--she felt it was unfair and it was not in line

with her idea of my children of progressing through school in the fastest way possible. So I went straight on. I finished primary school when I was 11 and then had to stop another year, something to do with the legal age of going into high school. But then I skipped a year in high school, so when I finished high school I was just turning 16, which is ridiculously young. I went to the university at the age of 16. I think that's too young, but it wasn't too bad. There's a category of children called "young brights" and they're often people who sort of have a trajectory of their own. But they feel comfortable about it. At least in the school system they're going to work out very well. Your social life is a bit restricted and I felt very strongly that I was forever playing any competitive sport with people who were in lower grades, because we were assigned by age.

I guess that pretty well covers early experiences. Okay?

Dodds: Well, then we move on to what early adult experiences were important to your intellectual development, perhaps particularly things at university.

Goodnow: Well, one aspect of that had to do with the choice of psychology. At the end of three years, I had an English major and a psychology major. I began a psychology major simply because the University of Sydney insisted that you had to include one science subject in your arts degree. That was a problem. I'd gone to a school that taught Latin and Greek and luckily taught both Mathematics One and Mathematics Two. But we had no science: not only no physics or chemistry but also no biology, no zoology, no botany. When I looked through the list of offered science subjects, there was this subject called psychology that counted as a science subject and I thought, "That sounds OK." Anything that I hadn't done in high school sounded very interesting. Then I discovered it was fascinating -- nowadays most undergraduates would say it was terrible. It was all about vision, and hearing, and maze learning and things like that - - but to me it was totally new. Then I discovered that you could actually get a job working as a psychologist, so I thought, "Well, I don't necessarily have to be an English high school teacher."

Those early experiences were also lessons about nature of work: What it offered and what it required. At the end of the third year I felt ready to go into some form of paid work rather than take what is called in Australia an Honors year: a fourth year with selective entry based on your performance in the previous years. But I then discovered that if I went to work I would be paid junior wages. I could do exactly the same job, but I would be paid as a 19 year old and it would be two years before I was paid as an adult. So I said to myself, "Oh, that's ridiculous. I'll go back and do an Honors year." But at the end of that year I was still under 21. Luckily, one of the department's faculty offered me a job as a laboratory assistant, basically helping people go through their practical experiments.

So those were some early collegiate experiences. Intellectually, I think the most important thing in terms of early experiences is that there was a very well read Professor in that department and he had brought work by Lewin to my attention. So for my fourth year theoretical essay, I did a survey of Lewin's theory.

Dodds: Lewin? That was unusual.

Goodnow: Yeah, I think he was probably the only person in Australia who knew anything about Lewin. For that year, you also had to do an experimental thesis, but you could choose your own project. This same Professor had had us reading something on Piaget, so I did a study asking whether children really felt that once you played a game like cricket you couldn't change the rules. That was actually a developmental study but there was a long break after that before I went back to child development.

For me, a further influence was again an experience that was not strictly intellectual. It was more a case of learning what was possible. I got thrown out of the Honors year by the Professor for whom we did the experimental study because I hadn't consulted him for the first six weeks. My feeling was that I had to go on and shape the project first and then I could come back and say, "This is what I would like to do, and I've done a pilot study, etc., etc." His idea

was that I should be consulting with him right from the very beginning. I went away and wept a little and then I thought, "No, this is ridiculous, there must be another way to do this." So I went back and apologized very nicely and wept and sort of said, it was out of respect for him, etc., etc., etc., and he allowed me to come back. He was the faculty member who offered me a job after the Honors year as a demonstrator working with him, so I guess he must have thought that I had behaved properly for the rest of the year. I think that was the first time I had ever realized that, "Okay, these things can happen, but you can recover from them if you really have to"—an important early collegiate experience.

I went from there to being a Demonstrator for a couple of years and then was appointed as a Temporary Lecturer for another couple of years and I started doing an MA. At that time, you couldn't do a Ph.D. in Sydney. You had to go overseas to do that. So I started an M.A., but still not on anything developmental. At that time there was a new Head of Department, whose major interest was in factor analysis, so we all became very knowledgeable about factor analysis. And I felt, oh, this is really a bit weird. They give all these factors names --this is a spatial factor, for instance, but you can solve those problems in all kinds of ways. You could solve them algebraically, and you could solve them visually and so forth. So I figured that what you should do what to do is take all these spatial tests and get people to identify exactly how they did them and then see if the factor loadings corresponded or not. Then Cecil Gibb, one of the senior lecturers—I had been doing some co-reading with him; he was a social psychologist—said, "Look, where do you think you're headed?" "Well," I said, "I've been a Temporary Lecturer now for a couple of years and everybody says I do it very well. I'm teaching the first year classes, which have 12 hundred students, so I teach the same lecture three times a day and I get rave reports on teaching. I've been awarded a University Medal for the Honors year work, I'm almost finished an M.A. and sooner or later there'll be a lectureship with tenure." He said, "I think you should go talk to the Head of the Department," which I did. And this Head of Department, the factor analysis one, said, "How many women do you think have tenure in Sydney?" I asked: "How many?" He said, "Two; one is in mathematics and the other is in philosophy." I said, "Oh, sooner or later you're going to have a tenured position here," and he said, "Yes, and that'll be around about the time that the war is over and there'll be a whole lot of people coming back who are returned soldiers, and there'll be two things against you. One is that you are female and you're the kind of woman who's likely to get married, and you will be competing with the returned soldiers." So, I thought, "not much future here at all." I went back to the very kind senior lecturer who had asked, "Where do you think you're headed?" and said, "What do I do now?" He said the only solution was to go overseas and get a Ph.D. and come back, because none of the returned soldiers would have Ph.D.s and I'd be in a much stronger competitive position. So I asked, "Where do I go and how do I finance this?" "Well," he said, "You apply for a traveling scholarship". I was lucky to get one of these, so the next question was: Where to go?"

The idea I ran past Cecil Gibb was that I go to Bryn Mawr, because a faculty member there - Eugenia Hanfmann - was working on thinking in people who have schizophrenia. I basically like to learn how people think. That was true for the rules of the game study and it was true for the spatial factor stuff. And I'd begun reading some of her stuff about schizophrenia and how difficult it was to comprehend the nature of their thinking. It was a challenge to all theories of thinking (I really did not know just how difficult it would be). My mentor's relatively gentle response was "No, that's not a good idea. That's a small university. You should go to a big one because the peer group there will be better for you. You'll learn as much from the peer group as you will from the faculty --and that will be your--it becomes your peer group forever." He recommended Harvard or Berkeley or Illinois, which is where he had gone. And Harvard had just started a new department called Social Relations. You could specialize in Psychology, Anthropology or Sociology but you had to do some of each: "I think that's the place you should go." I owe that man a great deal, and I came to regard him as a model for myself when later I was in a potential mentor role.

So I went to Harvard, took the required courses and the required exams etc. Over that time, I was a research assistant to Leo Postman and then to Jerry Bruner and to Robert Bush, who was working with Fred Mosteller. All very cognitive, and all with adults.

Dodds: So where does the interest in child development come in?

Goodnow: Well, after the Honors year I was working for quite some time on judgments about probability and I was not interested in developmental questions at all. All the work was with adults. I did a Ph.D. with Fred Mosteller on how people made probability judgments: a big thing in studies of learning in those days. Later, as a post-doc I worked with Jerry Bruner and George Austin on the book: *A study of thinking*. So that wasn't developmental either.

The only reason I got interested in development was that—No, there were two things. One is that I had heard through the grapevine that Piaget had written a book on probability and that John Flavell was writing a book about Piaget. So I wrote to him and asked for advice because “all I can find is in French”. And he said, “Well, that's all in French, but here are my-- here are drafts on the other chapters.” By that time I was feeling a bit--I was running dry on the probability stuff and I felt it would be--this could shake up my ideas. So I read it in French (I had 5 years of high school French - and German) and then translated it for myself into English, because I thought this is either brilliant or it's bizarre. The methods were great, but the theory struck me as really being very strange.

Dodds: And the second thing?

Goodnow: By that time I was married to an American - Bob Goodnow - who had been a student at Harvard at the same time that I was. (At a later time, I would have kept to my pre-marriage name - Jarrett - or invented a new one, but in 1951 changing my surname was in line with custom and with my feeling that I should take marriage seriously but keep working in my own right). In 1959, Bob wanted to do some work in Hong Kong and I thought, “Well, okay”. By that time I was interested in having children and I figured, “I can get lots of help there”. I basically asked myself: What can I do in Hong Kong that I couldn't do anywhere else?” And Hong Kong had a population of children who were not going to school, but were essentially urban. They had come in during troubled times in Mainland China, but there were not enough schools to accommodate them. So the Hong Kong school system set up a lottery and if you were lucky enough to get in the lottery you went to school. Otherwise a lot of children were going to little rooftop schools or they were learning from the one in the family who had managed to get in via the lottery.

