

Diana Slaughter-Defoe (currently Diana S. Kotzin)

- Born 10/28/1941 in Chicago, Illinois
- B.A. (1962), M.A. (1964), and Ph.D. (1968) all from the Committee on Human Development at the University of Chicago, in developmental and clinical psychology

Major Employment (until date of interview; she retired in 2011 as Constance E. Clayton Professor Emerita in Urban Education, Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania)

- Professor of Education, School of Education and Social Policy, Northwestern University: 1980-1997
- Associate Professor of African American Studies, Department of African American Studies, Northwestern University: 1981-1997
- Assistant Professor of Behavioral Sciences (Human Development) and of Education, University of Chicago: 1970-1977



Major Areas of Work

- Culture, primary education, home-school relations facilitating in-school academic achievement

SRCD Affiliation

- Child Development Editorial Board (1995-99), Chair of the Black Caucus (1979-81), Social Policy Committee (1979-81), Governing Council Member (1981-87)

SRCD ORAL HISTORY INTERVIEW

Dr. Diana Slaughter-Defoe

Interviewed by Dr. Adrienne Andrews
University of Pittsburgh
November 27, 1996

Slaughter-Defoe: This is November the 27th 1996, my name is Diana Slaughter-Defoe and I was a member of the Governing Council of the Society for Research in Child Development. I am being interviewed by a friend and colleague who is an experienced interviewer, Dr. Adrienne Andrews, currently on the faculty at the University of Pittsburgh.

Andrews: I'll begin with your experiences with SRCD. When did you join SRCD?

Slaughter-Defoe: I believe that I, I know that I was a member of SRCD by the fall of 1973 and I probably joined between 1971 and that date because I can recall that I first attended a conference of the Society for Research in Child Development at the University of Minnesota at that time. I'm moving ahead where I am asked to describe the first biennial meeting I attended. That's been as you can imagine over thirty years ago. I remember it being full of white persons. I was very surprised. I recall that my interest about the Society for Research in Child Development was peaked because my advisor Robert D. Hess was a member and when he lectured in class in child development at the University of Chicago he would always talk about the Society for Research in Child Development and I noticed that his papers were being presented at that organization. I concluded from what I heard in my class that this was the predominant organization in the nation influencing perspectives on childhood growth and development and that if I wanted to play a role in influencing the perspectives on black children, African American children that that would be the place that I needed to belong. So as a graduate

student I was introduced to the Society and attended the first meeting in 1971 as a result of being mentored by Robert Hess at the University of Chicago.

Andrews: So your earliest contacts with the Society and with whom and I think you may have just already described the first biennial meeting so what were your first contacts and with whom, if you can recall?

Slaughter-Defoe: I recall in 1971 looking for the black people at the meeting. Looking for the sessions that might have some relevance to African-American children. I do not remember being greeted by anyone in the Society at that time though in such that I was made to feel welcome as a member and I recall seeking out black persons that I could meet and talk with and feel comfortable with. I remember, it's been so long, meeting Aline Garrett and speaking with her. I don't really remember too much else at this time and I surely do not remember any of the larger than life figures in the Society.

Andrews: Could you describe the history of your participation in the scientific meetings and the publications of the Society and in other aspects of work within the Society other than governance?

Slaughter-Defoe: By 1973 I was an entry level faculty member, assistant professor at the University of Chicago with a joint appointment between the Committee on Human Development and the Department of Education. Though it is difficult for me to remember I am fairly certain that I probably presented a paper at that conference. It also was a very important time because I along with several other African-Americans, graduate students and faculty members around the nation convened the first open meeting expressing concerns about how African-American children were portrayed in the studies presented at the biennial meeting or the lack thereof and the need for all of us to become more involved in influencing greater diversity within the Society. We wanted diversity at two levels. One level was at the level of our own participation within the Society because this is related to as you can well imagine career advancement. And the other level was at the level of the actual studies of other than white mainstream and typically middle class children. My own dissertation for example had been a study of low income black children entering kindergarten from a preschool Head Start program and the prediction of factors related to their success in the first year of school from reported maternal behaviors. I looked for like minded persons in the Society who had this kind of interest. That is an interest in research which was in the field, on site studying people in their natural environments and institutions. More often than not persons who were doing non-laboratory oriented research were persons of what we would say today of color. I gravitated toward those persons who seemed to be interested in the study of children in their natural environment, in the study of intervention efforts to improve the lives of children, and in the study in general of socialization factors. So for me in 1973 probably most importantly we convened the first meeting of what was ultimately to become the Black Caucus of the Society for Research in Child Development. Since 1973 I have attended every biennial meeting of the Society and at every one of those meetings I have made at least one paper or symposium presentation, at the least being moderator for someone else's session. So I consider the Society for Research in Child Development (SRCD) my primary professional organization. My colleagues and my career were both launched in the bosom of this organization.

Andrews: So then describing the history, have you participated in the Society's governance and what were the major problems and issues that confronted you during your time if indeed you did serve in a governance position?

Slaughter-Defoe: I served in a lot of governance positions. I would like to mention first of all that several of us now who were the early founders of the Black Caucus of the Society for Research in Child Development are this very year, 1996-1997 jointly and collectively writing the history of our first twenty years in the Society. This particular group includes Harriette McAdoo, Valora Washington, Ura Jean Oyemade, Margaret Beale-Spencer, Aline Garrett, Geraldine Brookins, Melvin Wilson, Deborah

Johnson, Suzanne Randolph, Vonnie McLoyd, and Algea Harrison. I hope I have not left anyone off. We are writing our collective history of our experiences as Caucus members in the organization and the early relationships that we had with members of the organization and I would hope that by the time these tapes become available this working draft will be available to anyone who is interested in pursuing aspects of my life history in that context. My first actual appointment beyond the Caucus to a governance position in SRCDC came in, I believe, 1979. During that same period roughly 1979 to 1981 I was actually the second elected chairperson of the Black Caucus. Jean Carew who is now deceased was the first, I was the second elected chairperson of the Caucus and during that time I also served on the initial and beginning Social Policy Committee of the Society for Research in Child Development. This was from I believe 1979 to 1981. Then in 1981 I became the first elected member of this organization who was African-American to serve as a member of the Governing Council. Harriette McAdoo was the first appointed member to the Governing Council. I was the first elected member and I served in the Governing Council from 1981 to 1987. While I was on the Governing Council I also did some work in relation to a special committee helping developmental psychologists achieve credibility in the area of providing public services to children in connection with the eventual and subsequent National Register of the American Psychological Association and after serving on the Governing Council I have most recently am associate editor of the primary publication of the organization, Child Development. I began this service just recently actually in June of 1995, serving with editor Marc Bornstein. During the interim period from 1987 to 1995 I don't believe that other than on a biennial basis serving in some capacity as a reviewer for program committee, that is committees to deal with the upcoming biennial program, I don't believe that I performed any governance role. I guess I should also mention that my 1983 monograph that was published on early intervention was the first monograph published by (an African American) and about African-American children in any publication in the Society. To that point the Society had been in existence since 1933 I believe. When my monograph was published in 1983 it was another first; Jean Carew had published a monograph however it was not specifically concerning black children so my monograph was the first piece that was done by a black person and about black children. So that was a turning point and it was a very historic event. It surely helped me obtain a tenured position at Northwestern University in the School of Education and Social Policy where I have been on the faculty since 1977.

