

Carolyn Ann Shantz

- **Born 5/19/1935 in Kalamazoo, MI**
- **Spouse – David**
- **B.A. (1957) DePauw University, M.A. (1959) Purdue University, Ph.D. (1966) Purdue University**

Major Employment:

- **Wayne State University – 1971- , Professor**

Major Areas of Work:

- **Social Cognition**



SRCD ORAL HISTORY INTERVIEW

Carolyn Ann (Uhlinger) Shantz

Interviewed by John W. Hagen
At The Society for Research in Child Development
Ann Arbor, Michigan
September 15, 2000

Hagen: It is September 15th and we're just about to begin an interview with Carolyn Shantz. We're now proceeding with the interview and we have written responses for the first questions under 'General Intellectual History,' but we're going to begin as a takeoff point with number three, talking about origins of your interest in the field that we're both in.

Shantz: Okay. What surprised me most in all of my graduate school days, were to my surprise, the courses in my minor, child development. In some ways it shouldn't have surprised me because basic to any clinician endeavors is the question of developmental roots of pathologies and strengths, and to this day I hold the bias that any good clinical program has a heavy component of developmental psychology. Walter Emmerich and Bill Martin taught fascinating courses, this was at Purdue, on personality development, the family and child, observational research and so on, and Charles Smock, who was about to depart to study with Piaget, introduced us to Piagetian methods, findings and theory. To begin to grasp the cognitive development was the most satisfying experience of my graduate training. It was, I think, the complexity and fertility of Piagets' ideas and approach to studying how children think that was the basis of my interests.

Midway through my graduate work I went on a clinical joint internship at Worcester Massachusetts State Hospital, Worcester Youth Guidance Center and Clark University, circa 1960. It was a cultural shock. Although Purdue had some exposure to theory (Hull, Tolman, Skinner) the emphasis I realized belatedly was "dust bowl" empiricism compared to Clark University where theory was central. There, Heinz Werner's comparative theory, akin in many ways to Piaget's, was predominant and a developmental emphasis was in every course, such as a seminar on symbolic representation. And as luck would have it, Wolf Mayes, a logician from England and authority on Piaget, was a visiting professor that year. He provided some important pathways through the symbolic logic of Piaget's work and ethological psychology, just beginning to be introduced in the U.S., was also emphasized at Clark, especially the power of observation via research by Tinbergen and Lorenz with animals, and later by McGrew and Blurton-Jones with children.

Graduate students at Clark and I had many challenging discussions about developmental issues, and this really started to solidify my interests in developmental psychology: discussions with Joe Glick, George Rand, Joe McFarland, Sandor Bent, Pete Schiller, Johnny Langer and others.

Freudian theory still dominated the psychological circles on the east coast, particularly clinical ones. Part of my internship, quite an academic one I learned later, was a two-hour yearlong seminar in Freudian theory in the morning, both enlightening and eventually stultifying, I found. His stage theory I found most provocative, and the most positive influence during my internship was Roger Bibace, a Clark professor and intern supervisor who taught me to respect a theory by learning deeply about it before making a judgment as to its utility, consistency and applicability to real life development and pathology. Irv Sigel at Merrill-Palmer Institute in Detroit was the second important influence in my intellectual and research interests. He hired me for my first academic job as a research associate at Merrill-Palmer Institute. We had many discussions about cognitive development in general and specific important studies we were reading, and collaborated some in the study of conservation. This was a very common topic at that time. Also Irv had a meeting Thursday evenings once a month of the research staff to discuss a new idea he was working on called 'psychological distancing,' and its role in cognitive development. And it was exciting to see how the concept evolved and different methods were considered to assess it. The concept of distancing became central to his later research, and is a major contribution of his to the field. His impact on many scholars, Kagan, Bronfenbrenner, DeLoache, Mischel, Fisher, Greenfield, Wertsch, McCall, Sternberg and others, is attested to in the volume by editors Cocking and Renninger, The Development and Meaning of Psychological Distance, 1993. That was kind of a festschrift for Irv.

Hagen: And he's still going strong. I see him at meetings.

Shantz: He still is. Oh, absolutely. I can't – retirement, he doesn't know. And then there was a serendipitous event that also influenced my interest. John Watson, an infant researcher at the Institute and later at Berkeley, asked me one day if I would teach him about Piaget's theory and collaborate on a study to help him learn in depth more about it, because he hadn't been exposed to it at all in his graduate training. And I agreed, and in a few days he returned to suggest we study egocentrism. I was skeptical about the choice because I thought it was one of Piaget's more problematic constructs. My dissertation had been on a cleaner construct, one of the grouping structures, but we decided to give it a go and spent hours testing preschoolers in the old Carriage House at Merrill-Palmer Institute and had fun of debating what their responses meant. It really was a fun collaboration.

Hagen: What years would that have been?

Shantz: That would have been probably 1966, '67, in there, because I started –

Hagen: Because he left for Berkeley pretty soon after that, didn't he?

Shantz: Three or four years later.

Hagen: Four years, maybe '70?

Shantz: I came in '65, in the fall of '65, and I think John was there three or four years.

Hagen: That's probably about right, because I came here in '65 and he overlapped a little bit, because we would go in and meet with him, but I remember it was a long time ago that he did go.

Shantz: Yes. I was sad to see him go, but anyway that study was published in *Psychonomic Science* and began my interests beyond cognitive development into social cognitive development, and at that time the subtopic did not even have a name, and I'll tell you about a funny event later on that issue. Okay. I think that's about it in my response to what kind of formed my evolving focus on child development.

Hagen: Okay. The next question, the last one under the sort of general intellectual background is: are there some political and/or social events that have influenced your research, your writing or your teaching?

Shantz: Yes. And I'll briefly talk about four. The first one was just the initial job choice when I came to Detroit in the fall of '65. I was offered a child clinical job, or I had the choice of the job at the Merrill-

Palmer Institute teaching and doing research. And given my growing disinterest in clinical and increasing interest in research, more academic interest, let's put it that way, I decided I'd take the job at Merrill-Palmer Institute for at least a couple years and see how that went. So that was the first kind of social –

Hagen: Were you married at this time?

Shantz: Yes. Dave and I both came to Detroit. He was employed at Lafayette Clinic.

Hagen: Oh, really! Okay.

Shantz: The typical thing.

Hagen: Oh, the old classic clinic. Yes.

Shantz: Yes. And it was a very nice job and I followed him, and Detroit was a good area for getting jobs in psychology. So Smock and Irv knew each other, because they're both in cognitive development, and so that's how the initial hookup came.

The second part of what happened to influence my career was the impact of my children. It intensified my developmental interests, and especially observations. I am known for having home-grown examples of Piagetian constructs like transduction and so on, try to help my students remember what it means, and an emergent interest in lifespan development too as I got older.

The third major event that influenced me was Mavis Heatheringtons inviting me to write a review chapter. The letter appeared one day when I was newly at Wayne State. Mavis asked me if I would write a review chapter on social cognition for SRCDS' *Review of Child Developmental Research*.

Hagen: I was a co-editor of that. I don't know if you remember?

Shantz: Oh, I'm sorry. No, I didn't.

Hagen: Yes.

Shantz: I didn't remember.

Hagen: I think it was the same volume.

Shantz: Isn't that fascinating. I think because the letter was from her, or signed only –

Hagen: Yes. Right. She was the senior editor.

Shantz: -- that I didn't realize –

Hagen: And then I just was responsible for like three of the chapters. Yes.

Shantz: Oh, that's interesting. Well, it was a very funny letter to get because it asked me to write this chapter on social cognition, and I didn't know what social cognition was. I truly didn't know. So I started to ask around, and finally someone made the connection that Al Bandura was using the term 'social cognition' for his theory, and what it meant and so on, so I began to put together that early work on egocentrism, person perception work and so on, was what Mavis was talking about. So I wrote back saying, "Yes, if this is what she meant by social cognition." So it was kind of an amusing thing. I greatly enjoyed writing that chapter. And I think it really had a big effect on me because I felt like I was pretty good at it, seeing the patterns, knowing what research to kind of neglect and what to emphasize, and trying to see where field was going, and I really enjoyed doing that. And so your invitation, her invitation, was really important for what I did later in my career.

And then there was a fourth event. My husband David and I were talking one winter's night. He had been reading some in ethology, and he had had background more in behaviorisms, and he was getting kind of, oh what shall I say? bored by behaviorism. He thought it was just way too pat, really didn't deal with complexities, and he had done a lot of reading on aggression and now was reading the ethological work on conflict. I mean, some of the work was with crayfish and lobsters for heavens sakes, and we got to talking about it and he says, "You know, I think the field of social development, as I know it, has been led astray by focusing so entirely on aggression. I think they ought to consider conflict." Well, he and I knew immediately what the difference between conflict and aggression was and we started to talk further about it. And at Christmas we wrote a grant proposal to NSF, which ended up being funded to look at everyday conflicts between kids, and then I had the part to assess their social cognitive abilities, and one review sheet on that, the feedback, was so funny, because one of the reviewers was an ethologist whose entire experience was with crayfish. And he said, he had relatively little to say about the merits for studying conflict in children, but as far as he was concerned we were certainly defining the concept right, and what we were going to do looked reasonable. So we were one of the few, I think, who's ever been reviewed by a crustacean ethologist, as he called himself. And it was funded, and there was another group at Harvard doing a study very much like ours, also funded by NSF, and I learned later that Bea Whiting was one of the reviewers and was instrumental in getting that funded, and I think Harvard's too, perhaps. But anyway, I felt that was really a turning point in my career, of looking at conflict. At that point it had to be a kind of descriptive level, what kids were arguing about, what their emotions were, how they turned out and so on. So those were the –

Hagen: So was it mainly observational, or was it manipulative?

Shantz: The main study we did, that NSF study was observational.

Hagen: What age were the kids?

Shantz: They were first and second graders after school in the library room, but it was a clear area where they could play for an hour, and the parents loved it, of course, they were all out shopping.