So here was a population of children who were not going to school but were not from some rural background, which is usually what happens when you turn to unschooled children. You need unschooled children if you want to find out more about the big shifts in children's thinking. Those big shifts by and large coincide with school ages. There's a big shift that occurs between five and seven, which is when most children start school, and another around about age twelve, which is when most of them start high school. So it was a break to find some kids who are not going to school but are at the same time urban.

Well, it turned out that schooling makes a difference to some of Piaget's tasks. Understanding the conservation of volume, for example, was helped considerably by experience with high school, but schooling didn't affect other tasks. For me, the interesting results turned out to be of a different kind. Both shook up my ideas about development. And both made me feel that the developmental theories we were working with had some big gaps in them.

One of those results had to do with what we took for granted as a sign of cognitive development. There were several things that the Chinese regarded as a sign of intelligence that were not part of our assumptions. To take a small example, the children I worked with would not accept the possibility that one could treat as equivalent two pairs of colored buttons: a red placed next to a green and a green placed next to a red. By and large all my Chinese subjects said, “No, you can't ever treat those two as the same, it's a different order.” For me, that was the start of a long-term interest in cultural differences in what people regarded as intelligent behavior and as signs of development: an interest that prompted more reading in anthropology and in psychologists' work on cultural differences - not differences in

ability but in their definitions of what ability and intelligence were about. I've kept an interest since then in "the socialization of cognition," aiming at breaking down the usual barrier between social and cognitive development.

The other thing was the number of unschooled children with very good conservation of amount and of weight. I still remember one young boy who said, after the conservation of weight task: "Well, that wasn't any problem". I asked him why not and his reply was: "Well, I do the shopping for rice. I always buy a caddy, sometimes it comes in a long narrow bag and sometimes in a short fat one, but it's always a caddy." That really taught me that a lot of thinking is based in activity. I couldn't find a conceptual base in developmental work that said a lot of things were based in activity and it was a long time before I came to know that there was a conceptual base in Anthropology under the term "practices" and that - in the developmental frame - I should turn to Vygotsky. That experience in Hong Kong, however, was the beginning of a long interest in practices: best indicated in a 1995 book that Peggy Miller, Frank Kessel, and I edited on *Practices as Cultural Contexts for Development*" In short, you can start with one problem and end up with a recognition of others that are even more interesting.

Hmmm: I seem to have skipped the question about research mentors?

Dodds: Yes, who was important in that development, especially in relation to child interest and child development and who were research mentors.

Goodnow: I think my strongest research mentors were in the straight cognitive area: working with Postman, then with Mosteller, who supervised my Ph.D., and then with Jerry Bruner. To them, I'd also add some of the people I worked with in Washington DC. Some of them were part of an Army research unit that I had begun working in - I had joined Bob in Washington DC after the book on *A Study of Thinking* was finished - and we did quite a bit of work in this research unit on sleep loss. I would also add John Flavell. I hadn't worked with him but it was his generosity in sending me unpublished material that was a major guide into the Piagetian material. I'd like to think I have been equally generous, if not equally thoughtful. A significant colleague in the developmental area was also Dick Walk, who was working in early visual perception ("the visual cliff") and prompted my interest in those aspects of development.

Dodds: Okay.

Goodnow: We've got a lot to get through here.

Dodds: So you've talked about the Hong Kong experience being important, but were there other political or social events that influenced your professional activities, such as your research, your writing?

Goodnow: If I had to choose one of those, the most important would be relatively recent. Australia has gone through a very turbulent political history with regard to the treatment of refugees who arrive in the country without the usual kinds of documents. It's been a shameful series of events and it made everybody--it made a lot of us aware that a great deal of social policy had a very peculiar basis: in fact, a lot of social policy was sort of shameful. Some colleagues in Melbourne, namely Agnes Dodds, who's doing this interviewing, and Jeanette Lawrence, who's with us at the same time, had begun working with children who were living in that area but were Somali in background. They got me increasingly interested not only politically in refugees, but also in doing some research on the lives of their children. I've become especially interested in children who are called "unaccompanied": arriving without parents or other kin. They're a quandary for an administrative system that's set up only to deal with "families", and I've been made very much aware of the difference between legal or administrative perspectives and those that are more developmental. I've now begun to think more and to be involved more and to write a few pieces related to social policy and its use (or misuse) of developmental theory. Bureaucracy is certainly another world. That's probably the best example of influence from political and social events.

Dodds: Okay. Well, just going back to the development of your ideas in child development, do you see them as having evolved in a straightforward way or did they involve sharp turns in theoretical views or research style?

Goodnow: Oh, I'd say definitely in a nice straight line in some ways. You'd look at it and say, "My gosh, this is all over the place." I came back from Hong Kong interested in the whole impact of culture and context, and thought, "That's where I really want to go." At that time, I had begun teaching on a part time basis at George Washington. I didn't want to teach full time because I now had two very young children and I no longer had the full-time helpers that I'd had in Hong Kong. What I wanted to keep, however, was a research profile. So I actually did a study trying out the Piagetian tasks with a low income African American population. I did one study with a student and we wrote one report, one paper, on some aspects of it. The rest of the data I threw out, because these children didn't approach the tasks in anything like the way I expected. They would give me the right answer and I would ask the classic question. How do you know, and they'd look at me and say, "No, I was wrong. It must be not the same." Their orientation was "you're a stranger, you're from outside, you mean nothing to me, I'm getting out of here as fast as possible, and I don't wanna be in school anyhow". And so I decided look, I either work closely within an African American community and get to understand their point of view or I don't work with it at all. Basically, this data's sort of useless, so I discarded it and started moving in a different direction. At that time, George Washington had several people who were interested in perceptual development -- Dick Walk was the main one; he had done this big visual cliff stuff with Jackie Gibson --and that looked like a more promising way to go.

Recording paused and then resumed

Dodds: The next question's on personal research contributions and beginning with the first question what were your primary interests in child development at the beginning of your career, quite a bit of which you've covered in previous answers. But--

Goodnow: Well, my interests don't seem to follow a nice straight line. The switch to perceptual development came about because other people at GW whom I liked working with were all interested in perceptual development. Eugene Abravanel was one. Dick Walk was central -- again another of the Harvard peer group. He had been the person who first asked me to give a post-graduate seminar at GW. Lila Braine was a third: like me, part-time because of small children and again someone who realized that the thing to maintain was a research profile. And I thought that as a small department we could make more of a mark if we all worked on aspects of perceptual development. So I --well, I really wanted to work on the impact of context but I didn't see that as possible where I was. At the time, I thought you'd really have to go to places like South America if you wanted to find a culturally different group. But obviously that wasn't going to work. So I shifted over to working on perceptual development and particularly on cross-modal integration. So I worked on that for several years, attracted some very nice research grants, published several articles in the area. I was especially interested in links between touch and vision. And I might have stayed in that area for a while except that I was asked to write a handbook chapter on haptic perception and I thought, Right, that's not what I want to be known as, as the expert--one of the few people in the United States who's actually interested in haptic perception and in cross-modal integration. Although it's a fascinating area, I'm only really doing this because I thought the department should have some consolidated strength.

What I had begun being interested in, however, was the nature of drawing. That was still within the area of perception, and I had used a simple draw-a-person task as a warm-up to one on touch-vision coordination. And I found a number of things there-- that were intriguing...

Recording pause and then resumed

Dodds: So now we're looking at question two, what continuities and shifts--

Goodnow: Well, this first shift was from an interest in context, which I maintained an interest in it and read about it, but I didn't see any way of doing research. In retrospect I began to realize, well, I could have studied what those African-American children thought the task was all about. I mean, what did they think I was there for? If I had really understood the way in which they perceived the whole thing-- that was the interesting question. I still don't know how I might have done it, but it did seem to me a missed opportunity.

So the shift from there took me into the entire perceptual development sort of stuff. So - what took me out of that? Well, I shifted to children drawing, right? What struck me was that the usual explanation for what children produced was in terms of "errors" and in terms of children's visual perceptions. As I watched children draw - rather than looking at just the finished product - I was struck by the extent to which what they produced was essentially rule-governed. The head would come first, and if it was tilted a little, then the whole body would be tilted at the same angle. We identified a number of those "rules" and tested for them by asking, for example, for drawings that we had started to be completed. With some students - Sarah Friedman especially: she initiated a study in Israel and the writing of Hebrew- I did several studies on people-drawing and on children's production of letters like "b" and "d", Out of all that came a small book on *Children Drawing* : a book that's still being utilized. As a shift, it was basically driven - once more - by the sense that there was a strange gap in developmental accounts, and some odd assumptions that needed to be changed.

I still had that interest going when I came back to Australia in 1971. I came back largely for personal reasons. We had two children but little family support and after a couple of stories about plane crashes, I thought, if anything happens to me--where is the back up? I also had the feeling that I didn't want to die in the United States, so I began to think, Well, if I don't want to die here what am I doing here in the first place? Around about that time Bob said, well, he'd like to retire at 50 and sort of have a second career of some kind -and he was willing to leave Washington DC. So we came to Australia: to Sydney, which we all liked and where I had strong family support.