So what were the major problems and issues... Well, I think that again we are writing this up as part of the Black Caucus history but as I saw my presence on the Social Policy committee in 1979 to 1981 roughly, among members, that committee was chaired by Jim Gallagher, there was a concern to get the organization more involved with the public face I think in part to insure that support dollars would continue to come into the field relative to child and family research. There was a general sense at that time that research dollars were being cut back dramatically and that it was very important to get out to the public the benefits of research. Information about how ongoing research had benefited human lives. The membership ideas about the relationship between the Society and the public at large ranged from preferring that the Society be an advocacy organization at one end to preferring that ideas get out so that people will have a kindly view of research, and Gallagher, I think correctly, assessed the situation, the committee did, that we could get unanimity in the Society by focusing on the contributions of research rather than the advocacy role per se. We did decide that we would, for example, open a Washington liaison office, which we did. Through that office, we would collaborate in a consortium with other organizations that were trying to lobby relative to public policy support for research. We decided that we would thirdly establish fellowships where persons could take a year off from their traditional academic endeavors and maybe work for a year in the public policy arena presumably representing through their fellowship support the Society and finally it was during that particular period that the Bush Foundation supported at least four leading Universities who were doing training in child development and research, Yale University, the University of Michigan, UCLA and I believe the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. They were supported by the Bush Foundation also to do Post-doctoral training in Public Policy. So during this period, roughly 1979 to 1981, the Society in effect developed a very strong face toward social and public policy that it had not previously had in its 50 year history and I was very pleased to be part of that process and their involvement in

that arena as I have indicated took several forms. Establishing a Washington office, getting support for fellows on the Hill, helping senior members of the Society get training grant support at their individual universities, getting membership support for having a Social Policy newsletter, involving minority and other faculty in this process to get a more diverse spectrum of persons at the level of governance and presence in the Society. All of this with the, I believe, primary mission and goal of better justifying research, research dollars and its contribution to the society and lesser so as a particular agenda item the agenda item and focus of the Black Caucus which I represented which was to get children of color represented in the research. But these things are not contradictory its just that when you make a marriage people come to the wedding from different positions. I think that was a watershed time and as I see it these set of issues continued to be represented during my election into the Governing Council. I think that is why I was elected. I think that is why as a member of the Governing Council I had primary responsibility for nurturing the Society's newly created Committee on minority participation. I think that the timing of the publication of my monograph in 1983 during the time that I was on the Governing Council and subsequent things that happened after that period in terms of greater involvement of minority, greater focus on research with minority children of color and so forth. I think that all of that was part of the process. Now in my most current role as editor I have been pleased returning to an aspect of governance in this role as associate editor of Child Development to see that majority members of the Society have taken trends, these early trends very seriously. The panel that I chair as an associate editor is entitled Socialization, Ethnicity, and Context. We have had no end of manuscripts, we're not dying for manuscripts, we have them submitted by majority and minority researchers though I must say somewhat regretfully the overwhelming majority of research manuscripts are still submitted by majority members of the Society but it is quite clear that the majority members of the Society are making a serious effort to be more inclusive in their studies along the area of race, ethnicity and socioeconomic status lines of these children in their studies and I should say that that is a very important because during his life time Robert Hess (my doctoral chair and mentor) withdrew his membership from the Society for Research in Child Development. I can remember having conversations with him because I think that he withdrew from active participation in part because he felt that during his particular era the Society was not open to those kinds of ideas and concepts, and he found for example in the later years of his own career when he was in a chair at Stanford University, the American Education of Research Association to be a much more hospitable home for some of his own intellectual ideas and interests. Now for me personally I have found SRCD as much if not more so of a home as AERA and so I think this bespeaks to the trend that occurred during the beginnings of my career and the crest at which to some extent we were riding on.

There were problems and issues. It is never fun to be a pioneer. It is never fun to be the only black doing this, that or the other. You feel like and you actually are in an ongoing war looking for friends and allies wherever you can get them. So the biggest problem that I faced as I assumed real change between 1973 say and 1993 in the Society was the isolation and the loneliness that is incumbent with that mission and that level of commitment and I believe that I and we would not have prevailed had we not stuck very closely together which we did as members of the Black Caucus and those persons from the majority status field who were very helpful and supportive of us. Along those lines I would like to especially include certain persons. I would like to especially mention Mary Ainsworth, Glen Elder, Betty Caldwell. These three persons, there may have been others, I can remember them as being especially and particularly supportive, and of course Dorothy Eichorn, to us as minorities trying to do two things at the same time. Establish our own careers and therefore have a presence in this important and elitist organization on the one hand, and set up some type of infrastructure and working arrangement to get something out there in the literature that would be of some benefit to African American children in terms of how they are traditionally perceived.

Andrews: What do you believe are the most important changes to occur in SRCD and its activities during the many years you have been associated with it?

Slaughter-Defoe: Yes, I see what you mean because certainly its entrance into the policy arena pushing and pulling all of the time has certainly been an enormous change. When I say entering to the policy arena I mean being committed to studies of intervention and considering applied studies of development. Studies of intervention, studies of children in natural settings particularly children who are other than mainstream majority white children. These are extremely important changes that have occurred and that we now take for granted in the Society. They did not come about because any one person woke up in the morning and decided to do things differently. They came about as a result of the concerted struggle and efforts of on the one hand the Black Caucus of the Society for Research in Child Development and on the other supportive majority members of the Society itself...even if they primarily supported the Black Caucus' efforts because they were interested in utilizing them as they moved into the social policy arena and thus justified the continuation and continuity of research and evaluation funds.

Andrews: The next set of questions have to do with the field itself and please comment on the history of the field during the years that you have participated in it, continuities and discontinuities and so forth. Also have your views concerning the importance of various issues changed over the years, if so how?

Slaughter-Defoe: I think I commented on the field quite a bit already don't you? Would you say so?

Andrews: Yes, I would agree but there may be some detail that you....

Slaughter-Defoe: What I would like to ...

Andrews: No, I was going to say we would go on to what are your hopes and fears for the future of the field? What do you see the ongoing direction to be?