Hagen: A before or after school program?

Shantz: An after school program, so it worked out very well, and Dave and his colleagues worked on that behavioral analysis, which a lot of people weren't doing yet, getting video tapes of kids and having mikes and so on on them. Then I did the social cognitive assessment. Another side benefit of such research were two of Dave's research associates were older women who came back to Oakland University to finish up, Ellen Price was one from Stanford, she had wanted to take a masters, and Joyce Schomer, I think, was finishing up, and they've become lifelong friends of ours and we've traveled together and all, so it's really interesting how these relationships evolve over time. So those, I think, are the – I wouldn't say any straight political events influenced by research interests though.

Hagen: Okay. The next section has to do with personal research contributions, and the first question on the list says, what were your primary interests in child development at the beginning? You've already talked about that. I don't know if you have anything to add to that?

Shantz: Well, mainly I would answer number two. Maybe you want to say in the mike what number two is.

Hagen: Okay. Sure. Number two is, the continuities in your work, which are most significant, which shifts have occurred and what are the responsible events?

Shantz: Okay. I would say my main continuity is that I've been focused on preschool and elementary school aged children, and cognitive and social cognitive development. I mean, you can see that also as a major shift. I went from straight cognitive –

Hagen: Right.

Shantz: -- looking at the effects of irrelevant information on kids' problem solving kind of thing into social cognition, and then into social development, specifically conflict. In fact, John Flavell one time said to me, "Carolyn, you're going to run out of areas for your research interests if you've gone from cognitive to social cognitive to social."

I think the cause of the shift I've eluded to before, was the serendipity of John Watson getting me started in the interest in social cognition by our study on egocentrism and evolving, I mean it's part of my evolution as a child clinical psychologists, which was really a major: I've thought that how kids interpreted the world was awfully important to understand. The shift from social cognition more into social development was that review chapter in Mussen's Handbook, partly the one Mavis asked me to do, but later the larger one where John Flavell was editor of that 1983 Mussen Handbook. And there was a little section in my chapter on conflict, and as I was writing that I was thinking, boy, this looks like it could be a very fruitful area for research. Not just from what David said, but I began, because I was teaching a course on theories of development, began to realize how conflict was embedded as a force of change in virtually every major theory. And I thought, you know, I'm going to put that on the shelf and think about that when I get through writing this chapter, and Dave and I had done the one study on conflict, but that was a confluence of events that helped for my evolution into interest from straight social cognition into conflict.

Hagen: Did you look at sex difference back at that time?

Shantz: We did look at some, but neither Dave or I were very interested in sex differences, and we knew what we'd find. That's probably one of the reasons we weren't very interested; little boys are more aggressive than little girls.

Hagen: Well, certainly my mentor Eleanor Maccoby started looking at that early on, and I just recently heard a talk by Nicki Crick who's now at Minnesota, who's arguing that little girls are every bit as aggressive, but it's in the verbal domains, and then as they become young teenagers it gets more sophisticated and almost underhanded.

Shantz: I think she's right. Very. And when I've taught in my classes, the female students are all smiling, they know exactly what Nicki's talking about, social exclusion, spreading rumors, all that stuff. And we saw that kind -- we didn't see relational aggression so much with six-and seven-year-olds, but you saw the little girls sitting at some of the work tables, talking up a storm, and what they were doing was of no never-mind. And the little boys were on the floor, what they were doing was very important to them, the activity, and they, you know, make little balls of play dough and throw them at each other. I mean, it was just classic sex difference. So, of course, we reported them, but we -- I guess it was, we either couldn't or weren't that interested in what kind of theory about sex differences could we use to go further than just documenting the differences, and we never came up with anything, so we didn't really stick with them very much. The linguists have more in conflict. They are very good, not so much theory, but very good at looking at some of those subtleties of little girls' relational aggression that Nicki talks about. And yes, the mikes picked up little girls arguing, sometimes being verbally quite aggressive. It's just they aren't as observable -- the conflict isn't as observable, so it's no wonder the field thought little boys were --

Hagen: Well, it probably didn't fit the definition that was being used at that time.

Shantz: That's part of it too. Yes. I think that was. Yes.

Hagen: The next question asks you to reflect on the strengths and any possible weaknesses of your research, theoretical contributions and the impact of your work?

Shantz: Okay. I think the major strengths were in the review papers. I know some people think that this is not the greatest contribution to a field, but I frankly was of a different opinion, in the sense that every time I got done doing an empirical study, I thought, "There's another pebble on the empirical beach," you know, this just building a VITA -- I mean I wasn't finding things that really intellectually turned me on, but by reviewing areas of research, I thought that was much more interesting, and finding patterns and trying to

make sense for the field out of an area of research. And I got a lot of feedback from people, how helpful those early chapters were. In fact, Nicki Crick, interestingly you brought up her name, she was a graduate student when I first met her.

Hagen: Oh, really!

Shantz: And she came up to me at SRCD, said she was scared to death later, because she'd read that early chapter and it was so helpful, and she wanted to know, "How do you write review papers? I mean, how do you start that?" And I said, "You're going to find out when you do your dissertation, because that's essentially what you're doing." So we had quite a talk, and I thought gee, well what a neat student, you know? Ran into her every SRCD meeting after that, and we became good friends. She eventually became an Associate Editor of the Merrill-Palmer Quarterly.

Hagen: That's right.

Shantz: But I got a lot of feedback from people that was very positive about those, so I really think in the long run those papers were probably my major contribution.

The other, I think, was probably the work on conflict. It was really interesting, you know, Dave and I saw the difference between conflict and aggression right off. When I'd go to meetings like APA Division Seven or SRCD, people would invariably ask us how our study on aggression was coming. And it was clear that most people were not making any distinction between conflict and aggression. And until you got that conceptual change started, it seemed to be nothing was going to work in terms of understanding kids arguments, debates and so on. And I never felt more that I wanted a study published than that review paper in *Child Development*. Bill Hartup was Editor, and I had written to Bill and I said, "I just gave a paper on "Child Development, Conflict and Conundrums" as my presidential address for Division Seven, and in there I reviewed a lot of research on conflict. Do you think you'd be at all interested in my working on a review paper?" And he said, "Sure, but just don't emphasize your own work so much. Do more of an evenhanded one." So I went ahead and worked on that, and by the time I got done I really liked that paper. You know it was one of those where you're really proud of it, and you just think the field needs this. It will be helpful to them. And I knew a lot of people working kind of in the area, and I was so eager for that to be published, and then when I got the reviews back and Bills', it was revised. Is this appropriate for me to talk about?

Hagen: Sure.

Shantz: Well, one person wanted me to reorient toward topics, and I wanted to use the dynamic system of where -- what makes kids get to conflict, what goes on, how do they end and so on, kind of the Robert Hinde approach to looking at interactions. And then one of the reviewers who was Kate Garvey, I found out later, and of course she knew the linguistic literature in pragmatics much better than I, and kind of opened my eyes to the work of Shiffrin and Ochs and a lot of other people that were, you know, they were not being published in the established journals. They'd never get into *Child Development*, *Developmental Psych* probably, but their work I found fascinating, and indeed it was very useful. So that review paper became even better. I mean that's the happy event you want with good reviewers. They're very constructive and it made a better paper, and then it was published, and I'm just very pleased with that paper in particular. I wanted it published more than anything I've ever written.

The weaknesses, I think, are that I've never had an empirical project and, you know, where you start with question one and you just systematically do study after study looking at the phenomenon and trying to tease apart the context it occurs in, what causes it and so on. I guess at a number of reasons for that, but I won't bother. It just never evolved very much. And I especially noticed that when Hilary Ratner came on the faculty at Wayne State, because she is just the opposite. She has had studies that just are, you know, study one, two, three, four, and then they branch out and it's a very coherent career if you look at it as doing studies. Just opposite to mine. And so I think in that way I have not made any major empirical contribution, except perhaps in this very limited area of the NSF study. It was published in Berkowitz's

New Directions for Child Development. That was the major summary of Dave's and my NSF study, so I don't think that was my strong suit in my career at all.

Hagen: The next question is, what published – and in a way you've answered some of this too. What published or unpublished manuscripts best represent your thinking, and which studies seem most significant?

Shantz: The most misguided, as I recall was –

Hagen: Most wrong headed, is that what you –?

Shantz: Yes. Okay. I think by best papers are the ones I've kind of mentioned here and there. The '83 Mussen Handbook chapter on social cognitive development, which wasn't easy to do given that John Flavell was the editor; that was a bit of pressure.

Hagen: Paul, by the way, we had one rather not very complete interview, and he just died, so we never got a good oral interview, which I'm very sad about.

Shantz: That is sad. Yes, I'd heard that he was sick.

Hagen: Yes. He had been sick and his wife thought he would be getting better, so we sort of put it off, which was a mistake in retrospect. Again, you just don't know all the time.

Shantz: Yes. You don't. And then there comes a time where it's too intrusive.

Hagen: Yes. Exactly.

Shantz: That's too bad.

Hagen: But at least SRCD did give him an award at the Washington D.C. meeting and he came for it, so we were very pleased, because he hadn't been coming in recent years.

Shantz: Had he been kind of not well for a period of time?

Hagen: Yes. He had cancer, it was either – was it bladder? And then he had had a recurrence, and I guess then it had spread.

Shantz: Okay. Then I think that '87 article in *Child Development* I thought was an important paper. And the major empirical study was the Shantz '85 paper in Berkowitz's *New Directions*, so those are the main – And you know there's another study I like, but it was just a pilot study, and that was in a book by Cocking and Renninger called, *The Development and Meaning of Psychological Distance* in '93. That's the festschrift for Siegel.

Hagen: Oh, right.

Shantz: And I reported, because I didn't have much more than pilot data on the lessons children learn from the conflicts, the arguments they have with their classmates, and I liked that study and I wrote it up in a chapter. It was not sufficient in its database to be an article, but it was a lot of fun to do the interviewing and to write it up, and start to look at what kids are abstracting from these social events, which took me back more to social cognition. So I've always liked it, but I wouldn't say it's a great piece of science by any means.