That brought about another research shift. I realized, sort of, that I couldn't just stay with children drawing. My students would have to have something broader. That was especially the case for the first three years, because I had taken a position in the School of Education at Macquarie. I was beginning to feel one should be useful. And they had a job available at the time that I was interested in moving, before the children were deeply into high school. That School gave me the job of running a full year course-- developing a whole new course on early childhood education and intervention. I got very interested in that and I'm still regarded as something of an expert on early childhood development and things like child care and intervention and so forth. But bit by bit I felt I should have gone back more and more to the analysis of contexts and so forth, and that's the shift I began to make more clearly when I moved over to Psychology in 1975.

Dodds: So would you reflect please on the strengths and the weaknesses of your research and theoretical contributions followed by the impact of your work?

Goodnow: Well, that's quite a question, isn't it?

Dodds: Well, let's split it up and start with the strengths of your research and theoretical contributions

Goodnow: Well, I've already mentioned one weakness, namely, that I didn't recognize an opportunity when I saw it. One opportunity I didn't recognize was when I was doing my PhD thesis. I was sampling male and female undergraduates. And all the female undergraduates said, "Oh, this is not my kind of thing." And these are Harvard undergraduates and when they say, "This is not my kind of thing," it means they're not going to do it at all. So I, in fact, sampled only males and it was years and years later that I became very concerned with the sort

of exclusion of females from all kinds of things. That was a weakness. It was a long time, light years, before I co-edited a book with Carol Pateman on *Women and the Social Sciences* and some time after that a book - with Jennifer Bowes - on *Men, Women, and Household Work*. So I think that was a weakness: those two missed opportunities. The other sort of weakness is that I let myself go in a direction that was basically built around the idea of: Well, let's have a shared research core that brings us together and I'll fit in with what my colleagues are doing.

The strengths were just sort of--that's a good question--I think the strength of it is the continued emphasis on the ways in which people think and the ways in which- these often reflect the state of their own lives and the nature of the context that they're in. That emphasis covers work on definitions of intelligence in various cultural contexts and on people's developmental timetables. I got into the timetable concept when I was interviewing women who'd been born--mothers who had been born in Lebanon. A school had approached me and said, "We're having terrible difficulty with these children. They're just not ready for kindergarten." So-- it was fairly easy to find out why. The mothers and the teachers at the school had entirely different timetables for what children entering school could do or could be expected to do.

Involved in all of that was a feeling that I should try to be useful. There was also a combination of strengths and weaknesses that I wanted to avoid. It was the kind of thing that's happened in studies of visual perception in Australia. There's an awful lot of people working on visual perception, because there was one professor in the University of Melbourne and if you wanted to work with him that was all you did. You worked on visual perception. So that particular state was overloaded with people who were experts in visual perception. I was getting Ph.D. students who came from Education and from Psychology, and I thought they're not going to make a future out of doing exactly what I do.

In contrast, the whole business of parental thinking could be taken up in a variety of directions. Some students worked on parents' and teachers' perception of homework, some worked on cross-generational perceptions of important values: Judy Cashmore's thesis on that broke new ground for studies of socialization and became the basis for the different view on socialization that Joan Grusec and I proposed. Basically, I think the theoretical impact is different if you sit on one subject and all of your students do that. And I just didn't think that was feasible, because if they were going to be employed at all they were better off doing research on parents' views of development.. So that's a combination of a strength and a weakness that I have always been prepared to move from one topic to another to fit the people I'd be working with or the students that I had. At the same time, parents' understanding of development filled - once more - an odd gap in developmental studies. All the emphasis at that time was on what parents did, with very little comment on what parents thought they were doing.

So it's out of that that Andy Collins and I came to write *Development According to Parents*. Well, I'm not working so much on development according to parents now, at least not as directly. But the work in that area certainly had an impact. Marc Bornstein recently said to me, "You know, it's incredible. Out of that small book that you did with Andy Collins there's a real cottage industry now of people working on parent's ideas."

I guess the other strength is that I finally did get back to the whole idea of actions as a basis for the way people think. That's missing in a lot of studies in development. For me, it was a return to that young boy and his caddy of rice. I mentioned earlier the book on cultural practices as contexts for development. That was a way of getting back to the context material and--but also a way of getting into the whole activity stuff so that the definition of context was much more in terms of practices than it usually was. Practices covered not only activities, but shared routine activities that are not just within one family, but are also culturally shared. That was a nice mixture of concepts. And that book has had quite a lot of impact; there's more discussion of practices now than at an earlier stage. I have no idea of how to estimate its current status. I think that's something you have to ask other people about.

Dodds: Okay. The next question also is a compendium question, so I'd like to try and break it up a bit. What published or unpublished manuscript best represents your thinking about child development?

Goodnow: Well, I've already mentioned some. One is the book with Andy Collins, *Development According to Parents*. That represents my thinking that what you really need to understand is the way people think about things, the way they perceive them. The other manuscript that I've already mentioned is the one on cultural practices. That really combined an interest in contexts and an interest in activities. It also represents a constant concern on my part on what "context" means, other than some reference to country or neighborhood. The book I mentioned earlier - *Children Drawing* - is still being used. I still get royalties on it and it's ancient. But apparently there's nothing else like it, and it was a lot of fun. It probably best represents my attraction to phenomena that have been missed or that existing theory can't handle very well. With Jeanette Lawrence, I'm currently working on a book on the views people hold about inheriting - the way it ought to be for money, land, and "small things". The way people think once more, and once more an area that's strangely relatively neglected. I've also begun to write a little about links to social policies: there's a chapter soon to come out in a book edited by Lene Jensen on *Social Policies and Developmental Theory*, and I've used that as a first foray into links between bureaucracy and developmental theory, using analyses of contexts (and their amenability to change) as one way of bridging those two areas. Why don't we take those as the most representative?

Dodds: Do you want to draw a distinction between what best represents your own thinking about child development and what is contained in most developmental studies?

Goodnow: Well, by and large you don't put a lot of effort into something unless it is really part of your own thinking. I still am a bit concerned about the distinction that's often drawn between social or emotional development and cognitive development. One of the things that certainly came out of my cultural experience and a lot of the contextual stuff is that that distinction is not a valid one. I would still like to do something about weakening that distinction that would have more impact. It's sort of come up in several publications. But it's never come up in a forum that's had a major impact on what people do. In fact, most cognitive developmentalists now are retreating from anything that looks like social or emotional aspects or has anything to do with values. So I'd add to the "representative" list a chapter called "The socialization of cognition," which is still often cited by anthropologists, and by a few psychologists interested in the effects of contexts. But most of the cognitivists have retreated from anything related to values or emotion or developmental tasks. The big emphasis is on neurological connections or substrates, and that's where the grant money is. I think that's a great pity. I heard the other day a talk detailing the way Chinese regard learning not as an outcome but as a virtue, a virtuous activity in its own right, with less emphasis on methods or outcomes. And I thought: Now that's a nice example of a combination of cognitive development and social development. And that's what I see as missing in much of our developmental stuff now.

Dodds: The third or fourth part of that question is: Do you see any contributions as wrong headed?

Goodnow: I don't think they were wrong headed so much as they missed some significant points. They were missed opportunities. Peggy Miller once picked up a comment I made once. I apparently said: "What I'm really often attracted to are the things that are homeless. You run up against something and you think, "Now that's really significant, but I don't have a conceptual home for it. There's nothing in developmental theory that has a home for it so then I begin looking for a conceptual base somewhere else." She came up to me after that talk and said, "You know, that is exactly what happens to me. I went in to do a study on aspects of language development in African American families and I was struck by the extent to which the

language that was used was in the form of story telling: story telling about the nature of my day and in much of what was said, -you basically told stories." And she began looking for things that were about narrative and discovered there was very little in developmental psychology about narratives. There was a lot about grammar, but very little about narratives. So she did some lovely research on narratives that parents used: stories that were about children, with children or by children and said, "By and large it's only by listening to t parents talking about their own activities that the children pick up the ideas of the right style and the importance of being able to tell a good story." I think it's the failure to pick up, to go further, having noticed some homeless phenomenon that's sort of the most wrong headed, together with just letting myself get involved as an expert in haptic perception. At the time it was sort of good for the department, but not necessarily good for me.

Dodds: Okay. Let's move on to asking you to reflect on your experiences with the research funding apparatus over the years. And it seems as if the question's really wanting to know about your participation in shaping funding policy and implementation as well as support for your own work.