Slaughter-Defoe: Well, I think I commented on the history of the field already. There is much more than could be said obviously. This is a good opportunity for me to say that in case I have neglected the level of detail that would be useful relative to my own observations I will refer later to, well maybe now is as good as any, to two pieces that appeared in American Psychologist. In American Psychologist the April 1994 issue, volume 49 #4 there is a biosketch about me on pages 284 to 287 in reference to the award that I received for distinguished contribution to research in public policy. This biosketch and citation, I will just read the citation. It says, "In recognition of a quarter century of excellence in developmental research Dr. Slaughter-Defoe has dedicated her distinguished research career to identifying factors that promote and impede academic achievement in African-American children. Her study of maternal antecedents of academic achievement in African American children has not only identified and documented the effects of family environments and maternal interactions with their children but also has demonstrated the role of maternal involvement with and attitudes toward institutions beyond the family. In addition to advancing recognition of the role of maternal values and belief systems and maternal access to community institutions, Dr. Slaughter-Defoe has conducted research into the effect of school environments on children's achievement. She has conducted pioneering research on the relatively unexplored effects of private schooling on African American children. Her work has enabled her to articulate those factors that lead parents to choose particular types of private schools and those that promote and that impede the achievement of African American children. Since 1968, she has been engaged in a career-long study of the effects of Project Head Start and other early intervention strategies. She has made significant contributions to the study of the relation between parental socialization and children's school-related behavior and achievement. A follow-up study of the cognitive, social, and academic performance of her dissertation sample is one of fewer than a half-dozen longitudinal studies, spanning 1965-1978, ever conducted with African American children. She is initiating a 30-year follow-up study of the 1962 Hess sample of socioeconomically diverse African American children and families in the Chicago area and is currently collaborating in an evaluation of the primarily Westside Chicago implementation of the School

Improvement Program designed by James Comer, MD, of Yale University.” Now the second article I received the award for distinguished contribution to research and public policy from the American Psychological Association and then I made a speech on it and the speech was subsequently published a year later in the April 1995 issue of *American Psychologist* and it was entitled Revisiting the Concept of Socialization: Caregiving and Teaching in the 90's - A Personal Perspective. The one thing I noted about what I wrote which addresses the specific question on the history of the field is my observation that people had stopped in the last couple of years, by the time I published the April 1995 article referring to the concept of socialization and I wondered, had thought about the implications of that. The idea of socialization is a very powerful one and I want to remind you of it although I know Dr. Andrews (being an anthropologist) that you are well aware of it. The concept is that from one generation to the next ideas about living and how to live one's life and practices that are adapted are transmitted from persons who are older to persons who are younger. The initial amendment to this concept was introduced in my field by a fellow by the name of Bell, who introduced the idea of bi-directionality. Bell argued that young children by virtue of qualities that they have can influence parental responses to them but jumping ahead now twenty years you very rarely find even the concept where the bi-directional or unilateral referred to at all. After I published this April 1995 article I got a note from Glen Elder who was president-elect of the Society who suggested that part of it was that there was such a... the concept was no longer used because it had such a, or not used as frequently because it had a kind of a notion of constraints was attached to it in ways that people preferred not to see relationships between say adults and children for whatever reason today. That is there is a certain amount of prescriptiveness and constraint and so that is one is socialized into something and so forth and that as we moved away from the idea, we as a society that people are inducted into a way of inventing and personifying themselves that we moved away from the use of this concept. I think he is probably right but we have moved away from that and at the same time moved into the idea that there are no victims that everyone has a personal responsibility for all aspects of their situation and of course when you move away from the idea of socialization you move away from the idea of the larger environmental and social context affecting perception and behavior and in some sense we have lost something and I hope that we get back to it. We need to get back to the idea that it is up to the older persons or persons more experienced of any dimension not just age to pass on to the young what's good about how we live our lives and encourage them to dismiss those things which are not good, not healthy and not adaptive. But I feel that this is the greatest change in my general area within the field of child development is the idea that we are reluctant to seriously talk about the concept of childhood socialization because it implies a level of responsibility that people who are adult given how difficult it is nowadays. They don't want that burden, that's my view of it, on this. This is a major change if you think about it, for example we have now children who grow up and their children (are) in more than one family because of divorce and remarriage and the like. We've gotten out of the idea of talking about the fact that there might be a shared world in which children experience because the world is so complicated. We have more than one family contributing to that world and then we have a real sense that children will not necessarily take all that we give them. They will select, they are actors in the situation too so they have a certain level of empowerment. I think this is the biggest change and there are some good things about it but leave us face it, in my view it is still the case that children are dependent and they need people to help them translate, negotiate and navigate what there is in the world. My hope and therefore fear for the future is that the society will lose, that researchers will lose the sense of their responsibility to understand the responsibility that adults have for enabling children to make sense out of and adapt into the world in which they are born into and that they find, and that what we would have for example, twenty-five to thirty years hence is that researchers (will be) doing studies of parents and children from the point of view that everybody in that equation is equal. Everybody in that equation is not equal. Even if a child's temperament does influence how you will respond to him ultimately you have more to transmit to the child than the child has to transmit to you by way of values, morals, adaptive practices, etc., etc. My greatest fear is that the field will equalize and equate roles and relationships between parents and adults on the one hand and children on the other.

Andrews: You have given up some personal information but the question now is on personal notes. Tell us something about your personal interests, your family, especially ways in which they have had a bearing on your scientific interests and contributions and on your applied contributions. So essentially how your socialization influenced your research interests.