Hagen: I guess that brings us to the last question in this section, and that is asking you to reflect on your experiences with research funding apparatus over the years, and have you played a role in shaping research funding policy or implementation, securing support for your own work and related matters?

Shantz: Okay. Yes. I was both, what would you call it, a supplicant and a panel member. As a researcher, most of my research has been funded by NSF, NICHD and Spencer Foundation, and then local ones like through Wayne State, you know, little seed monies. The last application I made went to NIMH and it was an interesting experience. Essentially said, “Well, the research is good, but we really think her major strength is reviewing research in the field, and essentially she ought to keep doing that and we’re not going to fund your project.” It was really a downer, and I had to laugh at a SRCD meeting –

Hagen: About what year was that?

Shantz: That was, I would say, maybe six years ago.

Hagen: Okay.

Shantz: A bunch of us gathered in the cocktail lounge at SRCD, where a lot of the important business really goes on, as you know, and got in a discussion of some old folk like me, relatively old folk, all of whom were talking about ages in funding, because three of us at that little gathering of about seven people – well, actually all three of the older people had experiences where you’re told in a sense, kind of pat on your head, “you’ve done good work, this isn’t up to snuff and why don’t you go back and do more of what you do so well, or find another funding agency.” And we also were aware that NIMH had a young researchers training program and they were trying very hard to fund young researchers, so there was this talk about age and none of us know, and who knows, for the field over all, maybe that is the way, the kind of policy there should be, to give the benefit of the doubt to the younger researcher. I don’t know. But that was about six years ago was the last time I tried.

I think to the experience of doing a SRCD Summer Institute, years ago when Ping Serafica, otherwise known as Felicissima, was the Chair, and that got together the social cognition people, Selman and Chandler, oh a bunch of us, and that was an interesting – I had to think that had an interesting effect, you’d have to check me out for sure, but I think that led to some funding for those people who were involved in that institute.

Now, as I’ve been a member of two major review panels, one was an NIMH review panel, Walter Mischel was the Chair, and some of the people on the committee were Walt Emmerich and Fran Horowitz –

Hagen: That was NIMH?

Shantz: I think it was NIMH.

Hagen: Oh, okay.

Shantz: Lila Gleitman, Posner. And I think the only developmentalists then were Fran, Walt and me, and that was a real eye opener in being on a panel in Washington, in several respects. But one of them was, I was afraid I was going to be the only one that wanted some kind of conceptual framework or theoretical base to research that we funded, and I was really surprised that I was not a “lonely voice in the wilderness,” there was a lot of push on that committee to not fund research unless there was at least a mini-theory at work. And I found that, because I guess I didn’t see it reflected all that well in the published research, but that I had gotten the notion that conceptual framework theories weren’t all that important, but that certainly wasn’t the case on that committee.

And then the second committee I was on was a NICHD-Aging I– I think it was I, there was an Aging I and an Aging II, and that was a group. Nancy Eisenberg, Claire Kopp, Kate Garvey, Mark Appelbaum, Les Cohen, Phil Costanzo, Roger Bakeman. We had a ball. And it was a hard working committee. That was one of the things that really struck me. These people worked hard, and we had great times, and we remained friends ever since. I mean it was a really interesting social impact. And in Albuquerque SRCD for example, Mark got together the whole group for the first time, and it was great fun. Of course, several of us were on the verge of retiring or had retired, but again, the group I thought was very – oh, how should

I say, it could take many perspectives on a proposal, and I think anybody that submitted and had that committee would have been very pleased to hear the discussions. I was always very impressed.

Hagen: Do you remember who the Exec. Sec. was?

Shantz: Yes. Levitan.

Hagen: Oh, Teri. She was our student here. I was on her committee.

Shantz: Oh, my gosh.

Hagen: Yes. She's been around. Washington –

Shantz: Yes. Oh, wait a minute, or was she the NIMH? No. No. She was the NICHD.

Hagen: Great.

Shantz: And she was a very important person in kind of helping facilitate things, and occasionally substantive comments, which I thought was terrific. I mean she had enough background she could do that.

Hagen: Oh, yes. She would.

Shantz: So that had a lot of nice side effects.

Hagen: She's at NITA now, you know, she has one of the top roles at NITA.

Shantz: Oh, I'm happy for her. She's happy with it, I'm sure.

Hagen: Oh, yes, she loves it. Yes.

Shantz: Well, I found though that I had a shelf life for doing that kind of work of about four years. You learned so much, not only about submitting, but about what's going on in the field and so on, but the rewards of it, apart from the social ones, decreased and I found it hard to serve –

Hagen: You get to dread when those packets come and you have to start again.

Shantz: Boxes and boxes.

Hagen: Now it's electronic. I was on a NSF one recently and they sent it all electronically and I did the reviews electronically.

Shantz: Oh, that's great. Of course, NSF you still had to --

Hagen: But we still had to meet.

Shantz: Did you have to go in?

Hagen: And for this we did. I know that they often don't.

Shantz: Now is that social and developmental sciences, or what division was that?

Hagen: This was actually – it was a year ago this summer, and it's a new initiative that's joint with the Department of Ed and NICHD to get research going on sort of education and development in young children.

Shantz: Oh. So it's not in the standard structure?

Hagen: No. It wasn't the standard, although they have modified their standard structures of that too.

Shantz: Yes. I had understood they did. So that's my experience, both as – I had very good experiences most of the time in submitting grant proposals, except for the very, very last one. And that wasn't just that it wasn't funded, it was the tone of the review that I found problematic.

Hagen: Sure.

Shantz: And I didn't think it was the best analysis. I saw some weaknesses in it that weren't identified, and I thought some were, you know, dreamt up. But as a participant on panels, I found that a very rewarding part of my career, until as you say, toward year four, the boxes arriving and – speaking of things arriving, aren't we going to be getting pretty soon the panel SRCD program submissions to us as we serve on these panels for the Minnesota meeting?

Hagen: You should have them now, actually. We'll check with Thelma when we have a break.

Shantz: Okay.

Hagen: Yes. Because everything went out to the panel Chairs.

Shantz: Okay. Well, I saw you should get it the 27th of September probably. Maybe that's –

Hagen: Is that right? Okay. Then it's –

Shantz: I wasn't worried about not getting them. It's probably they're divvying us some up.

Hagen: Right. Yes. Because we had the three thousand of them in here and then they get divided among the twenty panel Chairs, and those all went out.

Shantz: That's for a symposia and posters?

Hagen: That's symposia and posters together. Yes.

Shantz: That's going to be fun.

Hagen: It'll be a big meeting. We were just up there, in fact, last week, finalizing some of the plans, so I think everyone goes to like the setting.

Shantz: Yes. I found Albuquerque – it was interesting, but I like Minneapolis a lot.

Hagen: Yes. It'll serve us better. Okay. Now I think we're already in the next section, which is institutional contributions, and the first has to do with the institutions in which you've worked, and actually there are relatively few in your case, just as in my case.

Shantz: Very few. Yes. Aren't we funny? I don't think we're normative for our field.

Hagen: No. We're not.

Shantz: Yes. Merrill-Palmer Institute in Detroit from '65 to '71. I was a Research Associate in the Research Division of the Institute headed by Irv Sigel.

Hagen: And Marty Hoffman must have overlapped too?

Shantz: No. Marty had already gone to here.

Hagen: Okay. He had come here then?

Shantz: Yes. He was at the University of Michigan. He was still Editor of the Quarterly, but he wasn't at the Institute.

Hagen: You're right, now that I think about it, because I came in '65, and I think that's when he came.

Shantz: We really have parallel careers, don't we?

Hagen: Yes.

Shantz: More than I realized. That position was just, in some respect, a gravy train. We had a research assistant given to us half time, and we were just supposed to develop our own research program, and I collaborated primarily with Irv, and some with John Watson too, and then I taught courses for the graduate students at the Institute. Now some of those were Ping Serafica was a student at the Institute, Dave Bearison, Judy Auerbach – oh, I'm forgetting somebody at Wisconsin. This is terrible. We taught those students developmental, but also at that time I was hired by Wayne State, or a collaborative with the Institute, to teach students in the PhD program at Wayne State because they had no developmental program, so those students would come over and I would teach them too.

In the late sixties, things began to change at the Institute.

Hagen: Who was the Director at this time?

Shantz: Pauline Knapp, for most of the time I was there. It was the money. It was financial problems. The Institute was supported mainly through the ClayFord family, and Mrs. William ClayFord was the primary sponsor, and I'm not sure what went on behind the scenes, but it was clear the -- just like Fels Institute and all the other institutes of child development, a lot of them fell on hard times when these large families like Fels soap, and in this case the Ford family, became less interested in supporting. And so she wrote in three years of support to give the Institute, as I understand it, three years of support for the Institute to find a home, and it began to look at other universities, Michigan, Michigan State, Wayne State and so on, to become part of, you know, it's one institute among many institutes at those universities. But it also shifted direction from an academic program to a community service based program, and I knew that wasn't me. That wasn't my strength, and it wasn't my rewards. I really liked teaching and doing research.

Hagen: Was that when Greta Fein -- is she the next Director or a part of that?

Shantz: I don't think she was the Director, or if she was it was toward the very end.

Hagen: I know she was for a short time because she came and talked to us about some collaborations, and then she left for Texas before --

Shantz: Yes. That's right. I'm sorry. It must have been in the seventies, because Merrill-Palmer Institute, like the Quarterly was bought and the buildings were bought by Wayne State in '79-'80, I think, in that time frame.

Hagen: Well, then Frank Palmer was there.

Shantz: And Frank Palmer was there.

Hagen: Yes. Well, didn't he sort of preside over the decline of it?

Shantz: Yes. By that time I had already been at Wayne State for a while, so it really did go downhill fast in terms of being the force it was before.

Hagen: Exactly.