Goodnow: I've had a fair amount of success in getting research funding for my own work. But luckily I could do a lot with fairly small grants. I did have some impact on funding policy in Australia. I was a member for quite a few years of the Australian Research Council, which reviews grants and so forth, in all areas. I was able to change their policy in two directions. One was they had some priority areas that needed to be established and I went for cognition as a priority area. For psychology, that was the only priority area. We could never have gotten developmental as a priority area, because there wouldn't be any support from people in other areas. But cognition is the sort of area that philosophers and anthropologists and even the economists thought, "Well, that sounds all right". So it was sort of saved. Max Colthart -big in the adult cognitive area in Australia- once said to me, "Oh, I've just discovered that a lot of what comes to me is really based on having that policy established." But we also managed to salvage--and it was one I again took the initiative for -- a small grants policy. I'd come to know that policy the U.S.: a certain amount of money was set aside for small grants and you could get them more quickly and you didn't have to wait 18 months and go through so much. And so I got the Australian Research Council to start on that. Then, after about five years, some began to think, "Oh, it's not big money and there's as much work dealing with things under \$25 thousand as there is in dealing with a million, so let's get rid of it." But I was able to rescue that and to keep it going. It turned out that a number of mathematicians also need only small amounts of money, so they came to the party. I don't know what the current status of that policy is. Most of the emphasis for that Research council is now on larger but fewer grants and that's hard on scholars who are starting out or who want to move on a different path. Well, those are the two main impacts that I've had on research funding policy and they've both been in Australia. No real impact in the United States. In the U.S., I was on a couple of NIH committees that reviewed grants and I was a member, after I came to Australia, of the Social Science Research Council in New York, But that's very little in terms of shaping policy in areas that were straight developmental.

When I came back to Australia, I was more stunned by there being so little work being done on developmental issues, and so little in the way of any organization that brought together those who were working in the area. For quite some time there was this very small group of people who met together. Their interests were all based on Piaget. For them, that was what developmental was all about. I joined them. I knew a lot of Piagetian material but I didn't think that was the way developmental work had to go. But it meant that developmental has had to grow more or less by itself in Australia. It's now a relatively strong area.

That's basically the end of sections one and two: right?

Dodds: Two, so this might be a place to stop, because I think we're probably pretty close to the end of that tape.

File 2

Dodds: This is a continuation with the interview for SRCO oral history project with Jacqueline Goodnow on the 5th of December 2008. This is side three of the tape and we have covered sections one and two. Jacqueline, before we go on to section three, it seems to me that there some things in the different areas you've worked in that you haven't really covered, and I wonder if you'd just like to go back perhaps a bit to talk about-- especially in relation to this notion of continuities and shifts--some of the other areas that you've covered both empirically and theoretically? Yes, I think coming through the whole of your career there's been this really strong interest in context that's come out in quite a number of different content areas, but has always permeated almost everything that you've done. Or is that not true?

Goodnow: I think it's true. It's certainly true after being in Hong Kong and doing a study with Chinese children and Piagetian material. It's basically from there on that I began to really read more anthropology and sociology and so forth. But you're right. We seem to have wandered around a bit or I wandered around a bit and it would be a good idea to pull things together and, as you pointed out, there are some pieces missing. I haven't mentioned any of the work on crime or on the distribution of care giving tasks. It does all hang together, even though on the surface these look like different topics. The crime material, for instance, was a contribution to a consortium focused on understanding and intervening in juvenile delinquency and crime. I came in mainly on the significance of contexts (neighborhood was a major one of these) and Jeanette Lawrence came in mainly on the nature of "pathways". With Jeanette also, I worked on the ideas people held about the possible distribution of caregiving tasks among members of a family. Perceptions about distribution are also at the core of the work we've been doing on inheriting. The constant theme is that we always need to look at what people see as a problem or a choice, what they see as possible or as called for, and how they come to hold those views. Does that cover it? Or do you want to add something else?

Dodds: No, I think that's-it.

Goodnow: Well, whatever, but let me do a little more pulling together. Certainly the theme that is always prominent is this interest in the way people think about things, the way they define tasks, the way they go about problem solving, the way in which they define responsibility for children or for elderly parents. That's there from the very beginning, even before I went into developmental stuff. The interest in context starts with the work in Hong Kong. That experience was really galvanizing, so that's the second big constant. After that, I wanted to know how people come to think in the ways that they do. And part of what I've wanted to do there is to say that, yes, context matters but the first thing you need to know is how context is defined. There's an awful lot of confusion in the developmental area as to how you define context. And you can't define them just by national identity. So that's part of what went into theme three, which is that as a way of defining context you might turn to the kinds of actions or ideas that are pretty well shared. So activities and practices, that's kind of theme three, and theme four is an interest in social policy. That also began a bit with the Piagetian stuff and with the follow up of trying to get some work done in the inner city in Washington DC, even though I abandoned it because I couldn't think of a way to do it that made sense. The only other thing that I think is important is I guess the social policy stuff. That theme also starts-- well, I've already just said that. It starts from the experience of finding the Piagetian tasks, in their usual mode, useless for my purposes. I began to think, 'Well, there must be a way of being useful and combining research and policy factors.' A couple of us began taking a look at Sesame Street and at evaluations of early intervention. But I felt very strongly that the only things that worked well within the city, with African -American groups, were projects where they were in charge and they could hire you or fire you, but not projects where you were in command. In fact, I thought one of the best shifts in policy within the U.S. was when at a certain point NIMH would not accept proposals to work with African American communities or

any vulnerable community unless there was a signature from somebody who was regarded as an elder or a senior member of the community. I thought that was one of the biggest shifts in policy. That- and an editorial statement from the journal, *Developmental Psychology*: "We won't accept your articles if you've only got one gender, particularly if it's all only males and you don't have a good reason for sampling only one," People now take for granted that you have to sample both. But really it's not so long ago that everything was done with males, including my own 1951 Ph.D.-- to my embarrassment and amazement now. Part of what contexts do is clearly to lead you not to think about some ways of doing things or some assumptions.

So what else fits in the social policy area? The one- year course on training people to get involved in early childhood education zeroed in on policy, querying the usual separation of staff training and of funding for all-day and part-day care. Policy comes up also in the work on Women and the Social Sciences and on the distribution of household work between male and female partner (that study was all about couples who did not follow the usual divisions of labor). It was a nice merger of themes because it was really about the way people thought about household work, and the way they thought about gender, and the way they thought about responsibility. We had first looked at those questions in relation to children and then moved on to adults and, with a shift in tasks, to the views people held about the possible or proper distributions of care-giving tasks for a parent in need of help. I certainly hoped that putting out a very readable book on the distribution of household work, concentrating on couples who were not following stereotyped patterns of division, would lead people to say, "Well, it is possible to do things in a different way." It has at least become a standard reference in courses on feminist theory.

Dodds: Are there other aspects of policy interests?

Goodnow: Well, one was that in '76 I started, with a colleague at Macquarie, an MA course in childhood studies and social policy with entry from people in social work or caseworkers in child protection departments and so forth. Ailsa Burns and I ran that for about four years, maybe six years, and out of that we got the book called *Children and Families in Australia*. That was a lot of fun. And it was significant. People still tell me, "Oh, I grew up on that book" We did a second edition of that and then my colleague - Ailsa Burns -- said, "I don't want to do that again." It's now been taken up by Jennifer Bowes (a post-doc of mine) and her colleagues, and it still manages to mix research and policy questions. Out of that course, however, came some people who went on to work on things like the politics of childcare.

Part of that concern with policy was also a set of questions about the ways people thought about responsibility. Actually, those questions came up more directly in some other research but we've always thought of them as one pervasive issue in policy questions. The nature of responsibility came very much to the fore when Jeannette Lawrence and I began to work together. Jeannette is the other person present in this interview. She also had an interest in distribution of tasks and in the nature of developmental tasks, but she was more interested in adults, in the later phases of development rather than the early ones. It's out of that that there came the work we did on the allocation of care giving tasks for an elderly parent in need of help: the allocations people thought were possible or were reasonable given other responsibilities. And that was quite rewarding. I had officially retired by that time-- there was at that time a set age limit --but I hadn't given up research. I basically retired from teaching and from departmental committees. Jeanette and I combined on a research grant to look at the two aspects of family distributions: the distribution of care giving for elderly parents and the ways in which people approached issues of inheritance. We've got a couple of articles already out on that. But we're about to start putting more of it together as a potential book.

. I know I still haven't said anything about crime.

Dodds: That was the one that I was about to ask about. Where does it fit?

Goodnow: Well, crime really fits a little bit. It's a combination of interests in social policy and contexts. Jeannette and I had a colleague called Ross Homel who was basically a criminologist, but had done a Ph.D. in Behavioral sciences. He was a colleague of Jeannette's from way back and officially I had supervised his Ph.D. thesis. Since I knew nothing about crime research, I was basically only editing what he wrote But Ross put together a consortium to look at developmental approaches to crime and its prevention.

Dodds: That was where the consortium's book came from?

Goodnow: Yes, it came out as from the consortium, but I would say that Jeannette and I and another colleague, Alan Hayes, were probably the ones who really brought that to completion and gave it any developmental perspective. And do you want comment on the impact of that on policy?