Slaughter-Defoe: Well, I guess I should also in talking about this kind of go back maybe to the general intellectual history there too. I have no family of procreation. I have only a family of origin in personal interest and of course I have been a professor/teacher all of my life. I think that I have had the luxury of time in ways that others have not necessarily had in that I have been able to do a lot of traveling and meet a lot of people and my own thinking has probably been informed by that. I'll give you an example of something that people with heavier commitments don't have time to do that occurred just most recently that I got great satisfaction out of. One of the Society's members, Dr. Cynthia Garcia-Coll convened a group of persons from three different countries at Brown University in Providence Rhode Island this fall. We all went without honorarium and spent two days at Brown discussing potential collaborative work between Mexico, the US and Canada on topics that might be of mutual interest. Everyone who attended was a delegate of some country so of course I was one of the delegates from the United States. I think that probably some kind of initiative will come forward within the next 5-10 years where more collaborative research will be done between the nations of North America just because there is a corpus of people in each country that wants to see some of that happen and because the countries each in my opinion face common problems in relation to education on the one hand and the bifurcation relative to have and have nots on the other within the social and economic social structures. I have had the privilege to be invited but I also had the time and resources to go and be there and I think that's the personal note that I would probably would like to leave. I, as a result of not having the extensive personal commitments at home, have been free to go and to work with people to forge networks to change relationships and structure ways of interacting among people on behalf of children, children of color and diversity for all of my life and I have gotten increasingly interested in that of course with advancing time and age. I began my career thinking the problem in the literature was simply that African American children were eliminated and not mentioned and not studied and not discussed and when studied and discussed talked about from the point of view of deficits and deficiencies in the literature. I realized early on that it was really all children of color in the world that were missing and by this time in my life I have begun to take seriously because I have the where with all (resources) and the capability and responsibilities for helping to create the kinds of infrastructures which that would or that could potentially not only make those initial changes but sustain them. So I think that would be the one personal note that I probably would want to leave, but then going back to my own family background I'm going to just make that very short because there are other places where as you know since you are my official biographer there is more detail. I was born in the city of Chicago. I grew up on the south side. I was a working class black girl whose father sustained himself by a career in the military though I didn't travel with him and I was raised by my great grandmother on my mother's side which I think is enormously important because at the time that I was born there were five generations of family members on my mother's side and of course my father's mother was living and so I very early on understood the intergenerational transfer as a concept that I lived and breathed. My great, great grandmother was living when I was born. I was always interested in human development even before I knew that there was a field of study in called Human Development and I think that's the most important thing.

Andrews: So that would be your origins of your interest, you were always interested in human development is that what you said?

Slaughter-Defoe: Right that's basically what I am saying.

Andrews: The individuals that were important to your intellectual development if you were up there already, you talked about early work experience. Did you share any of that, a lot of that is in your Bio, early adult experiences?

Slaughter-Defoe: Okay, early work experience. My perception as I guess is that of any girl growing up was that my father was very smart and my mother was very beautiful. I identified with both of them. I didn't have a favorite. I really enjoyed the fact that my mother was pretty or reputed to be pretty and had beautiful skin and that my father was smart. I think I am a lot like both of them though I am probably most like my father's mother, in temperament. She was feisty, argumentative, aggressive, career oriented, independent and beloved by all of our family. I think that her early tales to me, and I think I have shared this with you before, of her experiences and confronting whites in the South on behalf of her brothers and so forth had an enormous influence on me. I learned about race relations in the society through her. My mother's mothers who were role models more in the sense of what I didn't want to be like. Very attractive women who could not take care of themselves, or it seemed to me could not take themselves, and who because they didn't have a viable career were virtually penniless given that their husbands died earlier and there were not benefits in those days, were virtually penniless in their old age. So I often say that these early experiences in family background made me know that whatever I ultimately did I would have to have a career and an independent source of income on my own. Now I also started working very early, well not very early but I did have a job in the library when I was in high school. I have to say that the early influences on my intellectual development were actually in high school because I admired Katherine Dunham, who as you know is this famous African American dancer and anthropologist and I recall thinking how wonderful it was that she had a background in dance and also a scholarly background and I wanted to be like her and since she had a Ph.B. from the University of Chicago. I thought at the time that it was a Ph.D. and I decided that I too would get a Ph.D. from the University of Chicago which is where she had gone to get her Ph.B. By the time I arrived at the University of Chicago I later discovered that that was an A.B. but I didn't know it at the time, maybe if I had I would have gotten only a bachelors degree.

At any rate one of the origins of my interest in child development and what individuals are significant to me and so forth from early research mentors to significant colleagues. I was initially interested to be accurate about it in human development, and I was interested in human development because my background had been one as a child of an extended family in which intergenerational transfer of values and ideas and ways of behaving in the world and so forth were enormously important and I understood that. Now my decision to focus on the child development aspect of the life cycle probably was simply the result of my own age as a young woman. I was 21 when I entered graduate school (1962) and my advisor whom I had mentioned earlier, Robert D. Hess, that was his field of interest and I felt comfortable particularly when Head Start broke (summer, 1965), and being and having those affiliations and relationships, so I would have to say that a combination of being attracted to training in human development. I originally had planned to be a clinical psychologist and decided that I would take the variant at the University of Chicago that emphasized human development, instead of entering straight psychology, you could also do clinical psychology in those days... I entered graduate school in 1962. You could do it (clinical psychology) in education, you could do it in human development or you could do it in psychology. The difference would be what you would take differently as a core. Everybody would take the same clinical psychology sequence of courses but the core would vary.

My core was human development, that was an interdisciplinary core it had to do with how I saw the world. That you wanted to bring in the ideas from anthropology, psychology, sociology, biology. That made more sense to me, that interdisciplinary because of the kind of interest biology is involved in intergenerational relationships so was psychology but so was sociology and anthropological concepts. So I decided as an undergraduate at Chicago that I would major in human development and when I went to graduate school to take training in what I thought would be clinical psychology I would use human development as my core base particularly since I had already taken so many related courses to that major as an undergraduate. But what I found is that my particular advisor, Robert Hess, was imbued with the spirit that research could facilitate the solution of social problems and he transmitted that commitment and that belief to me osmotically, I would say just by virtue of how he was doing things, how hard he was working and so forth. Not necessarily by any extended conversations that we

had in any kind of mentoring role I just observed that he took very seriously what he was doing and it impressed upon me that maybe research and I think that was the general zeitgeist belief in those days at the University of Chicago that research could contribute significantly and importantly to the solution of social problems and as I said I think the specifics of me choosing that end of the life cycle because I can remember just as well Bernice Neugarten who was also a very important figure at that point in my life at the University of Chicago she would have been just as happy if I had stayed in the Aging area (as a matter of fact I did do my Master's Degree in Aging) and I was just as comfortable in that field. That was a less well developed field, Adult Development and Aging then by comparison to now and I know that Bernice Neugarten tried to get me involved in that. I liked her very much clearly as a woman, as an academic woman in a role model position but I was committed to working in the child area partly as I said because I was a young woman, didn't have children of my own, this was a way of getting maybe indirect you know forms of gratification whatever and also because you know the general sense that you start there in life and the importance of education to African Americans at that time as a vehicle for educational and social and occupational opportunity. So for all those reasons I think that I chose Child Development (as a concentration within Human Development). Notice what I didn't say, I didn't say that I chose Child Development because I was really intrigued by the changes in what children are like from one age to another or one time period to another, one critical period to another and so forth. I was never as fascinated about the internal working in terms of the development and change of children as I was about the social and contextual factors that impinged upon those changes or influenced the vicissitudes of those changes. That's always where my interests were.