Shantz: But the daycare center stayed, the preschool, and a PACT program stayed, several of the faculty went to Wayne State and then the Journal went to Wayne State.

What I did at Wayne State was, at the time, they wanted to build up the developmental program.

Hagen: What year was that?

Shantz: '71. Eli Saltz and Sandy Brent were the two primary developmentalists, and they were both in cognitive. I'm not sure why they hired me, because I had kind of duplicated them in some sense, but they started hiring and so a PhD program in developmental psychology was instituted at Wayne State. And we hired Joe Jacobson in infancy, and Glen Weisfeld who was in ethological development from the University of Chicago, and Hilary Ratner, and she was hired primarily to replace me and Eli Saltz in the teaching part, because I was taking over the editorship of the Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, and Eli was my first Associate Editor, so they needed someone to help out with that. And then we kind of got a bonus, actually, Wayne State was reorganizing some of their departments, and one of them was Nutrition and Food Sciences, and so we inherited Kathy Urberg and Melissa Kaplan, so we became the largest area of all the areas in our department. It kind of began with serendipity, because they just happened to reorganize.

Hagen: That was also a time when developmental was building nationally.

Shantz: And it has stayed fairly large, so that was my bare institutional experience.

Hagen: Now it says here to describe changes --?

Shantz: Oh, could I say one other thing I forgot?

Hagen: Sure.

Shantz: The other way we changed our program was we decided we wanted a lifespan program –

Hagen: All right!

Shantz: And we thought – before we got the Lifespan people, we said, “We want to make this program more special, and there aren't very many offering lifespan work, it's mostly infancy through adolescence,” so we hired Gisela who is still in the Psychology department, and Joe Fitzgerald.

Hagen: Is he still there?

Shantz: And he's still there. In autobiographical memory. Gisela, of course, has had lots of awards in her area. So that really brought our area to being very large.

Hagen: Right.

Shantz: I didn't mean to forget them, but that was an important role, I think I played. I wasn't all that taken with adulthood and aging research, except for the work of Schaie and some of Gisela's, and it was in cognitive pretty much, because everything else seemed to be sociology or epidemiology, or it wasn't much psychology of adulthood and aging (End Side 1A)

Hagen: Okay. We are ready to resume the interview, and I think we're down to the question now under institutional contributions that focuses on teaching and training issues?

Shantz: Okay. Well, I've alluded to the primary change in the developmental program was the expansion into lifespan developmental, and the reasons for that. And we also have an Institute of Gerontology that really enriches that program too, like the University of Michigan does.

Hagen: Ours is being closed. Did you know that?

Shantz: No. I didn't know that.

Hagen: We can talk about that over lunch. It's an interesting history. I think that a couple very bad political decisions were made there, because remember, it used to be jointly with yours –

Shantz: Right.

Hagen: -- it was a joint effort and funded by the legislature.

Shantz: Yes. As far as I know, Wayne's is going on.

Hagen: I think you're right. Yes.

Shantz: But you see they can also tie in with that huge medical school, and I think they were getting a lot of support, I don't know what the case – well, we'll talk about it at lunch. And then we have a number of people on the faculty at Wayne that contribute to our program. Doug Barnett and Rita Casey are two child clinical people that – Rita in emotions and Doug on attachment, primarily. Ira Firestone in social psychology, and Becky Treiman in cognitive; she's a reading specialist, Career Award and all, she's very good. So they've all contributed to the enrichment of the program too.

One of the things I did midway in my career was say I think our students ought to get out of the classroom and go and have a field experience, just one credit hour, one semester, but get their feet wet in trying to use some of the course work, academic work and confront real life problems people are having. We started that, and they had –

Hagen: About what year?

Shantz: Oh, good question. I'll have to look it up.

Hagen: Okay.

Shantz: I said midway. I would assume it was in the early eighties maybe. They had sites, I worked out relationships with juvenile court, with an adult counseling center that helps adults who are going through divorces, people fired from their jobs, career changes, whatever the adult problems are; a church that helps elderly people, because it was part of our lifespan, in all kinds of issues with sites like those at preschools, comparing preschool programs, for example. So we had diversity of sites, and students were a little reluctant to do this, but they did it because they had to. And then they found out that --

Hagen: Was this child development majors, or --?

Shantz: The majors in child development. Yes. I'm sorry, I wasn't clear on that. It was required. It was one credit hour. But they came back, almost all of them saying, "It really was a good experience," and they were glad they did it. And they wrote up a paper –

Hagen: I was one that started the parallel thing here, and we went through a lot of battles with the University just to say it was a legitimate experience, but we won those.

Shantz: Did they write a paper, the students?

Hagen: It's still going on. Yes.

Shantz: We had to turn it into a – but it was also good because we wanted them to kind of coalesce their experiences, and a paper helps doing that. We also found a problem though with the sites wanting to use them as free labor –

Hagen: Oh, sure. Well, also, I found that getting to know the politics in sociology of the sites was as important as anything else –

Shantz: Exactly.

Hagen: -- because they really got some insights into why a lot of things in theory don't work in practice.

Shantz: Exactly. That went on – I guess that program went on probably about ten years, and then there became such a research focus intensification in the program, and a change in the group over time that they just decided – the area decided to do away with that field study.

Hagen: That's too bad.

Shantz: Yes. I thought it was too. We even had talks with clinical trying to institute it as an applied developmental program. I think that's a question that comes up later, but again those talks didn't lead anywhere so we had our free standing little field experience. I guess those are the two primary aspects to answer number two. Did I answer number two?

Hagen: Yes. I think we've pretty well covered that.

Shantz: Okay. All right.

Hagen: And then the next one blends right in, then you already partly answered what experiences have you had as a teacher or trainer in the courses you've taught, and the tension between teaching and research?

Shantz: I hardly say anything in my notes about a tension between research and teaching, other than the time teaching takes, that's major, otherwise I haven't found that there was a problem when I had an active research program. It was just sheer time. And then, of course, I took off, what about five years working half-time, or two-thirds time when my children were young, so that I'd go in just for three days a week and be home rearing them, so that made that time issue even greater for me. You know, the courses are all listed in my Vita, so let's skip that.

Hagen: That's fine. Yes.

Shantz: Some experiences stand out in teaching. I had as an undergraduate, the daughter of one of my colleagues, who at first I didn't even know or recognize her. I saw the name was similar, I didn't realize it was his daughter, and it was Jerry Rosenbaum's, and she was going to go into dance and she so liked the course I taught she ended up forsaking dance and getting a PhD in developmental psychology.

Hagen: And did her parents thank you or did they --?

Shantz: For which Jerry was forever grateful.

Hagen: Well, given it was dance. If she'd wanted law maybe he wouldn't have been.

Shantz: That's true. Or medicine. But he was just delighted. And she's done some publishing too.

Hagen: Great.

Shantz: So that was kind of a fun experience, and recently I had one something like it, actually she was a U of M engineering student who came up and started asking about how to shift to Wayne State and a major in psychology, or whether she would stay at U of M and in psychology. She thought she'd give up engineering, and she said, "Well, I credit you for that. I just watched and saw how much you enjoy teaching, and I thought, I want to do something in my life that I will enjoy doing. I don't know if it will be teaching or not, but I sure enjoyed the subject matter much more than my engineering." And I said to her, "You are aware, aren't you, how much less money you're going to make in a lifetime?" And she said, "Yes, I am." So those kind of experiences stand out. It happened to be with two women students.

My PhD students, there were three that I felt were especially rewarding. Goodness, and it turns out they were all three women, although I have had male, and very good male doctoral students, but Toni Antonucci, Diane Carlson-Jones and Cathy Hobart. I was a major advisor on their dissertations, and the three of them were unique students, just almost gifted I felt, and fun individuals, open students, it was just a really nice relationship with each of them. Cathy Hobart and I wrote a chapter together, she was actually the only graduate student I wrote with, and that was great fun, but I think those are very special relationships with doctoral students.

Hagen: What years were those? I'm working on a lot of little hypotheses, and I've also -- I know when Wendell Jeffrey got the Mentor Award of Division Seven a year ago at APA, and it was very interesting. He got very emotional and cried, but he said that his best student relations were sort of mid-point in his career. He didn't have them very early, and he hasn't had them in recent years either.

Shantz: That I think is -- well, one was very early. One was the first one, Toni --

Hagen: Toni would have had to be. Yes.

Shantz: -- and you know the years are on that Vita. Diane was kind of mid, and Kathy Hobart was mid, and then I dropped off doing much dissertation research advising because I knew I was going to start retiring and I didn't want to leave people up in the air, and I wasn't going to do what Bill Hartup has been doing, which is to stay around for doctoral students. I mean, to me retirement is retirement, and I'm going to be out of there.

Hagen: Right. Different people do it very differently.

Shantz: Oh, it's amazing. Some people just sell or get rid of all of their books.

Hagen: We had Dan Katz here. He just died a year or two ago at ninety-six and he was still coming into ISR until the last year or so when he was too feeble, but that was still his life and he was still --

Shantz: Oh, I can appreciate that how some people want to go right on and never retire. I can see that, but it's not for me.

Hagen: Are you going to move away?

Shantz: I don't think so; both our girls live in the Detroit area and our grandchildren are there.

Hagen: Right. I'm in the same boat; I've got four grandchildren here. (Interruption) Okay. We're now recording again, and the last question actually you partly answered too, applied child development research. You talk about your course that got students out into applied settings.

Shantz: Right.

Hagen: Have you actually done any research that you would say was directly applied?

Shantz: No, but what I did do when I was President of Division Seven of APA was – or was I Secretary/Treasurer at the time? I can't remember, but did a survey of applied developmental psychology programs in the U.S. and Canada.

Hagen: I remembered that. Yes. And something came out on that in the newsletter, or --?

Shantz: Yes. In the SRCD Newsletter, in fact, I looked it up so I would have it; it was fall '87 issue. And it was about the first survey –

Hagen: Is that available? I'd love to see that at some point.