Dodds: Well, yes, I think that one of the things about that is that people around the country found it accessible and relevant to Australian conditions. And many people in government departments found that they could use that piece of work to give a developmental perspective to the kinds of policies and the kinds of programs they were developing. It looked at people's involvement in crime as something that didn't happen immediately, but was related to the whole of their lives and the whole of the life around them. That was a sort of developmental approach that people interested in crime in Australia had never thought about before.

Goodnow: Yes, by and large most developmental analyses in relation to crime - basically, all they did was to track changes with age. That got people thinking, "Well, once they're 15 you can expect trouble," but you needed to look at other aspects of their lives and the company they kept and the attitude towards various kinds of actions and so forth. So it was sort of shifting people away from this notion of you just need to know their age and what stages are they at, which are also age based. That's still a very much utilized book, because each chapter that we did we ended with a set of written notes on how you could use this material and people found that very useful. In fact, Jeanette and I formed a trio with Ross and planned a more scholarly book on development approaches to crime and its prevention but that didn't work out. Ross was by that time too involved in so many other aspects of crime prevention. But we did get two articles out of it all and they are well cited. But I have not continued with an interest in crime prevention. For me it was mainly another interesting way of looking at the nature of context and at the way people constructed concepts of crime, conditions that promoted crime, and crime prevention.

Dodds: Jeanette and I feel that the things that interested you about that are now a lot of the things that interest you about refugees. Is that the case?

Goodnow: Yes. Well, refugees are a marvelous combination of interesting things. First of all, there is a question of how refugees get to be defined, and how people think about them, whether they define them as illegal or as people seeking asylum. They are different from immigrants, who basically had some time to plan a move and time to decide what they can take, and they've already been accepted and they know where they're going. Refugees often have to leave and they don't know where they're going, so it struck me that a study might well a background culture and becoming part of another culture: a task quite different for refugees. And in terms of policy--I just thought our treatment of refugees who arrived by boat during the time when the Howard government was in power was so utterly shameful that you had to do what you could to at least change people's orientation to it. So I came in as an extra party on some work that Jeanette and Agnes had already started: a study on Somali children in Melbourne. Most of that work--the original gaining of some research funds and the work on involving these children in soccer clubs and learning clubs and so forth and developing measures for the adjustment to school is theirs. I became very interested, however, in the

whole nature of research with people who were in this vulnerable situation. And it consolidated my interests in social policy: already enhanced by taking an interest in Judy Cashmore's work on children in vulnerable situations, with particular attention to children in out-of-home care. It's out of that that I came to write a chapter - for a Handbook on Research with children (in press) on children who are still seeking asylum: with particular attention to "unaccompanied" children.

Dodds: We were talking, before in the first part of the interview, about the published manuscripts that best represent your thinking. You might have mentioned that chapter.

Goodnow: Ah, yes. It's a chapter I'm actually very pleased with. It was a new venture for me. So I was very pleased when I sent it off and the reviews came back saying, "Oh, this is generally excellent, but here is some stuff that you should add to it." The reviewers mentioned a whole lot of work that I didn't know. But I love discovering things that I don't know and that are relevant to what I'm interested in. So I learned a great deal from that. The particular challenge with the children who arrive unaccompanied is that they need to be thought about developmentally in their own right rather than as members of a family. If they're members of a family, the decision-makers don't have to think about the fact that they're children. They're their parents' responsibility. But if they arrive alone they're our responsibility and the responsibility of the culture that they've come into,

Yes, you are right. There are other things that could be mentioned. We're covering a large number of years and because in Australia there are still not many developmental psychologists, many of us come to be approached by people in related areas and then we find it difficult not to contribute to work we see as important.

But we had begun to follow through on the context theme. I would never have gone on to the juvenile crime stuff except that there was a strong emphasis on neighborhoods and social supports. And it was, again, an area where even defining what a context was challenging. So that's where we were, sort of everything else was forgotten.

Dodds: I think that probably does back up quite well. It was just that we thought a few threads were missing.

Goodnow: there are a few others that are missing but, God, this is getting to be a long interview. Well, actually it's a very long history to account for, because I was born in '24 and my first research project was when I was 19: that was the Piagetian rules of the game. I'm now 84 and still very active in research, so there's a lot of history to account for. And it's not all on one topic which would be simpler to summarize. I like working with other people, so I'm quite happy to move every now and then in a direction that is sort of part of a team rather than working always on a single project all the time, as long as that direction still has links back to my main themes.

Dodds: Well, could we say for the history of thinking about SRCD that very often when you do move you open up a field that other people keep up on. And so when one looks in several areas, there's Goodnow- again.

Goodnow: Yes. Well, I think that what I find exciting is to sort of discover something that makes you think, "Well, that doesn't make any sense", or, "There's a great big hole in there". Most of the stuff on parents and children for instance, was on what parents did, especially in relation to discipline. Missing was the question: what do parents think they're doing and what are their ideas about children and how they change, etc., etc.? That was a sort of sense of, "Hey, wait a minute. It must be important". So I look for ways to explore that missing part. .

Dodds: You liked pursuing them?

Goodnow: Yes, I become obsessive about them and say, "Oh, why is nobody doing anything about that?" That's often because it's not all that easy to find a way of doing it. I don't think that I would have gotten far with the care giving tasks or the inheritance material if Jeannette had not been able to come up with very good ways of doing that work. So that was a nice match between the questions that needed to be asked and finding a way to do it, It was, and is, a very good partnership.

So: Any other big gaps?

Dodds: No, I don't think so. We move on to institutional contributions-- to ask in which have you worked and in what capacities. I would have thought that that would all be covered in your accompanying vita.

Goodnow: That's if I can find the early part to it. But very quickly I started at the University of Sydney. I went to Harvard for a Ph.D. and I was a post doc there with Jerry Bruner. I then worked with an army research unit in Washington DC. They had a nice research job and that was fine for about three years. And that's when we went to Hong Kong. I had a visiting connection with at the University of Hong Kong and a small research grant to cover the impact of schooling and non schooling. Then I came back and started working with George Washington University and that basically fills the period from, oh, '61 to about '71. And I decided that I would not teach full time, but I would work half time and would concentrate on research, because if you don't keep the publications up and you don't keep your research going then you sort of disappear--

I had a really good colleague, Lila Braine. We shared the graduate seminar and an office, and we both wanted to concentrate on research. So by the time we were ready to pick up full-time work again we each had some nice research grants behind us and some publications. Then in '71 I came back to Australia and I've been at Macquarie University since then and the rest of it's on the vita and its pieces of paper.

Dodds: Now, the next question is about connections with well known research sites -- I presume they're meaning in the U.S. They ask you to describe your role at that facility and then talk about changes in it and the role you believe was played by that in the history of child development research, which is perhaps a bit difficult.

Goodnow: That's an enormous amount. I don't think we want to go through that in relation to each of those research sites, And it's difficult to say how institutional changes were made that changed the course of developmental research....

Dodds: But you did set up the developmental program at Macquarie University--

Goodnow: Yes, that's true. And, if I look back, I think Dick Walk and I, at George Washington University, made big changes in the psych. department there and that flowed on to the whole area of early perception and early cross-modal integration. The question is how to keep these things going. But that unit certainly was relevant in the history of child development research, because it opened up the question of what was there without having to be learned, what capacities were there or what biases were there. So I think an enormous amount of stuff on early perception comes out of that sort of institutional change.

Certainly, as you say, setting up a new program in Australia made an enormous difference simply because there was practically no developmental research here with the exception of some work based on Piagetian theory. There was also no strong feeling about the importance of research and of writing up what one had done in a publication mode that would reach other people. I needed to convince people - some already on the faculty and of course students that getting their research written up and published was not just promoting oneself. It was a moral obligation: The research they did was supported by public money (all Universities in Australia are funded by the Australian government) and the outcome should be public knowledge.

I guess the other change was establishing an M.A. course that was open to graduates from other disciplines and from developing course material that covered “children and families,” “children in cultural contexts,” development over the life-course, and the importance of policy-related research. The end result of all of that is the movement of graduates not only into University positions but also into social policy areas.

Dodds: I was going to say a lot of your graduate students have moved into some major roles in Australia and overseas.

Goodnow: Yes. I've had some very good students and-we made it possible for them to go in a whole variety of directions, but they could still feed into each other. So yes, it was a great time, very good graduate students and, of course, there are some flow-on effects from being a mentor to some people who were not at Macquarie.

Dodds: That's always good.

Goodnow: Yes. And that's sort of a lot of fun. I'm still acting as a mentor to people in the area of early childhood who are about to publish their first piece of paper or apply for their first research grant, and that's rewarding.