That is childhood socialization rather than what we would call childhood development and I think that that was quite consistent with Robert Hess and his colleagues, Virginia Shipman and others having been mentors to me during that period. They were very busy about the business of clarifying the context of Childhood Growth and Development and indeed Robert Hess has been as I have mentioned in other papers that I have written, a student of Allison Davis the first Black scholar and anthropologist to be on the faculty of any major majority white university in the country. He was on the faculty in the Department of Education, though an Anthropologist by background and training, at the University of Chicago and was a mentor to both Robert Hess, my advisor on the one hand and Lee Rainwater who did a lot work on black families on the other. Both of those individuals, Lee Rainwater and Robert Hess who had respectively at the time of Allison Davis' death chairs at Harvard and Stanford and came to the final festschrift for Allison Davis. Both of them had been students of Allison Davis and then I was his student. I guess in some ways I am a granddaughter of social anthropologist, Allison Davis and some ways I think that's partly why I've always been comfortable with anthropology even though I'm a psychology, anthropology, sociology, etc., with a more interdisciplinary persuasion and indeed today I am professor and coordinator of the interdisciplinary program in the School of Education and Social Policy at Northwestern University entitled Program on Human Development and Social Policy. So my life and my identity have been you know quite consistent on that point. Having disciplinary training but always pursuing an interdisciplinary course.

Now I think I have said who my research mentors were. Significant colleagues, I've mentioned some of those and again as I said in this April of 1994 article, Political and Social events, is that where I am? I'm going to ask you, I guess it's not so much these specific questions but if somebody asked you Adrienne, do you have a picture of Diana Slaughter-Defoe's general intellectual history what things would you want me to build up a little bit, to say something about at this moment?

Andrews: Well, I think basically knowing that I would assume you were influenced by the Civil Rights movements, and the Black power movements if not actively involved, perhaps actively involved but those events and how they influenced or reinforced your already existing orientation in terms of your research and writing and teaching if there were significant incidents or events in that particular moment in history that influenced you along those lines.

Slaughter-Defoe: Oh, thank you that's good. That means I am doing pretty good, right! Yes, number four is very important because while I was a graduate student I fell in love and I was just enormously overwhelmed by a young man who at that point was named --. He has subsequently changed his name to -- and is presently I believe at this point of this interview on the faculty at the University of -- where he is actually getting off the ground a new program in the area of African American studies. Our lives have intersected over the years since graduate school at a number of different points but the first point was the summer of 1962 when I had just finished college and lived with three other girls preparatory to going to graduate school at the university in the building next door to his sister, who introduced me to him. I thought he was marvelous, his energy level, his concern and his commitment to black people, his well worked out articulated point of view, etc., etc., etc. about the situation of black people and it was he who introduced me to or I would say politicized me in relation to African American people. Put it this way, I had lived the life and just as the University of Chicago was responsible for stamping a concept that I had already lived (i.e. human development) I would have to say that my relationship with --, which was more of a distant adoration rather than an actual relationship sort of was the stamp of politicizing in terms of what this is the direction to go to make a commitment to a mission to a life. For example while we were graduate students we all decided that we would go to a black school to do our work and that is the context in which for example I first became a faculty member at Howard University, he went to Fisk University and so forth I mean in other words we made certain decisions about our lives you know between roughly 1962 to 1968 was when I got my degree. He didn't get his until years later but we made certain decisions that were the result of how we reflected upon thought about black people and we were involved I can recall in the summer of 1967 in setting up a local organization that was supposed to bring together black writers and so forth and so on. Probably one thing that we didn't do, we left Chicago in, I left Chicago in 1967 and did not return because I did a year's worth of work at Howard University from 1967 to 1968 and two years of work at Yale University. I did not return there until 1970. Some very significant things happened in Chicago during that period from 1967 to 1970. It was a different place; the Center for Inner-City Studies for example took off and got going. A number of things happened within the sort of black, African American cultural life in the city of Chicago between 1967 to 1970 while I was away but during the later, the middle to the latter part of the 60's due to --'s influence and I mentioned him in this April 1994 article, I was certainly politicized in a way that I had not been during my undergraduate career and as we struggle to find ways that we could as young scholars, potential scientists or whatever to sort of make some sort of connection with all of the changes that were going on in the movement essentially outside. Changes that inevitably from the point of view of changes in the academy my subsequent career certainly benefited from. That is to say its quite clear that I would have been in the University of Chicago without any benefit from any kind of affirmative action because I was there before but my career moves from roughly 1970 forward were certainly the result of the benefit of that kind of movement. I think as colleague we have been life long friends we have now a standing arrangement, once a year we have lunch. We had lunch this summer and I've never seen him so happy and it pleased me no end, in the spring I wrote a recommendation for him to get this position, which he did get at the University of --, and I had the sense that he was enormously happy at least for the first time in his life. His daughter had just received full support to -- and she had already finished college successfully; (although) the marriage that he had with his daughter's mother didn't work out, he had always taken care of her and really just adores her and so she is from all indications launched and he was back doing his own position again, cause for a number of years he had been working for someone else in the African American Cities Program as opposed to being the director of the program which he was in the early 80's. So I had never really seen him quite as happy but I expect throughout our lives since really the two of us together probably constitute 66% of the black graduate students at the University of Chicago in 1962. It's not as if there is a whole school of people out there that I could be having lunch with I don't think that is the case. I think that there might have been a couple more than that but not a whole heck of a lot more. There certainly weren't any more people in my unit between 1962 and 68 when I graduated.

Andrews: Were you there when (the late) Dr. Bobby Wright was there?

Slaughter-Defoe: Yes, but Bobby Wright was my student. I was young enough when I came back to join the faculty in 1970. I went there in '62 to '68, I came back in 1970 and I was young enough so probably he was a bit older than me, but I was young enough that Bobby, I was on his dissertation committee and I can prove it because I have a copy of it and in fact I put it in the Northwestern Archives and then, what's the fellow, can't think of his name he is deceased also, the fellow who was his chair? I was on his dissertation committee and Maisha Bennett who was his peer graduated around the same time that he did, Bobby that is. Bobby just died prematurely. Dr. Joseph Wepman, I took a class with him as part of my clinical training. He was an older man then, Bobby Wright's dissertation chairperson when I was a student in the early 60's and I took his course in diagnosing children with learning disabilities. Yes, for example I list on my vitae, the long version of my vitae the names of the students with whom I worked and one of them was Bobby Wright who was my student. I'm not saying I taught him anything. Susan Stodolsky who is still living was the other committee member and he did a study of observing kids with learning disabilities in naturalistic settings. But Bobby was one of the early ones to come out and Maisha who always wrote beautifully, her college background was Holyoke, Mount Holyoke and she was there but those people