Shantz: Don't you have an archive on the Newsletter? The SRCD Newsletter.

Hagen: Oh, then we would. I thought it was -- Okay. Great!

Shantz: Well, see it also was in the APA Division Seven –

Hagen: Okay. No, we'll have it. It's easy. Yes.

Shantz: -- but then it was – Oh, you know what it is, I remember, I abstracted a little bit for the SRCD Newsletter.

Hagen: Okay.

Shantz: The one for Division Seven was a little larger, and if you're interested I could find that.

Hagen: Okay. Well, I'll put the SRCD one first and see.

Shantz: But that actually had some interesting effects from what I heard in terms of, first of all, focusing, letting people know that there were this many applied programs. But secondly, that people were using the term in the most idiosyncratic way, because when I had my students, I can still remember it in room 138 in our building, having all of this stuff out from all of these universities and trying to discern, is there any core? Is there any similarity among these programs? And it was a challenge to kind of solidify –

Hagen: But that probably set the stage for that work then later that Celia Fisher and John Murray did in the early nineties –

Shantz: That's right.

Hagen: -- on applied developmental programs.

Shantz: Yes. Celia has said it was important to do, and part of it was under the auspices of Division Seven –

Hagen: Right.

Shantz: -- to give some recognition to the field of applied developmental.

Hagen: And then, of course, our roots are there anyhow when you go back to the beginning of the roots, that's where the field came from.

Shantz: Isn't that ironic?

Hagen: Yes.

Shantz: I've often thought that, that it's like we started this field dealing with the problems of children, the real life problems, and now we've been in science and now we're trying to go back. Yes, it is kind of interesting. No. I myself have not done applied research, but I am very admiring of some of the research that's being done in the field. I think it's awfully hard to do and do well.

Hagen: Oh, it is. It is, and there aren't a lot of good examples, but there are some. I think there are some. Along with that, it's not on here, but I'd like your impressions and views on our training of minority students. We should really build that in, because I've been very involved, and SRCD certainly has dealt with the issues and we've had our ups and downs. I guess I'm thinking mainly at the graduate level, but if you want, given you're at Wayne State, I'm sure it's an issue at the undergraduate level as well?

Shantz: Yes. I have not had one minority student as a doctoral student. Kathy Urberg has, especially from Turkey and China.

Hagen: You know that one, is it that guy? He's wonderful, I sat next to him at the banquet in Beijing –

Shantz: You said.

Hagen: -- and he is just great. Yes. He was so much fun and so positive about –

Shantz: Yes. Very good-looking guy –

Hagen: Yes. Very nice looking, and –

Shantz: Yes. He had an interesting history. Having a female mentor was an interesting experience for him because as a Turkish male –

Hagen: It wouldn't happen, of course.

Shantz: -- it was unusual, but he managed pretty well and so did Kathy. She's awfully good in working with these students, not the foreign students, she's not the only one that does, but she has had – because she's had big projects on smoking and a number of issues, she's been hiring a lot among her projects.

So anyway, to get back to the main thing, I haven't had minority graduate students, well in classes, but not as a major advisor. But undergraduate – well, no – one just occurred to me in the course I've taught most of my life, Introduction to Lifespan Developmental Psychology at the graduate and undergraduate levels. One of the graduate students in that course about five years ago did a paper, they're all doing papers on different topics, and he got it published. He came to me and said, "Do you think I could even possibly get this published?" so we sat down and talked about it and how it should be changed for a submission. It was on violence in young black males, and he had done kind of a review of the research and pulled out some good ideas and some of the problems with the research. I thought it was an unusually good paper, so I really was encouraging him, and he ended up publishing.

Hagen: Great.

Shantz: So I had that very nice experience, but we don't have a large number of minority students in our graduate programs, which may surprise people, at Wayne State, but even our undergraduates are only around twenty-seven percent is the last figure I saw.

Hagen: Oh, really? Interesting!

Shantz: Yes. Twenty-seven percent, because people often say this is a black university, and it ain't by a long shot. It's mainly Caucasian.

In the undergraduate, I don't know that there's anything special about my teaching of minority students. Wayne State has such a diverse population. For example, we have a lot of Muslim students.

Hagen: Well, of course, Detroit area has the largest Muslim community.

Shantz: Oh, yes. And Jews. You just name it –

Hagen: Oh, that's true. Yes.

Shantz: -- and I think we've got it. So you have this unusual diversity. One of those Muslim girls was convinced that the topology of authoritative, authoritarian, permissive, and indifferent parenting just did not occur among Muslim families, so for her research project she got some items and did some interviewing, and come to find out it's just exactly the same. It was really cute. She said, "I wouldn't have believed it if I hadn't done this." I said, "Well, that's what research is about."

No. I wouldn't say there's anything particularly special. I don't deal with a lot of racial issues or gender issues in my class, just because they are not of great interest to me, but we do talk about some issues, you know, so it's – no, it isn't a big feature in the way I think about my teaching or in my experiences, they're just – the minority students are just like all the other students from what I've experienced.

Hagen: Well, I know that Algea has said at Oakland, this was some years back, it may be different now, that it was a real problem for her because the minority students would kind of come to her and expect almost special consideration and so forth, and she just felt that wasn't appropriate or fair.

Shantz: Yes. I would imagine she would have. Well, it is true --

Hagen: Well, unless you have something to add, we're now ready to –

Shantz: No, I don't.

Hagen: -- talk about SRCD, starting with some of the bare facts of your earliest – when you joined, some of the early contacts, roles you've played, the first meetings you've attended?

Shantz: I think I joined around '65-'66 when I started.

Hagen: That's when I did too.

Shantz: I'm a little embarrassed to say I don't know for sure, but you know, I just don't.

Hagen: And I can guarantee we don't have the records either, because they weren't kept that way back then, you know, where you'd be able to retrieve for individuals. Now we will, but they weren't at that time.

Shantz: Not then. And I think the first meeting I went to was, interestingly enough, Minneapolis. You too?

Hagen: Yes. That was in '67.

Shantz: Yes.

Hagen: And then it was again in '71, remember?

Shantz: Yes.

Hagen: Because it was supposed to be in Ann Arbor, and the hotel closed here, and so that's why. It was so close.

Shantz: Yes. It switched there.

Hagen: Yes. So Minnesota was '67, and then the L.A. one was '69.

Shantz: That's right.

Hagen: It was actually, not Anaheim, what was it? It was right on the water, a beautiful setting. Santa Monica in '69.

Shantz: Oh, yes. Okay.

Hagen: Right. And the attendance at the Santa Monica meeting was under a thousand, and then Minneapolis jumped up to about fourteen hundred in '71, for the second Minneapolis meeting.

Shantz: It seemed huge to me, like a kid, you know?

Hagen: It was at the Lemmington Hotel, which is totally gone now. Have you been back there in recent years?

Shantz: Well, I've been to Minneapolis about, what three years ago?

Hagen: Oh, well then you've seen it. The downtown's had a total renovation, its really nice.

Shantz: Isn't it nice?

Hagen: I think people are going to really enjoy it.

Shantz: They're going to be pleased with it.

Hagen: Great restaurants, theatre, nightlife if you want it.

Shantz: Right.

Hagen: That new convention center, that's very nice ambiance.

Shantz: Yes. I haven't seen the convention center, but I did get into their new unusual art museum that's on the river there. It's very unusual. But my reaction to SRCD was amazement and excitement as a new professional. I was amazed that so many people were doing what I was doing, research and teaching in child development, and the wide range of ages, that intrigued me. From graduate students to very senior people, and I was just in awe of meeting Al Baldwin, John Flavell, not that John was so old at the time, but well known to me, of course. Urie Bronfenbrenner, Robert Selman, who I almost thought was not Robert Selman because I thought he was much older than he actually was. The upshot was, and I think it was important, was the feeling of community that SRCD conferences provided, that I never really had thought about or expected.

Hagen: Did you start with APA that early?

Shantz: I don't think so. I think I joined SRCD before APA, but not a long time. I think by my sixth or seventh year.

Hagen: The APA was already huge even back when you and I began.

Shantz: Right.

Hagen: I remember Robert Sears I saw at one of my first APA meetings, I can't remember what city, I think it was in D.C. though, probably in the late sixties. And he said, "I've been standing here a half hour and you're the first person I've recognized," and here he had been a former President of APA –

Shantz: That's right.

Hagen: -- so it really lets you know what had happened. Of course, people now accuse SRCD of the same thing; it's gotten so big they can't cope with it.

Shantz: Oh, yes. When I was at Purdue, and I cannot remember her name, there was a child developmentalist, she was kind of clinical and so on, and she was telling us about meetings when there would be five hundred people, and the earliest meeting she went to you could meet in one room. All the members of SRCD could meet –

Hagen: Well, that was '63 even in Berkeley, the program; there was only one session at a time.

Shantz: Oh, yes.

Hagen: And I think there were just three or four hundred people there.

Shantz: Yes. She talked about a few hundred --

Hagen: Exactly.

Shantz: -- and how nice it was. Did it ever meet in Philadelphia? It seemed to me –

Hagen: '73, and that's the first big meeting.

Shantz: No. It was before '73, I'm sure, because I was at Purdue – see I left Purdue in '65, so it was in the sixties, and she was talking about it in the fifties or forties.

Hagen: I can dig it out. I have a list of every city every year, but it was on campuses for many years. It was Penn State, Illinois and so forth.

Shantz: Right. Well, that's kind of – I think having heard that when I went to Minneapolis, I was kind of expecting this small group, and it was big.

Hagen: No. That's when it just started to get big, and then, of course, it just skyrocketed. Now we've leveled off, so I think we won't get a lot bigger.

Shantz: Yes. Well, that might be just as well. Well, beyond membership, let's see, items two and three I kind of wrote together. I think you actually have this, but –

Hagen: Yes. Good. You don't have to go through –

Shantz: You know, local arrangements committee for the Detroit meeting --

Hagen: That's when we worked together.