Dodds: And you've got the group at Lismore

Goodnow: Well, that's an area of change, yes. A university called Southern Cross University (based in a town called Lismore) set up a research advisory group to help in the development of a new Centre that would bring together people in Education and in Law, with a strong emphasis on children and young people as active participants in the school system and in the justice system. That advisory group is chaired by Judy Cashmore; an early graduate student at Macquarie who did a thesis with me on cross-generation perceptions, and went on to do research in several policy-related areas, with a strong emphasis on children in the justice system. She's now the only social scientist who is a member of the School of Law at the University of Sydney and she has certainly changed not only research but also some procedures and practices related to children and courts. It's at her request that I came on to that Advisory Board, and we've been working toward developing research strengths within a group of dedicated people who will go on to make other changes.

Dodds: Okay. We've been talking about institutional contributions and particularly people that Jacqueline has been involved with as a mentor. Now I think we would like to talk a bit about teaching and your experiences as a teacher of child development research or as a trainer of research workers. Could you comment also on the tension between teaching and research and your experience in the field of child development?

Goodnow: Well, a less specific question is, what courses have I taught? Well, I taught courses in basic development at the second and third year level. I think the really novel one was the M.A. in childhood studies and social policy that we started --that was something that didn't exist before. The other specific question was about tension between teaching and research. I have mixed feelings about even regarding there being a tension between them: one ought to feed into the other. The tension that's developed increasingly is the fact that the emphasis on teaching and the amount of teaching that everybody does makes it difficult to get a lot of research done unless you're prepared to work close to double time. That's an increasing problem as Universities move towards reducing support to staff and emphasizing doing more and becoming bigger. For example, how many people do you have doing fourth year, the Honors year, with all of them having to do a serious research project and a serious theoretical essay, with both calling for supervision?

Dodds: Seventy.

Goodnow: Seventy? Yes. Well, you see, when I went through there were probably three. They take a lot of looking after. And so I see the tension coming now between two pressures. One is to increase the amount of teaching you're doing, but with reduced support in doing it, which means you have less time, and the other is at the same time the universities are beginning to use your ability to get grants and your ability to publish as criteria for promotion. So the tension is really between the two demands, especially since Australian universities don't have the tradition of a long summer break or having a nine months contract, which the U.S. has, so people have got three months in which they can get something consolidated done. Here you've got--you get six weeks if you're lucky. Officially you have four and unofficially it used to stretch to a couple of months, but now more and more you're seeing the official timetable. I think that's the biggest tension that exists. It's not an intellectual tension. It's a tension in terms of the universities essentially making two demands, but making it less and less easy or possible to meet both.

Dodds: And reducing support?

Goodnow: And reducing support, yes.

Dodds: Okay. Thank you. Experiences in applied child development research or applied work more generally and also comments on your role in putting theory into practice?

Goodnow: Well, some of that we've already covered. The involvement in crime is certainly part of -putting developmental theory into practice in a form not only of giving people a rundown on what developmentalists could tell them about this, but in terms of ending every chapter with how you can put this into practice. I think that started also started certainly at George Washington, where a couple of us put together a seminar on the evaluation of Sesame Street. We didn't do any research ourselves, but it did sensitize a lot of graduate students to the fact that there was research out there that in fact could shape policy.

I've done perhaps more on policy since coming to Australia. We've mentioned the crime prevention consortium. Before that, the year's course in early childhood intervention and early childhood education made major differences in policy, because it was the first time that people who were responsible for long daycare had anything to do with people who ran half day kindergarten sessions. There was a lot of professional separation between them but it's out of that that there came a couple of people who then worked towards joining the two." That was a big change in policy to the point now where there's practically nothing but long daycare. It's lost its stigma.

Dodds: You've also been a consultant on major research projects for the government and on practice orientation in government [inaudible].

Goodnow: Yes, yes. It's a big harder to say they're exactly putting theory into practice. Certainly I'm a member of a research advisory group for the Department of Community Services and that does a lot of stuff on children who are in out- of -home care and so forth. I'm also on a research advisory group for Burnside, which is a non-government organization, but a powerful voice when it comes to issues related to child care and child protection, to shaping social policy and implementing social policy. You could add also the University in Lismore: they're very strong, as I started to say earlier, on the ethics of research and on the importance of children as participants. That's an area that both you and Jeanette have been involved in, and that's putting research into practice. I'd add also work done with people in Charles Darwin University. They organized a conference about four years ago that was essentially on research and social policy with regard to Indigenous populations in Australia. I gave a paper on the importance of having Indigenous people involved in the planning and designing of research and in implementation of any policy rather than being just the so called subjects of research or or the targets who were supposed to benefit from various policies. I ended up becoming one of

four editors for the volume that came out of that., despite my firm conviction that I had been a co-editor on two books and I would never do it again. Well, actually the one with Peggy Miller was a delight, the one on cultural practices as context. But we had complete control over that and what we did was we wrote before each of the chapters an introduction as to how this research came about and then a short epilogue in terms of where it went after that. That was very satisfying. But co-editing, if you're not really in command of it, is a chore, and with this book I was number three on a list of four. We were all glad when it finally got published. But it's going to be a very useful book. And it's already beginning to change the nature of policy and the nature of understanding with regard to Indigenous people. And it had strong representation of speakers from Indigenous groups, so that was a big shift. So I think there's basically a lot about putting theory into practice.

Dodds: Yes, that's covered a lot about theory into practice. I wondered if you had anything to say about what you think is meant by applied child development research?

Goodnow: Oh dear. I think I'm glad it's at least a question, because basically there isn't a separation between the two, any more than there is a necessary separation between teaching and research. The whole history of developmental theory comes out of so called applied questions and the moment you start developing theory that's about the nature of change you're automatically into "let's do something about this kind of thing". Perhaps the major separation is in a lot of the stuff where people are looking for genetic predispositions or bases. It's almost impossible to turn that into social policy except in terms of sort of saying, "All right. Let's test them all for their genetic codes." Some of it is interesting. Moffit and Caspi have data showing that for children who come into an abusive situation and have a particular genetic makeup are especially likely to show long term consequences. Children without that genetic code are more likely to make it., to come through. That does help account for how you can get variety in the consequences of abuse.

Dodds: Okay.

Goodnow: And then what happens if they don't carry this genetic makeup? Does it mean you only help the ones who have the predisposition? And do you check for genetic codes without consent? You just can't check routinely for genetic codes. And even--and if you could you would still have major, very awkward decisions to make about what you would do. So I do think there is some research that's very difficult to convert into any kind of action. But I just don't see any great distinction. I think it's a distinction that's perhaps been generated by people who wanted to feel that they were into "pure" research, whatever that means.

Dodds: Like the physical and biological sciences, I think.

Goodnow: yes, but the distinction is just a basic misconception of what developmental research and developmental theory's all about. I never think of myself as now I'm doing "pure" research and now I'm doing "applied".

Dodds: Good, okay. Experiences with SRCD, when did you join, what were your earliest contacts and with whom and your first biannual meeting?

Goodnow: That's going way, way back, isn't it? I certainly joined SRCD when I was still in the States, so I would have joined it probably early '60s. I was particularly interested in the journal. And I can't really tell you what the first biannual meeting was that I attended. I just attended them consistently even after I had come back to Australia. I've missed the last three, but that's partly because it's the time of year when it means two overseas trips, long ones. And I'm also finding it now much too big and no longer the pleasure that it used to be. But contacts with the Society? I think my closest contacts came when I spent a semester at Minneapolis in the Institute of Child Development and people like Willard Hartup and W. Andrew Collins were

very much involved at SRCD. That got me much more involved. And I came to know people like John Hagen. I didn't ever work on an SRCD committee, but I was certainly very interested in what they covered. And I found myself very much pleased to see the increasing interest in social policy and in having members of SRCD functioning in Washington departments as advocates, helping people frame research that involved children or had developmental implications. I found that very interesting. But it didn't lead me to being any part of the governance work of the Society. I was an associate editor for a while, but not a full editor. I was not a council member or a president or any other officer. I think my most involvement was sort of as a reviewer--

Dodds: Yes, I was going to say you've done. I'm sure, a great deal of review.

Goodnow: --yes, I did a lot of reviewing. And I just thought it was a fantastic Society, which is why I kept going back from 1971 on. That's why I also urged every developmentalist in Australia to join the Society. That's perhaps been my main contribution to contribution to the Society as an institution. It has a healthy Australian membership.

Dodds: As a person looking at the Society from--largely from outside----but having attended regularly, perhaps you could say something about what you see as the most important changes in its activities.

Goodnow: I think one of the most important changes has been the emphasis on linking policy with research. I think the *Social Policy Report* is excellent. And I think the other big change that's occurred is it's become more international. It's still aiming at becoming even more international, although the people who are attracted to the meetings are particularly from Europe. It did become less totally concerned with the U.S. That big push towards getting more international members is perhaps spurred on by the fact that there's now a competing society: the International Society for the Study of Behavioral Development and that's attracting a lot of international attention. There does seem to be a growing awareness, however, of cultural diversity both within and outside the United States. The days of reports based mainly on middle-class "Anglo" children are over. Those are what I think are the most important changes.