...that's why I said there was a lot that happened between '67 to '70 while -- and I had gone to honor our commitment to go on to black colleges. He went to Fisk and then down to Atlanta; that's where he met and married the woman who became his wife initially at Spelman, and I went to Howard. It's very interesting about that, he wanted me to go to Fisk but of course you see I had grown up in the this five generation of women situation and I wanted my own career so I decided not to go to Fisk I went to Howard and so, plus I don't think I was his type anyway. He was always in those days enamored of lighter skinned woman. I don't mean that in a negative way, his mother was light skinned and so was his sister, you know but I am just saying that I wasn't his type. I was his intellectual type but I don't think I was his physical attraction type. Anyway I went my way, and I was actually, I would have to say, if God will forgive me and -- too but I think I was better served by having done what I did. He was certainly a colleague and after that since we were so early and I was so displaced a number of my subsequent colleagues have been present or former students. For example I would count you as one of my good friends/acquaintances and you are, you know, sort of a former student or at least someone studying at the institution where I was working and it seems to me that I have met in my lifetime an awful lot of people who have especially after they finish and move on and establish themselves and are in the process of establishing themselves who have become good friends and colleagues to me so you have two tiers of people. People that I have known through the SRCDC particularly African American colleagues and then people whether African American or otherwise who I have had some kind of a mentoring role myself to and in my opinion all of these people I have written with them, I've talked with them, I've taught them, I've been taught by them you know these are the people that I would consider important to my intellectual development. Now just using you as one example when I decided to develop this course at Northwestern on Women in Child Care in the African diaspora. I called you to give me the benefit of your insights as an anthropologist and a female African American anthropologist into this topic, so this is a little bit off the point from what the SRCDC probably has in mind but I'm making the point for the purpose of this historical tape that I have never confined myself just to child development researchers to get insight on questions, problems, issues in my field. I've always been much broader and much more interdisciplinary than that and that has influenced my research, my writing and my teaching.

Andrews: Well, you can add more as it occurs to you. I don't guess we have to be totally lock step. Well, that pretty much completes section A. We kind of went full circle here. The personal research contributions, you've talked about your primary interest in child development/human development and how those intersected. So basically you have outlined your intellectual history and what lead you to the point that you are at. Your family influence, the influence of a dear friend and colleague in the early stages of your education at the University of Chicago, various

people who have been colleagues and mentors, and people that you have mentored as well who have turned out to be intellectual colleagues as well as friends. So now I'd like to ask you, and you've also talked about your interest in child development as I stated previously, so what continuities in your work do you see as most significant. Have there been shifts that have occurred and what events if you can recall were responsible for any shifts that did occur in your work.

Slaughter-Defoe: Thank you. That is not as difficult a question as I would have thought it might be at some point in my life. I believe that I have always been interested in the applications of my work. It is probably, I thought about this, I told my students yesterday, I am actually probably an expert in the area of interventions. Child interventions. I have, over these 20 years been concerned about not only learning what family factors contribute to children's achievements but also learning what interventions can be used to facilitate them. Now at the risk of going into too much detail here I would want to mention, I think in the past eight years I told my students yesterday I believe I have been involved in four major interventions in different ways. First, I have been involved all of my life in monitoring Head Start Programs. Head Start is the world's national laboratory when it comes to interventions. Second, between 1987 and 1988 I have served on various panels that have to do with charting research directions for Head Start Research and Evaluation. Critiquing what had gone on in previous years, making recommendations for the future. The appointment to that kind of panel comes directly from my early Head Start research and follow-up with Head Start children. Second, I was involved as a national advisory committee panel consultant to what I call the Transition Study. A national study coordinated by Drs. Sharon and Craig Ramey to look at 31 trials in which partnerships between public schools sending Head Start Centers and local evaluators were made. As part of the national advisory committee to that larger study I traveled to 11 of those 31 sites ranging from Alaska to Texas to New York to Wisconsin, Minnesota, Ohio and others looking at how these partnerships were forged and the extent to which the two primary goals to empower parents such that they would get the support services and the backup that they needed to enable them to continue supporting their children as they transition into primary grades on the one hand and looking at how early classrooms develop more appropriate "responses" to children (i.e. developmentally appropriate practices) on the other. I have observed those sites and participated in making recommendations about their success and the like and I have observed and in some settings the expectation has been that this model would literally be an aspect of school or educational reform. Whereas in some other sites it has been primarily a follow-up study of what's happened to Head Start children and their peers as they have moved into schools. The third type of intervention that I been involved with in the last year is in doing the evaluation myself with Thomas Cook here at Northwestern and Charles Payne of the Comer's School Improvement Program. This is an approach toward organization and management of schools which is child friendly and oriented toward child development. Youth Guidance, a Social Service agency in 11 schools in the Chicago public school system, is presently implementing it. There are 9 at this point comparison schools. A final report on our evaluation of this effort is due at the end of July for example 1997. My primary responsibility has been to look at the impact of the introduction of the Comer process on primary grade children's responses to their perceptions of school climate, as that's the main target that that effort is focused on. My colleagues have been focused either on the upper grades, as in the case of Tom Cook or on a more qualitative look at the overall process of implementation as in the case of Charles Payne. The fourth context at which I have had work with interventions, all of this within the last eight years I want to mention again, has been the Quasar Project which is a 12.9 million dollar project funded by the Ford Foundation that is coming to an close and is based at the University of Pittsburgh (where you are a faculty member) in the Learning Research and Development Center, known internationally as LRDC, in which the focus has been on instruction. Teachers changing how they teach math to urban children where the focus is less on computation skills and more on reasoning exploration, math is fun, thinking about how to be a math problem solver as opposed to just going through something by rote. I just spent, for example two days this past week hearing the detailed results of that project as they are now in the process of being written up. This intervention was distinguished by its focus on teaching the classroom the instruction unit and not as much by comparison

to the other three models on families and I am not going to since its not appropriate here to discuss as I did with my class yesterday what I observed about commonalities and issues raised by these forms of early intervention. That is with children who are all very roughly nine years and under by comparison to their similar and unique features. But just the past, I guess eight years alone, probably would qualify me to be considered an expert in the area of educational reform and intervention just because of the magnitude and scope of the projects with which I have very intimate knowledge in terms of how they are and are not working for children in poverty. So I think that this is my involvement in early intervention as something that began almost the moment I began my career. For example my very first job post Ph.D. was working in fact with Dr. James Comer when he was getting the Comer model off the ground in Yale at the Child Study Center in 1968 to 70. That is where I worked so I had intimate knowledge of the Comer model as a potential intervention model for enabling children to adjust and schools to change to help them adjust as early as 1968 and '69. Again working with Head Start today in the Transition study I began that work when I did my dissertation I was working with Head Start children under the supervision of Robert Hess. My work in the area of Head Start and Comer, those have been continuities, this interest in early interventions. This interest in schooling, early schooling, achievement in school and so forth is I think another and closely related early continuity and indeed for child development I did a review of the literature in that area in the 1990.