Shantz: Yes. Right.

Hagen: Do you remember all those people we had trying to pull that together, and that's when Algea and I were the Co-chairs, or some such thing.

Shantz: Right. You were, and we had those meetings and Hilary and I were on our hands and knees measuring for footage for a registration.

Hagen: Oh, the problems with the Book Cadillac Hotel.

Shantz: And they almost threw us out of Cobo Hall because we were carting our own stuff.

Hagen: I remember. Yes.

Shantz: Talk about unionized. Well, anyway, I think the most important thing for me was serving on the Publications Committee and being Chair, and part of that was my life-long interest in the field of publishing, and as Editor of the Quarterly. It meant something more than most committee work does when you're actively involved in that side of our field. And actually I wrote this out, I don't know, I was really impressed with the people on the committee, really competent and dedicated, and take very seriously, I thought, the publication program of SRCDC. And those who weren't as competent on the topic were good at listening and contributing things. I was just, I thought it was a good group, and it evolved, continued to evolve as people changed into a good group.

Hagen: Well, I think too, at your time it began to get more of a sense of its responsibilities were more around policy and not just the diddly little things like should we add fifty pages here or there, because it had sort of been that way early on and then it got more involved with the –

Shantz: It did bother me though, and I think it's number D down here, because I had to confront something that didn't make me awfully happy at the time I was Chair, and that was I had a lot of informal talks with people and said, "Look, one of the responsibilities of this committee is to bite the bullet, evaluate the publications. Are there some we ought to consider stopping, and are there some that are needed that we don't have now?" Well, I couldn't get anybody really interested in talking about this. A couple people were, that I happened to talk to, most were not, they thought it was a political hot potato, didn't want to upset Neil Salkind.

Hagen: Yes. I was going to say that's been the touchy one.

Shantz: -- on the abstracts, because – you know, and it wasn't all together clear with going on line about how that was all going to work out. But that was one of the disappointments for that being a Chair for, what was it, four years? Was it that long?

Hagen: Yes. You served two. It's normally two, and then we asked you to serve, so you served four.

Shantz: That's right. Four. The other kind of disappointment, and it was not getting the electronic aspect, you know, decisions made or recommendations sent to the council and getting that worked faster, and getting SRCDC to have it's own home page without having to go through the University of Chicago Press, that kind of thing. And that just seems to take time and doesn't act in any circles, and so I wasn't surprised by it, but it was a little frustrating all four years talking, and it didn't seem like we made a milometer of progress.

Hagen: No, but I think we were, it's just we don't see it until you get a little distance from it. You know the decision was made last spring that unless we find reason to the contrary, abstracts will be discontinued at the end of next year, I mean we need some phase-out. Some people objected because they felt maybe it's serving minorities, maybe it's serving foreigners, we don't know about that, so we're trying to gather some data now. But my guess is, especially foreigners, they've gone from being way behind to right up because of electronics, they can get everything now and they've really learned to do it better than U.S. people –

Shantz: Right.

Hagen: -- cause it's their way. It's their window to the world.

Shantz: Exactly.

Hagen: And I think they need it less probably at this point. And I see –

Shantz: And even if they need it, how much cost does the Society bear to meet those special needs? That's a good question.

Hagen: Yes. But anyhow, that is a bullet that we're biting. And the whole thing of electronic, I think we're up to speed now on where we need to be. We're not – we've always said we didn't want to be on the forefront of that, and we, I think, objectively, we have more to lose than most societies, because CD has such a large institutional subscription base and institutions, and many of the bigger institutions have three or four subscriptions, so if we go to sign on electronic with them they'll only have one, so we have to be careful. But Blackwell is right up on all the technology on all these things, so it's much more of the economic and –

Shantz: Kind of implications down the roads that you're trying to foresee –

Hagen: You know the implications, right, down the road that we're dealing with. Yes.

Shantz: Well, while I'm on the somewhat darker side of being Chair, the other thing I thought was I didn't have much luck with some editors, getting them to see that this publication committee should serve as a resource for problem solving, and the main function is not as just a watch dog of how they're running their journals. I just felt that message was heard and not believed.

Hagen: Well, a lot of our editors have large ego's, as you well know, and aren't necessarily listeners.

Shantz: No, they aren't. It may not have been heard, but even if it were heard I don't think they believed it. I think they thought it was really a watchdog.

Hagen: I don't know if you've heard, Lynn Liben is now the Editor-elect, so I'm looking forward to that.

Shantz: Yes. I think she'll do an excellent job. It should be a less rocky road by far.

Hagen: I think so.

Shantz: And she's an experienced Editor, so she knows what she's taking on.

Hagen: She also was one of my students.

Shantz: Was she?

Hagen: Oh, yes.

Shantz: Was she?

Hagen: Oh, yes. Early on. Early on. Yes.

Shantz: I didn't realize that. I should see your list. Maybe I should sit in on your interview.

Hagen: I've never put it together. I'm going to have to some time.

Shantz: Well, this does have an interesting effect to kind of look back over –

Hagen: I think it's good to look back.

Shantz: -- my brilliant career. Well, not so brilliant, but – I really thought, most of my experience was very positive and, of course, we had fun times.

Hagen: Also, you were involved in the real growth and change and some pains of going from really a mom and pop operation to trying to become a real executive office for the Society.

Shantz: Right.

Hagen: Because in eleven years we've gone from two staff people to eleven, and now two in D.C. as well, so we have thirteen staff people, and a budget of under a million to over three million, so that's –

Shantz: I didn't realize that John.

Hagen: Yes. That's a lot of growth in eleven years.

Shantz: That is a lot of growth.

Hagen: Yes.

Shantz: Well, see maybe my – it's funny, there was a question about the perceptions of SRCDD? Well, I'll wait on that, because I'll talk about that. Okay. Challenges as a Chair, further – oh, and then I just mentioned the Ad Hoc Committee, looking at whether the relationship should remain with University of Chicago Press or going to Blackwell. I mean, I was just speechless at times listening to some of the presentation from the University of Chicago Press, and I really came away with a feeling that we did need to shift. And then when I heard the proposals I had no trouble going with Blackwell and I could understand Fran Horowitz's reservation of the family basis of Blackwell and all, but I thought when we all got done we were comfortable with it, and I must say I'm glad to hear it's working out so well.

Hagen: Yes. I think it's worked at every level.

Shantz: But it really educates you. I mean, this is some of the fun on serving on these committees, you really get an education about the complexities of the publishing world, finances and practicalities and so on.

Number four was, I think, this business of the changes in SRCDD?

Hagen: Right. Yes.

Shantz: And I said my perceptions, maybe accurate or not, seemed to me that SRCDD focused in the early years on their publications and the conventions as a platform for sharing research. And over the years there was much more emphasis it seemed toward, it seemed to me, first of all on the membership that it be interdisciplinary and international, although I've never liked this business of our having to have a non-psychologist President. I just thought that was just –

Hagen: Now that's also now being considered and debated whether we should –

Shantz: I vote.

Hagen: Well, frankly, or I mean I will keep that, because I agree with you. I don't want to be quoted, but it's very hard to find a strong slate of the non-psychologist. That's part of the problem.

Shantz: I bet it is.

Hagen: Because it's not realistic, you know, that we really have all that many people from other disciplines.

Shantz: That's right. And again, it's like social engineering. I can understand why it was done, but I just don't like it in principle. I think you ought to let people express their wishes on that, and trust them that eventually on occasion, a non-psychologist will emerge as the president.

I thought there was more encouragement of resources. This is another change, especially in the Summer Institutes; I rather liked those. Now they were discontinued for a while, weren't they?

Hagen: It's because we couldn't get funding anymore. It was the same as the congressional fellows, now we have got those going again because we got funds again, but –

Shantz: Not the Summer Institutes?

Hagen: The Summer Institutes, we haven't found a source. We've even worked on it. Yes.

Shantz: Yes. That's too bad, because I thought my experience was very good with it. And Kate Garvey had a wonderful experience with a Summer Institute in linguistics where they all stayed in close contact throughout their careers, and so you know I've heard from others too how important those were.

The other thing, of course, is a lot more self-consciousness of SRCD as a field, and I think that's why this Oral History Project exists, and other ways, trying to get archives for the journals and so on established. I think there's more of a sense of history of the Society, and I attribute a lot of that to you.

Let's see. Oh, political sensitivity, in terms of having a Washington office. I think there's been – and these are my perceptions, a big push toward more interdisciplinary relationships, and I think that also, you have been very instrumental in.

Hagen: Well, I also think that that's not just SRCD, I think that's happening at the federal level, and it's happening at university levels because it's recognized that most problems don't just fall in one discipline. If you think of most issues of children or families, you know, they are not the domain of psychology alone, and we have to find constructive ways in working across the traditional boundaries. And, of course, that's why a lot of the departments our members come from are not psych departments. You and I have lived always in psych departments, but I think you have a very different perspective if you're at Penn State or Cornell and you're living with colleagues in different disciplines.

Shantz: Well, I think so too. Yes. Well, those are some of the perceptions –

Hagen: And I think those are all very accurate. I think some of the places where we've seen some sense of at least some members aren't always on the same page. A lot of the things the Washington office gets involved in, especially when it gets – moving from policy to advocacy to lobbying, that's been a source of controversy. And the whole issue of application, which, of course, we were talking about that earlier and that's what our roots are, but some people still think it's dangerous to go too far in that, that we still should be mainly advocating for pushing theory in research. But those are healthy tensions as I see it.

Shantz: Yes. And I think that it's a constant debate and it should be. Are there other changes that strike you that I just didn't mention, or you see as major changes in SRCD? I'm just curious.

Hagen: Well, I think the other one gets back to the whole issue around minority and whether or not what we're studying is universal or is it cultural or is it biological. And we're going through different waves of rethinking on all of those things. And I remember it wasn't that many years ago when we were talking about sort of the cultural boundaries and determination. And one very prominent

member of governing council said, “Well, I study cognitive development, so that doesn’t apply to me,” you know, like how could she think it didn’t apply?