Dodds: Okay. Still some of the history of SRCD is also the history of the field, but more broadly, the history of the field during those years you've been participating, most of all the major continuities and discontinuities that you see and then perhaps secondary your ideas about the importance of issues(?), because I think they're really two separate things. So the first one's more a comment on the field.

Goodnow: On the history of the field during the years that I--hmm, that's a big question that's sort of--the history of the field? Well, I've already mentioned some of the changes that I think have occurred. There has been enormous change in the development of both measures and theory at the infancy level and an enormous increase of interest in longitudinal research and in transitions. There was very little on middle childhood. There was infancy and then there was adolescence, but very little on continuity. So I think the increasing interest in the nature of change and the nature of continuity is a big shift. I think the other thing that's-changed is a move away is--oh, from early preoccupations with discipline. You know, if you read some of the early literature on parenting, about the only aspect that was mentioned was the forms of discipline that they used. Now that's still an interest, but I think it was a massively overdone concern with physical forms of discipline and with trying to reduce the nature of parenting to a few dimensions. So that's one of the things that's changed. I think there is now a much broader view of the nature of parenting. I think one of the other things that occurred in the history of the field was a change in views about the nature of language and language use. For a while, the only interest seemed to be in syntax. But the increasing interest in pragmatics and in language use, and then the stuff that Peggy Miller did on styles of language use within families and styles of narratives, and then Barbara Fiese's work on rituals within families and the

increasing recognition of the importance of the activities that went with various settings - like the work by Gallimore and Weisner - overall, I think the field has broadened out extraordinarily and at the same time become much more interesting. So also is the increasing interest in social policy: I see all those changes in history as having been helped by the presence and the orientation of the Society. I wonder more about the increasing links to neuroscience. What I fear might happen is that the people interested in neuroscience will go back to feeling that they are the purest of the pure and--

Dodds: And might already have done so.

Goodnow: --yes. Like a statement made in a talk I heard the other day: "if I can find it in the hippocampus I've solved the problem," sort of "I don't have to look at the nature of emotion anymore, because I know where it's been processed". We've already seen some breaks within Departments with the purest of the pure wanting to have separate Departments from the people who are doing more social sort of stuff.

Dodds: And you feel that is generally happening in psychology, or is this specifically in relation to child development?

Goodnow: No, I think this is true of psychology generally. The breaks in Departments haven't been just developmental. In fact, I think developmental has been a little slow in catching up on what was happening elsewhere simply because everybody was cautious about putting those caps and all those electrodes on children once you got beyond infancy and they would object. There's no way you can get a toddler to let you do that on with all those things [inaudible]. So we could end with another age gap.
The history questions make the personal notes the last?

Dodds: Yes.

Goodnow: Well, I'm interested in music. What are my other personal interests? I'm interested in Aboriginal painting, very much interested in forms that it takes, but also in its history: how it emerged and how it's continually changing, and the continuing debates that it involves—challenging our ideas about who owns what and about the nature of copyright.

Dodds: And about the creation of objects.

Goodnow: --Yes: the creation of objects, their appropriate display, and who is told what about what a painting represents. So it's got an amazing social background as well as being visually exotic. I must admit they're about the only paintings that I have left in the house now and well: that's perhaps my main extra personal interest.

Dodds; But you're also interested in literature?

Goodnow: Oh, heavens yes. Yes. I guess I sort of take that for granted. I do read widely, mostly for pleasure, and mostly novels.

Dodds: Story telling? And family relationships?

Goodnow: Story telling? What intrigues me now are, among refugees, the stories that are never told, that are never passed on to the next generation. Well, we'll go quickly into family, right? I was married from about '51 to 12 years ago, when Bob died. As I mentioned earlier, he was a graduate student at Harvard when I was there. Reinforcing Cecil Gibb's recommendation that I go to a big University because the other students there will become a kind of social convoy. We had two children, a boy and then a girl: both born in Hong Kong. It was quite a wrench coming back from there and managing without my two amahs, sort of one for each child. Not having to

cook for two years was fantastic. The family certainly made me think carefully about how to combine family with an academic involvement, and I've already mentioned the decision of, well, if you cut back in time just keep your research going and don't care about any of those part time jobs that might pay a little bit. Do without the money and don't even worry about it. You just keep yourself active in research and in publications so that when you are ready to come back you're not five years behind. Bob was keen to see me able to do both. And I don't think the children suffered at all. To my great surprise they've both become academics, one in the genetics of the immune system, and one in studies in media and communication. They've had a bearing. The older one, Christopher, sort of swears that he's, largely responsible for my interest in the drawings of children. There are a couple of his in the book on drawing. I didn't think they had a strong bearing on my scientific interests and contributions: they certainly did not create my interest in developmental stuff. For a while I was sort of galvanized into a strong interest in late adolescence as they both went through that period, and I began to think, "Hmm, there's a lot I don't know about that". But basically I adopted the policy that my own parents did. You can go as long as you like and as long as you're interested. But you've got to put some effort into it. I'm not going to push you into anything unless you're interested and ready to be committed to it. So Kate dropped out for a while and then came back in to university life when she was about 23, 24. But when she did it, she was interested and wanted to do it. I think the interest that they generate now for me is that I'm now a grandparent and that is something I know very little about. Mostly I just enjoy it, without any interest in turning it into a research project.

Dodds: We're now on side five of the interview with Jacqueline Goodnow the 5th of December 2008, commenting at the end on personal interests and family. So perhaps you'd like to just continue that--you were just telling us about being a grandmother.

Goodnow: Well, I find it an absolutely marvelous role. You sort of have all the fun of playing with the children and giving them bits of support, special gifts, but at the end of the day you're not responsible for them. That role has certainly added some extra interest in the views people hold about inheriting: inheriting money, property, or personal possessions. My children are now 48 and 49 and they both have children. So I really have to think more seriously about who should get what and about getting ready to de-clutter the house, etc., etc. That's certainly revived my interest in what has been called "the social life of things"—revived my interest in things and objects as another way of talking about narratives and context. On that last question: I don't know what is meant by "applied contributions".

Dodds: No, I don't understand that either. But as we were turning the tape you made a comment about the field of child development now taking account of development beyond childhood: becoming the field of development. I wondered if you could say just a little more about that, because I think that's a very interesting shift.

Goodnow: I think that's important, because one of the difficulties a lot of people in development felt that, because it was called the Society for Research in Child Development, the whole nature of even young adulthood and late adulthood and the continuing change the later phases in life were pretty well being ruled out of concern, People like Paul Baltes, for example, saw himself as very definitely a developmentalist, but it was very difficult to get anything on aging groups published in the journal, *Child Development*. That was one of the spurs toward the establishment of a second journal: the *International Journal of Behavioral Development*. He was one of those who felt strongly that a life-course view of development was a necessary step, that even late age was a developmental period.

Dodds: A developmental period?

Goodnow: Yes, a developmental period and not just a time of loss and deterioration. It's certainly true that when we came to write up the care-giving stuff, the journal of choice was

IJBD. I think that the name of the Society creates a bit of tension in the field, perhaps pushing people to extend the period of "childhood" to a later and later age. For the Society I think in terms of it being called Society for Research in Child Development and that takes you nicely through mid childhood and some adolescence.

Dodds: Yes. How much of adolescence these days may be called childhood?

Goodnow: Yes, yes. I think that's something the Society is going to have to come to terms with, because everybody who sees adulthood as also a period of development has to publish somewhere else.

Dodds: And really not attend the meetings?

Goodnow: Fewer of them attend the meetings simply because there's very little on adulthood as a period of change. And so --increasingly they go to the ISSBD meetings, because that's more open. That's how ISSBD and *IJBD* really started. And I think it's one of the tensions that the Society is going to have to work with. I don't quite know how to do it .

I think we could skip the question on applied contributions. If I had had a child who was deaf perhaps or blind: that might have made me more interested in studying particular aspects of language or hearing or other forms of perception. But neither of the children presented that kind of challenge.

Dodds: No, but would you agree that at the time you started your research, it would have been considered an appropriate field for a young woman with a family to be interested in?

Goodnow: In what? Interested in child development?

Dodds: Yes, child development.

Goodnow: Oh yes, yes it was seen as an appropriate field.

Dodds: I mean, was it seen as sort of something nice for women--

Goodnow: Women to do?

Dodds: -Yes: an appropriate field of work?

Goodnow: That's certainly not my feeling about it. And a lot of the people who were very active in the Society and in research on child development were male. The studies that were started at Berkeley, for example: The woman who initiated it and ran it couldn't get a position on the Berkeley staff, so a lot of the stuff was published as a Berkeley piece of work, with her name amongst others. Being a pioneer in child development research didn't mean that you--

Dodds: That you were employable?

Goodnow: -- employable, yes.

Dodds: --yes, it wasn't seen as field in which you were employable where you wouldn't have been employable in some other field?

Goodnow: No.