What shifts occurred and what events were responsible. I don't think a whole lot have occurred. I have been, if you look at it from the point of view of work and professional life, remarkably stable both in terms of working in the Chicago area for most of my career. Working at some of the same issues for most of my career. I would say no, I think that's right. I think we will just leave it at that and say not very many. A lot of consistency.

Andrews: Well do you see strengths and/or weaknesses in your research and areas that in looking back, and this is kind of leaping ahead to the next question, areas in which you might do something differently relative to your research or the questions that you asked or the models that you sought to apply and develop. Strengths and weaknesses basically, and the impact of your work, which has obviously been significant.

Slaughter-Defoe: Well just to put it briefly I think that my strength has been my resiliency in the sense that I have always been open to learning new things. I remember -- told me in the early 80's about the KayPro computer being the best, I went right out and got one. I mean in other words I've always been open to, I was a faculty member here at Northwestern I am currently coordinating the program area, and I am the first to completely computerize our relationships. I communicate with them with an exception of a quarterly meeting and contact in the hallways and the like, mostly by e-mail. This is a personal strength that has impacted everything. The weakness I think is that I believe that I have because of my interest in policy has been of great strength and of great significance I have not been single mindedly in pursuit of a scientific career and I don't think that I have published as much as others in my field, maybe as much my field but not as much as others of my generation and my stature and I think that that has to do with the context in which I have worked which have been so enormously training by the point of view of the kinds of racial issues and sexual issues that I have confronted but I also think its not just entirely that its been that I would decide that it was more important to site-visit the 11 Head Start transition studies and find out what was going on and try to contribute to facilitating that than to say sitting at home and writing an article about it, about some Head Start related topic. In other words, I have not sought data that I could quickly publish and get known for a list of publications. I have sought to move the field along by pushing into bold relief the situations of children of color and children of poverty and I think that that's a decision that I made very, very early on at the point of the founding of the Caucus and so forth that I really can't blame anybody for and also for the most part I have been rewarded for that. In other words, its not the case, there are people who publish, many more who have not received the kind of accolades and award that I have in my career.

I want to mention something else as another example of this pushing the field forward in terms that I really neglected to mention earlier in the interview. One of the most gratifying experiences that I had with the Society was to be part of the delegation, the official delegation in 1985 that went from SRCD to China where I was asked to, this was when I was still a member of the Governing Council, to lead the opening, open the discussion with the psychologists that we met there. That was a very important trip and it was kind of an important confirming turning point in my life in that I realized how privileged many of us had been here in the United States as far as being able to pursue our profession. At that particular time in Chinese history the only socialization study that was going on was the study of only children and the consequences because China had just put into effect a policy of only child. One child per family to then in some sense to control the population expansion and other than that particular research that was going on at one of the universities the psychologists had either been in previous years which they told us about at dinner and which had already been written about in materials that had been shared with us by Harold Stevenson, not been aloud to pursue their profession because the focus on the individual was not part of the political ideology of that particular government. So they either had not been allowed to practice their profession or the focus had been primarily on cognition and perception. We observed children in child care centers but we also learned that the Chinese did not really recognize at that point children who were learning disabled or otherwise disadvantaged because once again that was not part of the zeitgeist. The good news about that of course is that the emphasis in terms of Asian cultures on effort and the de-emphasis on intellectual and innate genetic ability is something that is very supportive of active educational initiatives on the part of teachers in the teaching profession. At any rate I had done a lot of reading thanks to inputs from my friends and colleagues including once again -- prior to this trip and it was really a peak point and in my life and in my work in the Society. I recall having a conversation hour on this when I returned and I recall being responsible in my role as Governing Council member for ensuring that Lee C. Lee who had been an original member of the Committee on Minority Participation got to do an invited lecture to the Society. She was a, currently then a faculty member at Cornell University. In any event my trip to China in the context of the delegation from the Society for Research in Child Development allowed me to formalize and then push forward a series of what I would call a contribution to the international initiatives and I'm proud to say that the Society has continued, has begun and continued to this day and it's not by accident that I brought forward the name of the Governing Council member who succeeded me, John Ogbu who had been, by my recommendation a member of the interdisciplinary committee which at that time was focusing on international matters and I have been pleased, as I said to see most recently in another trend in the field and in child development to consider these kinds of international connections and I forgot to mention that. I want to say in that same regard, I feel that this is a weakness in my own work. All of the issues that I have studied at this particular junction need to be summated and then redirected toward international concerns. I made a fledgling move in that direction in recent years by sort of enmeshing myself, I'll say for lack of a better phrase, in Caribbean studies of one sort and another. For example, it is not possible to do studies of the efficacy of Head Start in America in today's world because children from zero to eight in view of the new welfare reform policy and in view of the feminist movement and the increasing participation of women in the work force ever since 1963 means that all children even if they are not in Head Start, because only 25% of eligible children in poverty are at most, have some kind of early experience in group care situations now a days. With women in the work force the number of other early child care programs, including for profit day care centers and nurseries, mean that we no longer have "an appropriate comparison group" and the only way that we can get those comparison groups to look at the efficacy of specific kinds of programming independent of family care is to go to other nations where the plethora of social programs for young children is much more narrow and restrictive if present at all. I think the fact is that I feel this is something that I have not yet done and would like to work toward or spend some time working toward in the next few years in my career and I think that is a weakness. I have managed to inspire younger colleagues as well as former students to do some of this work.

For example one of my students, Deborah Johnson, back to Deborah Johnson has already done international work in Zimbabwe and the like, so in other words, students who have come behind me

hearing me talk have taken an interest in doing, and not just because of me but also because of opportunities available, international work and comparisons and putting their work and their ideas that they have sort of honed and nourished in this particular setting relative to African peoples of color in looking at in other settings of African peoples of color and I would include in that regard the Caribbean as well as Africa. I first visited Africa in 1972 and I have not been back since and when I did visit it was more from an informational data collecting rather than on a research mission. At this time I am extremely interested and have been for the last several years in trying to develop initiatives in the Caribbean but I think this is a weakness of my work. That my ideas need to be tested in another cultural context and I think that doing that will strengthen both the theoretical contributions impact and the like.

Now what published and unpublished manuscripts represent my thinking about child development. Which contributions the most wrong-headed? That's a tough one, I would guess I have to say that the American Psychologist article summates my research and best represents my thinking that I published in 1995 and that I alluded to earlier in this interview. I think that from the point of view of the Society in Research in Child Development my monograph that I mention earlier on Early Intervention Maternal and Child Development is the most significant. The most wrong-headed set of contributions, I haven't made any! I haven't made any! I have not made any. My work in the private schools area with Dr. Barbara Schneider is still path breaking. I think that the most wrong-headed thing I have done is not to beat on the chest of institutions that I have been at to get more release time for writing and that's been very wrong headed. I have allowed these institutions to underestimate my value and I suppose I mention this in the context of some current plans that I might refer to later on.