Shantz: It should. It does.

Hagen: And, of course, Barbara Rogoff and others have made it very clear that everything does, but certainly those are some of the kinds of things. And then the other things had to do more with, I think, unlike other organizations, and as I go to meetings with the Executive Directors of other groups, SRCD has almost resented it’s growth in a certain way. All other groups want growth; they view that as a positive. But there’s been this exclusive club thing that I still think exists among some of our members –

Shantz: Oh, yes.

Hagen: -- and they really resent that the meetings are so big, the journals are too fat.

Shantz: Good old days.

Hagen: Yes.

Shantz: Yes. In some way that clubby – see I think that’s the community feeling, and it was easy to get going to the first Minneapolis meeting, which is kind of ironic, it may be my last SRCD meeting in Minneapolis, but it was a sense of community, and it’s hard to maintain that as new people flood in, so I can understand it.

Hagen: And I think those are things we need to really attend to in the governance of it and the staffing of it too: make people still feel that they’re important and that they’re getting some unique benefits from belonging.

Shantz: Well, I’ve often wondered if there’s some way to structure the conference so that people could have more of a core group, and there could be, maybe, a triumvirate of sessions so that you could be meeting with fewer numbers, and get a sense of the fewer.

Hagen: Yes. The way that’s happened is with the pre-conference, because Wednesday and Thursday morning now, we must have twenty different groups ranging from very small to actually groups of a hundred or more, that –

Shantz: I bet the social is huge.

Hagen: And so that’s – and the black caucus has been very successful over the years that way, so –

Shantz: That’s good. I’m glad to hear that.

Hagen: Well, it’s an ever changing thing. Anything more on SRCD, or do you want to move to the fields?

Shantz: Yes. Let’s talk a little about the field, because then – yes, we’re getting – this is getting long enough. How have my views changed over the years about the importance of various issues? Do you want to read the first question?

Hagen: Yes. The first one is a comment on the history of the field during the years you have participated in it, major continuities or discontinuities or events? Have your views concerning the importance of the issues changed over the years?

Shantz: Okay. I think little by little there’s been an opening up of consideration of different methods. Maybe I’m a little biased in that view, being an editor, but I’ve had the sense that it used to be that you only

measure attachment with an Ainsworth strange situation. You only do this with this method, and I'm getting the sense that there's a healthy opening up, and I hope my editorship contributed to that; more acceptance of good qualitative research, for example. Ethnographic research, if it's done well. I think there's more awareness that other areas can contribute to core developmental psychology -- like linguistics. And that encourages me, that the field, I think, is not so fragile that it can't open itself up and still see itself as developmental science open to new methods and new other disciplines.

Certainly another big change in the field I see is much more serious consideration of neuroscience, brain-behavior relations than we -- oh, certainly by training or the first twenty years of my career, there just wasn't much. There wasn't much emphasis on neurological factors.

One other thing, I believe it seems that finally we're starting to get across how the field is accepting the notion of that nature versus nurture is a false dichotomy. Finally, the notion that genes have environments, and then environment needs an organism with a genetic structure to work on, that, you know, they're combined, they're not independent. And Fran Horowitz, and I've had funny conversations on this about how long it takes to wean people from the dichotomy of nature versus nurture.

Hagen: I think it's still coming though; it's not there.

Shantz: It's not there yet. Almost.

Hagen: I did not go to the talk, but apparently -- was it Art Jensen? I think it was Jensen still spoke it at the APA and was making a case of his earlier work.

Shantz: Yes. He'll go to his grave doing that, I think.

Hagen: It's going to take a long time. Yes.

Shantz: I think the third thing is that, that I've observed in the field is it's a relatively short shelf life of theories. I mean, Piaget had his heyday in the sixties and seventies, and then it's like, 'okay, now information processing,' well now there's some problems, you know, and somehow you wish -- or maybe I've not seen it, but I wish there was more an evolution of theory instead of this is hot, now it's not hot, so you switch to something else, you get more of a sense of the evolution.

Hagen: Yes. I was feeling the same way, and I was surprised that you talked earlier, and especially because you got into social development, you didn't really talk about the Searsian, which I was --

Shantz: That what?

Hagen: Bob Sears, the combination of psychoanalytic and social learning that started with that group in the forties and then --

Shantz: The translation, you mean of Freudian theory and to behavioristic theory.

Hagen: -- I remember Bob arguing in the first seminar I had from him, how you can argue cause and effect from correlational data if your theory --

Shantz: Tells you to.

Hagen: -- dictates it in that way. And, of course, that was so prominent, then that just sort of disappeared.

Shantz: Yes. Well, that's what you see, and that's kind of disconcerting, but sometimes it takes -- I think there's a lag, so you do get something dropped, but then it starts to come back again.

Hagen: No. I agree.

Shantz: Theory of mind is awfully close to the notions of egocentrism that Piaget talked about, but Piaget got out of style. And then Wellman, true he did make some important advances without using Piaget's theory so much, but just, you know, it was like Piaget's theory helped focus on that, but then Hank and others went further. But that's okay, I have no problem with that, but it is a little worrisome at times this apparent faddishness, instead of a theory truly evolving, but that's how it goes.

Fluctuating, let's see, what's this about? Fluctuating continuity -- The applied developmental psychology. Rather ironic because the focus of child development began in applied developmental, that's just what we were talking about, and went out of favor when experimental was so dominant. And I think some of the recent research on child care is really quite good using Bronfenbrenner. It's interesting, that's one of the places where it's used the most, in child care research. The special issue the Merrill-Palmer Quarterly did on "Daycare in the Nineties", I thought was one of the better issues he did. So that applied developmental, of course, is one of the changes I've seen in the field. (End 1B)

Another change I've seen is, I think there's more consciousness about the importance of getting at process of development than there used to be.

Hagen: Definitely.

Shantz: And I think that's important, and that's why I feel part of the work I've done on conflict is important, because conflict is just an impetus to change, and I'm hoping that that focus will be helpful as processes. I'm talking here on social processes, get more elaborated in research and theory.

Another one I said was this reconceptualizing nature verses nurture. Although I never hear people talk about Ann Anastasi's article, which is the classic one on this issue, 1958, *American Psychologist*, where she says, "We shouldn't be asking which one, how much, we should be asking 'how' nature and 'how' nurture influenced development? I thought it was a classic article.

Hagen: I'll have to look at that again. I mean, I remember loving her books, and then I met her when I was on council on APA when she was still around, this was probably in the eighties. She was Emeritus at Fordham, but still very active. I don't know whether she's still alive or not.

Shantz: I don't know that either, but her measurement book, sure, but I thought this article -- I mean, this is what I try to send students to if they can't seem to understand why it's not either/or or something, it's a very well written article.

Hagen: Good.

Shantz: I think there's less acceptance of traits as it were, and part of that is in the social areas, Mischel's work, and part of it is, I mean, is reflected in the less interest in Piagetian work, I think, is that it talked about some of his reasoning abilities being cognitive traits. So I think part of it has been less fascination with the whole trait approach that has helped encourage information processing and --

Hagen: I think that may be true in developmental, but not necessarily in other fields, because I have a good friend in organizational industrial and that still dominates there.

Shantz: Oh, yes. My younger daughter is a graduate student in I/O and it's like twenty years ago.

Hagen: I can't believe it. Yes.

Shantz: Well, they're dealing with very large numbers of people usually, so they have to go on -- Well, the hopes and fears for future of the field is that they will continue to be open to different methods. For example, I got a fascinating little study on focus groups, using focus groups of kids to talk about issues of friendship. I would hope journals and research funding agencies would be opened to different methods,

ethnography and so on and different disciplines, we've talked about that, like Elder's research I find fascinating.

Hagen: Yes. I think that opened up. In fact, the work I'm doing, I've spent a few days at the Library of Medicine where our archives are and that's absolutely fascinating. I'm going through things that no one else probably has, you know, when they were the Secretary of the Society or the President, they sort of accumulated all of this, then they just sent it away and no ones looked at it since.

Shantz: And you're the first one to look at it?

Hagen: And I'm the first one to be going through it, yes.

Shantz: Oh, isn't that interesting.

Hagen: Yes. It's very interesting.

Shantz: Oh, I bet it is. It's like raw history.

Hagen: Exactly. Yes. It's so different from reading – everything else we read is what someone else has distilled and put together in some sort of purposeful way.

Shantz: Right. And this is more of the everyday kind of –

Hagen: Exactly.

Shantz: -- notes, talks.

Hagen: Right. Letters, lots of this correspondence.

Shantz: And see that's the dialogues, I think would be the most revealing, about what was on their mind, what issues they were dealing with.

Hagen: Exactly.

Shantz: Fun. Could I add something to the interview?

Hagen: Of course. Yes.

Shantz: It's mainly about editing the journal, because that's twenty years of my life.

Hagen: Oh, of course.

Shantz: And one of the things that most predominates is, I think we have great people in our field. I mean, when twenty years of people giving their time and expertise to reviewing, authors receiving not the best decisions, the nicest, happiest decisions, being rejected or reject/revise when they thought they put in something terrific as is. Associate Editors that just really worked hard, Keith Stanovich for fifteen years, Nancy Eisenberg maybe eight years, well, and now Charlotte Patterson, Nicki Crick, Shelly Hynel; I've just had some very good Associate Editors who have been very conscientious in their work, and you just come away very pleased if you can have credit by association. These are your colleagues around the world and in the country, and for the most part, by far, the huge majority are just really good people, I think.

Hagen: And decent people to work with for the most part.

Shantz: Absolutely. You hear horror stories about journals and biased reviewers and capricious editors and associate editors, and I haven't seen that. I mean, sure the downers are you get people who promise to

review and they don't, or they don't send it in at all or they send it in so late it's not useful. And I guess that is the biggest downer, but they're very much in the minority despite the picture that Nelson's article in the SRCD Newsletter gave, at least I have found, I mean, other editors seem to talk as if they have a lot more problem with this than I've experienced for whatever reason.