Dodds: Because education had some of that kind of aura around it

Goodnow: Yes. And faculty people in education were also--

Dodds: Were men--

Goodnow: Were men, yes. So I don't think that it was seen as an especially good area for employing women. For me it was difficulty getting a job in the first place, because everybody said, "Well, A, you're female, B, you're a young female, and C, you're likely to get married and we don't want married women in the workforce, particularly if they're going to have children." Mind you, I didn't have children till I was 35, so it would have been a long wait. But it didn't really matter what field you were in. A lot of women went into kindergarten teaching training, because that was regarded as a nice thing for you to do before you got married. And one of the interesting things about ethnic groups in Australia is that kindergarten teachers training colleges had a strong Italian intake in the '60s, especially in areas a lot of the population had an Italian background. Before, they were not allowed to do anything like that. They were escorted to the college by their brothers or their fathers and at the end of the day they were picked up by their brothers or their fathers, and it was regarded as a nice thing to do. But that's the strongest case, I think for child development being seen as an appropriate area for women.

Dodds: But not in a research area or--

Goodnow: Not in a research area, no. No. I don't think so: not in the '60s. I think there was a time when to be employed at all as a woman was more difficult, but that was not necessarily restricted to child development.

Dodds: So it wasn't easy to get a job in child development because you were a woman?

Goodnow: No, no.

Dodds: No?

Goodnow: Well, there are some times when being recognized as a woman can be a plus, after you're already recognized. After I came back to Australia, I became a member of an institution called the Academy of Social Sciences. You had to be nominated for it. My older brother was a member of the Academy. He was an economist. And economists had a major role in that academy. They were the biggest group and I suspect the nomination may have come from them. There weren't many women and I made a fairly early move into being asked to be on some of the executive committees. But one of the economists said to me: said, "This is fantastic. This is the first time we've had a brother and a sister who were both members of the Academy, and I said, "Well, considering the small number of women you've got,"--

Dodds: It's not surprising.

Goodnow: --Yes, "it's not surprising", for women to get represented in the Academy was difficult and it was some time before I was asked to give a keynote address at one of their annual meetings. By that time I was beginning to get interested in the position of women in social sciences. A couple of the women who were already interested sort of asked me, "What are you going to talk about?" And I said, "Well, I've just come back from the U.S. and I'm really getting very intrigued about the position of women and the sampling of women for psychological studies and the extent to which a lot of our measures and a lot of our theories are biased." And they said, "Oh, that would be marvelous. Do give a talk on that." This was just around about the time when the journal *Developmental Psychology* said that they wouldn't accept papers where the sampling was all male or all female unless there was a good explanation. That talk was received by the Academy members - mostly male - with great coolness, but most of the women who were in the Academy thought it was fantastic. One of

the sociologists also thought it was fantastic, but added: "I don't see how you can continue in the field of psychology after doing a review of what has been missed and what has been mishandled," and so forth. But the women who were interested and I decided that we would put out a book. We'd get people in law and in politics and so forth all to talk about the place of women in their part of social science and the way in which the issues related to women were dealt with. Carol Pateman and I co-edited a book called *Women in Social Sciences and Social Policy*, and I'm told regularly. when I go to the Academy, by that it's still on the reading list for courses in women's studies.

Dodds: Oh, that one. That would have come out in the late '80s, early '90s?

Goodnow: I'd have to look up when it came out. It would have come out some time in the '80s. But that was probably one of the first things to come out in Australia on the way in which women were sampled and theorized within the social sciences. So that was a nice sort of break in the pattern and few of us regretted what we had done - I don't think any of us did. It's just strange to look back and remember that it was thought to be very "daring". So that was kind of fun.

Dodds: So what would be your message to young women--

Goodnow: Oh... Well, my message to young women is the same one that I've given to a lot of women who are graduate students who were absolutely thrilled that I was--that I had a partner and that I had children, because they were getting along and several of them had a child during the course of doing their Ph.D. And they had said to me, "Look, I felt that was possible, because you had children and you were still working full time." If they'd had males as supervisors, they might have been thought of as not fully serious about their Ph.D. --whereas I'd never feel that way. Some of the younger women on the staff also felt that it was a step forward: the first woman Professor in Psychology and the first one in any field at Macquarie University. That was in 1975. And I felt that I had moved back historically quite some distance. It was like swimming through mud for a while. It's changed dramatically, but I think it was important for the students I worked with that it didn't make any difference to me whether they had a child or not. I still regarded them as serious graduate students and that they could see that as a model I was involved in parenting, but I didn't feel that that was the end of my life in research or in teaching. So I think my basic message to others would be the same one that goes to my graduate students, which first of all, you can combine having a partner and having children with a serious commitment to research. And the other bit of advice is one I've already mentioned. If you have to give up anything, give up the teaching but don't give up the research and keep publishing, because if you give up the research--you can come back to teaching after a five-year break, but you can't come back into a research field after a five year break. I've just seen too many women who've tried doing that and they can't come back at the same level that they were at before and they're often out of date. And it's no longer a habit with them to keep up to date with the literature and to generate research projects and to get things published. Their ethos has been altered. It's not only that they need to catch up on the literature, but they have to recreate an identity that they virtually abandoned. So my advice is don't abandon it. Take a half-time job. Keep the research and remain visible because otherwise it's very difficult to come back in, except perhaps in a different capacity. I still think it's possible to come late into the field. Both in the States and in Australia some of our best graduate students were older women towards the later part of family life. I took it for granted that this was a more than possible step: "Okay, you aren't trying to come back in at the top. This is a new direction for you." And I hadn't really dropped out of a research career. They had never felt that they could--

Dodds: Have one?

Goodnow: --Well, do Ph.D.s. But they did come in and they were very good, very good.

Dodds: I think that where we are - at the University of Melbourne—there are fewer older women than they had in the past.

Goodnow: Yes. I think there are fewer of them now, because we sort of basically sampled the pool at that earlier time. Now more women stay working.

Dodds: Yes, probably.

Goodnow: Some of those older women had not been in work since their undergraduate career. Many of them had to do a screening year, but they were so eager. And they've stayed continuously in research or teaching. So I think the message is that that you don't have to abandon everything if you acquire a partner or children. If you have to abandon parts of it, look carefully at the parts you keep and the parts you abandon. There is another message I should pass on. It was given to me when I was first contemplating having children. I asked a woman who had combined an academic career with having children what she thought was a good age to have children. Her answer was: "There's never a really good time. Just be prepared to spend money on getting help. You'd borrow money to buy a car or a house or a boat. Just borrow money for your career. It's a good investment." That was enormously helpful advice

Dodds: And if you do drop out?

Goodnow: If you take yourself out completely then it's very difficult to come back at a level that you'll find satisfying. Sometimes, it's better to switch fields and start a slightly different path.... So basically it's: Yes, it's possible to do all these things and sort of juggle them all but you have to be a bit strategic about it.

Dodds: On behalf of SRCD, I want to thank you very much.

Goodnow: Well, thank you for doing the interviewing. It makes me feel that there's an awful lot of years to account for and that I'm not practiced at this. I basically don't like to look back or account for my life, so the interview has been longer than, I suspect, either of us anticipated. So, that's a special reason for thanking you. Dear me, that's an awful lot of years to have to cover.

And I've little interest in looking back. That is one reason for having resisted earlier requests to do this interview. The only thing that has encouraged me to finally stop resisting and be willing to look back is the comment by several people in one of the Society newsletters that the histories were being used as archival material by students interested in the careers of women, and I thought, Well, okay, we shouldn't let those archives be, again, gender biased.

Dodds: Okay. Jacqueline, just before we finish up I wondered if there was anything else you wanted to add that might have come to mind as we were talking?

Goodnow: There are two things that have come to mind. One is that I don't want to leave the impression that the only reason for publishing is to keep yourself viable and on the market. There are two other reasons that are really more important to me. One is that I see it as an ethical issue that I could summarize that very quickly by saying you should never get into a situation where it's public money and private knowledge. Research depends upon the funding of a university or a research grant, so it really is important that you not just keep the knowledge that you gain to yourself. You should put it out there. The other reason for doing it comes from a Canadian colleague and it's always made very good sense to me. His comment was that you don't really understand your data or the problem you're working on until you start writing an article that will be peer reviewed. It's a bit like you don't discover how little

you know about something until you have to teach it. For those reasons, I'm sometimes a bit heavy on graduate students. They finish their thesis and they think, "Oh thank God, I need never write another thing." In fact, they should have started writing articles before they get to that point.

No: there is one last thing I need to say. SRCD gave me an award for distinguished contributions to the study of development. That was tremendously important to me not only as an individual, but also because I was by that time in Australia. So, as I said at the time of the award, I felt this was not only an acknowledgement of individuals, but it was also an acknowledgement of the significance of an international membership. So I was happy to accept it on behalf of not only myself, but on behalf of all the members of the Society who were not in an American group.

Those are the two last points. I feel that if I wake up in the middle of the night with anything else it can sort of stay in the middle of the night.

Dodds: You've ranged pretty widely and I'm sure it will be and listened to and read with interest. Thank you.

End of Interview