And secondly, I had two occasions where people submitted stuff that had already been published with the most minor of changes. That was disappointing, especially one who was a senior person and should have known better, but wanted more circulation than the book he had published it in. So, you know, it has been by far, I think, a great reflection on the field because there are really some difficult issues that come up when people are trying to publish, between editors and reviewers and the authors, and I'm -- it just has underscored my feeling when I went into it that good people, decent people, they try to do a good job, just as the panel members in Washington, the research panel members I thought were unusually good.

Hagen: Do you think the move to electronic publishing will lead to a paradigm shift in the publication process?

Shantz: In the process? What kind of paradigm shifts?

Hagen: Or in the outcome? Well, I mean if you think about it, the journals as we now know them, which essentially it goes through extensive review and then it appears and forever it's archival, and that already is not happening with some things that are online publishing, and there's a lot of concern about it. But if you think about it in some ways it could be an improvement because it doesn't have to be a close-ended thing, you could -- the author, him or herself or other people could add to it, and that could be part of it.

Shantz: Well, I've always used commentaries and discussions as a means almost to --

Hagen: And that's right, and that is certainly a good way of doing it, but it could be much quicker and easier, I mean with electronic technologies.

Shantz: -- so it evolves. It could be in the electronics. I think the biggest thing is the peer review issue.

Hagen: And I think that's the biggest worry.

Shantz: Yes.

Hagen: And I think that's -- I was at an interesting meeting at APA last year where people are talking about the paradigm shift in our whole field and in other fields of where things have been hierarchical where things are networking, and that's happening like in clinical practice as well, you don't go to the therapist anymore necessarily, there's all different things. But then how does the public know how to judge? And in a way, how does the student know what to judge if he or she finds things on the web? And I'm finding my undergrads especially are finding all kinds of things on the web now --

Shantz: And believe it too often.

Hagen: And they think because -- and when you ask them, what's the source of that? They don't even know. All they know is it's from this website, so --

Shantz: Yes. It's like "it's in the library."

Hagen: -- there are lots of concerns and worries, but I also think potentially if it's handled responsibly it could lead to a more interesting in a different kind of way of --

Shantz: It could, but I do think it's going to start to blur the line for us, for good science --

Hagen: Oh, it is. Yes.

Shantz: -- and opinion, and half-ass science, I put it not too nicely, that's what worries me. I think part of the responsibility of the field is to tell the consumers/readers out there what is good science and what isn't, and then that's why the peer review is the only mechanism I can really think of to help accomplish that. If that goes by the Boards, that blurring is going to be a real problem.

Hagen: Yes. An interesting example of that came out this last winter, I don't know if you remember, but Craig Ramey released the latest study on the follow-up on the Abecedarian project, and he simply released it to all kinds of sources and it was simply an in-house release from his institute at Birmingham. It even made the front page of the New York Times, people simply talked about it. NPR was the only place that picked up that this wasn't a peer-reviewed article; it was simply an in-house thing. And I and Jack Shonkoff and others, then got interviewed by NPR, not to criticize Craig per se, but this whole thing, like this is simply released and all these different sources just started talking about it.

Shantz: Was it politically hot?

Hagen: Well, it had some interesting -- I forget what the twist, but it did have some interesting twists that would get ones attention, and it was about long-term -- it's the kind of thing Likert has done too, like when you're an adult, you know, that what happened to you when you were a little kid is now making a real difference, it was that kind of thing. But that's certainly the kind of thing we want to have very good documentation on and some agreement that, yes that is --

Shantz: The data really support that.

Hagen: That the data really support it. Right.

Shantz: Now did Craig purposefully release it?

Hagen: Craig's argument was that his work is so well known and part of public domain that he didn't have to have it reviewed. Now why he did it, really I don't know, but --

Shantz: I know Craig pretty well.

Hagen: You've probably known Craig from way back.

Shantz: And I've been talking with Sharon and him about doing a book for our series on the Hoffman Social and Emotional Development Series in Cambridge University Press. Well, Marty asked if I would be co-editor --

Hagen: Oh, really!

Shantz: -- of that series some years ago, and now he wants me to be the senior editor on the series, and he's about to quit.

Hagen: See, I was going to say you're not really retiring then.

Shantz: No. That's one of the things I'm staying with. I can't give up publishing entirely, so for Cambridge I am still interested, and we're talking with the Rameys about doing a book for the series.

Hagen: Then you really ought to get -- I'm sure you could find this and it's probably still on his website, but it was very interesting because I got many calls and emails because people heard me on NPR commenting on it that had nothing to do with the specifics, but it was just the fact that that's how the press had gotten this, and that none of them, even The Times, even noticed it.

Shantz: See, that's problematic.

Hagen: Yes.

Shantz: I mean he's not the first one for sure –

Hagen: No. Right.

Shantz: -- that has gone to Time Magazine and has gotten results published.

Hagen: And in this case, I think probably what he was saying was okay, but still why did he choose that route?

Shantz: Well, we could speculate, knowing Craig. Do I want to say anything else? Oh, just briefly, my experience with the Merrill-Palmer Quarterly was the quality of the research submitted to the journal right off the get-go has improved tremendously over the twenty years. I see more professionalism in how people review, and I think it was good that we could bring the acceptance rate down, although it got awfully low, it was worse than Child Development for a while, sixteen percent.

Hagen: Again, I think that's one of those dangers in grant review, everything, there's some sort of a balance, and to me it's probably about a third, about a third should get approved and two-thirds not. And if you get –

Shantz: Right. When you get down to sixteen percent, you know something's wrong.

Hagen: Right. Exactly.

Shantz: You just see this tremendous waste of time and effort and money, and –

Hagen: Well, and it's going to just discourage and dishearten people in the long run, and that's what happened with the whole grant thing, you know, when it got so tough to get a grant then the number of submissions went way down.

Shantz: Oh, yes. I remember Teri talking about that a lot. But the major accomplishments I'd like to talk about just a bit. One is the invitational issues that we started, and that was partly Eli Saltz's that we have one and it just really worked well, to take one issue out of the four each year and devote it to one topic, and the associate editors and I would decide which topic and so on.

Hagen: And that's always fun too!

Shantz: And it is fun.

Hagen: To brainstorm and to figure out –

Shantz: And we had guest editors some times and I guess there have been about fifteen of them now, and the journal got to be known in certain topics because of those, but we always had very good reaction to it because people would pick it up and there were six, seven articles on that very topic, and so I thought that was important. And I think, Gary Ladd, the new Editor is going to continue that. Also it made it easy to have very good quality research in the other three issues, and in part it accounts for our acceptance rates going down to sixteen percent.

Hagen: Right.

Shantz: That was just one year.

Hagen: Well, we faced that with CD, as you well know.

Shantz: Yes.

Hagen: I mean, when you have -- the special issues have been wonderful, but then our page thing and the expenses get so out of whack.

Shantz: Yes. And I guess another mark of – well, what I was quite pleased with was when I took over the Quarterly, in most impact studies it rated fifth or sixth, and I got it up to third.

Hagen: Oh, that's great!

Shantz: And that is behind Child Development and Developmental Psych, and they're both society journals, so in a way I like to look at it that it's the top independent journal. Independent of society, brought it up and I must say was really nice to get some letters as people found out I was retiring, you know, being very complimentary about my editorship, especially considering that if you're a good editor you're invisible. You don't get awards, you don't get compliments, you just do your job.

Hagen: Well, you'd also think you'd make more enemies than friends because you're rejecting more than you're accepting.

Shantz: Yes. In fact, I remember the first SRCD meeting I went to after I became Editor, and I'd rejected a fair number of manuscripts, I was really worried about meeting those people. Forget it, people were very civil, and one guy laughed one time, he said, "I wasn't surprised you rejected it, you should have." So some people could laugh about it and –

Hagen: Yes, sure.

Shantz: --but it is an invisible occupation, you don't want to be an editor if you want kudos or something, I mean you do get a few, but it's – you want to make other people look better, that's your job, and it's been fun. I just really prize some articles in particular where people had great data but they were very young, new, didn't know what nuggets they had, and you really had to put some work in on it. Or other people that just went way bonkers in trying to overextend their data and you have to say, "Cut back, stick with your data."

Hagen: In a way it's like being a mentor on PhD students, you know?

Shantz: Exactly. Yes. But that's why throughout my career it's been so much my – my colleagues are people out in the field through my editing and writing, more than local students or local classes. I've just always felt it's that community of researchers and teachers out there that I feel especially a kin to and want to help the field as a whole. Maybe that's a little grandiose, but that's how it was.

Hagen: Great.

Shantz: So that's pretty much it.

Hagen: Any other personal notes?

Shantz: Some of them you just take for granted, like our relationship over the years, and others that you don't even think to comment on them, but they're an awfully big part of just the joy. It's kind of that simple, the fun, sometimes the problems, but much more often, kind of the glee of getting to know people who are spending their lives doing what you're doing. I mean you have to think of it, people chose, of all the things we could have chosen, this is what we decided on.

Hagen: Well, and the fact that so many of us do continue it in so many ways after retirement, shows it's a labor of love.

Shantz: Oh, absolutely. It is.

Hagen: It's not – because I've known many people in the business world, and as soon as it ends, that's it, they want nothing to do with it anymore.

Shantz: Oh, yes. No, no. I'm going to work on a book. I don't know if it'll come out, but I've got two chapters written. And I think part of it is just having the luxury of reading, with no classes to meet, that's what I'm looking forward to, not that I'm going to leave the field, but I am going to leave the day to day – well, a little like Bill Hartup like you were saying.

Hagen: Exactly.

Shantz: But I thank you. This was an awfully easy interview.

Hagen: Well, thank you so much. You prepared very well ahead of time, and that was a big help too.

Shantz: Yes. A little focused.

Hagen: Okay. Well, on that note, let's stop and have lunch.

Shantz: Let's.