Andrews: Relative to funding and research funding please comment on your experiences, your participation in shaping research funding policy and securing support for your own work the issues surrounding that.

Slaughter-Defoe: Well, I have been very fortunate there as well. I have been funded by respectively the Social Science Research Council, the National Institute for Child Health and Human Development, the March of Dimes Foundation, the Grant Foundation, the MacArthur Foundation, the Spencer Foundation. I have been, not in large sums I hasten to add quickly but in enough sums to do my own individual research I have successfully competed and obtained funds. Probably the best thing that I did to make that happen for me as a psychologist because each field has it's own way of achieving those routes was very early on in my career I served 3 ½ years of a four year term as a peer reviewer for the National Institute on Mental Health and I learned there what the criteria were for funding, what a proposal looked like and so forth. I need to make a comment about that, which is important. It may still even be true today.

I began my career at the University of Chicago in 1970 where I served seven years before I was denied tenure and came to Northwestern where I have been since 1977 and at the end of this academic year will be 20 years and I have gone up through the rank from assistant professor to full professor at Northwestern where I am now but when I began at the University of Chicago at that point Robert Hess had moved to Stanford and as I said there was really nobody else there to give me mentorship and help on what to do to progress through the field or what I needed to do in order to be successful as an entry level faculty member and what I did in response to that which in the long run has benefited me over the short haul it was hell to pay but in the long run it has benefited me, I went out of the university and engaged in professional service and in that context gained information that I needed about how to do my job. This is where the research funding comes in, in other words there is absolutely no need for entry level assistant professors to be serving on a peer review committee in which they receive at three month intervals any where from 10-12 full fledge research proposals in which it is their responsibility to be the senior reviewer for at least three of them and a secondary reviewer, that is providing critique only as opposed to a summary and critique for at least three more but when I was an entry level assistant professor at the University of Chicago from 1970 to 1977 up through I believe 1975

or 1976 it would be on my resume, I served a 3 ½ year term in that capacity. Every three months I would receive 10-12 proposals and be responsible for being primary or secondary reviewer for them. You can image the time and energy, this was before computers. I used to take my typewriter on the airplane with me trying to type up my reports of what I thought about the particular proposal that I had very carefully gone over in those days and writing and typing my proposals in the hotel. Taking and dragging the heavy typewriter with me but I learned on the streets of hard knocks about how to write a proposal, what it needs to look like when it is full fledged, don't forget all the copies of the ones accepted and rejected were available to me and so forth. No one from the University of Chicago in the entire seven years that I was there ever told me how to write a research proposal and yet I learned because of what I had contacted so that while I was still at the university I got my first grant from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. I later learned that Glen Elder who sponsored that research or supported that research as a reviewer (he was the president of the Society for Research in Child Development this year as a matter of fact), that he was one of the reviewers of my first research proposal. I learned how to write a proposal from the streets of hard knocks as opposed to what should have happened, what could have happened was that some senior faculty at the University of Chicago, or two, faculty or two would take me under their wings and help me do what I needed to do, in order to be a credible, effective whatever faculty member there. At the point at which I left the University of Chicago which was 1977, I had already brought into that university one hundred and fifty three thousand dollars in grant monies which in those days was nothing to sneer at and as a result of that that is what subsequently became this early intervention monograph. So the study was subsequently written up but we got as I said supporting funds from the Grant Foundation. I have observed that assistant professors here at Northwestern are not required to do those kinds of things. They are expected to bring in research money and do some research and of course with the cut backs that has to be less of a criteria anyway but even then it was possible but no one told me to get tenure on just a good thought without bringing in a dime to the university, okay and I feel that so reflecting on my experience with the research funding apparatus I would as I uploaded and was top heavy in my early years in part because I was building my career during the period where these governmental agencies wanted to include minority peoples of colors in that overall process and because most of us who were around to be included were very junior because those who would have been more senior were not around. For example, there were two other minority members on that committee with me. One was Dr. Roderick Pugh who was professor of psychology at Loyola University here in Chicago and had been trained and worked for years as a clinical psychologist before he joined Loyola's Department of Psychology very late in his life. He is presently retired. The other person was medical doctor, Harry Elam who lives here in Evanston in fact and who was not expected to have any particular research expertise by comparison to psychologists because he was a pediatrician. Dr. Pugh was also and has remained a life long supporter of me. He was, for example, one of the people that I called on to write for me when I became a Fellow in Division 45 in the American Psychological Association and of course I am presently a Fellow in Division 37 and somebody told me Division 1 as well, recently. Dr. Pugh first saw me in operation as this young black woman with no supports on the block reviewing these major proposals mostly by majority researchers for big dollars where you had to put your evaluations in writing, summarize and evaluate whether or not this should be done. I think that experience, I mean and I was at that point I might have been I certainly was under 35 and I had no one up in the air, so as to speak at the University of Chicago that I felt comfortable, it wasn't a matter of feeling comfortable, I didn't not even know that I could go to them and say, what do you think. I recalled I had one proposal that was so mathematically oriented that I had to ask someone that I knew to help me to interpret whether the equations were appropriate but for the most part all of the proposals were sent to me as having something to do with my area. Now this little activity is the kind of activity that prepares you for what. The reason I say I uploaded in the front but it has served me in good stead all of my life, how is that? Let me use this as an example, I subsequently did identify some these proposals and used them in a course that I developed and taught first in Chicago and later in my early years at Northwestern on writing to get research funds in the early childhood/early development area. I did de-identify them, getting students to critique them. So I used them as teaching tools apart from modeling from my own first grant.

I also am now as I told you associate editor of Child Development, that early background in criticizing research in the formulation and so forth and so on carries me to the present day. It would be much more difficult to be associate editor of Child Development had I not written a little bit and also had this extensive ground breaking, “butt shaking” experience being a reviewer for the National Institute of Mental Health at the very early stages of my career so I have had experiences both in evaluating other peoples’ researches very early on as well as getting research money. Serving on, what was then called the Juvenile Problem Study Section. I have also worked with the National Research Council where we attempted to set policy about what should be, I believe I was doing this in the mid 80’s, what should be policy and directions for child development research at the point that which I served on this particular panel on the National Academy of Sciences, Mary Jo Bane was the chairperson and she was of course most recently working in the Clinton Administration in the area of welfare reform and assistant secretary and so forth. The final thing I think that I would like to mention here is my current work, all of which lead to my most recent appointment in the Board of Scientific Affairs in the American Psychological Association. However, I want to say something else, almost in every instance and without exception when my name has been put up for an appointment in an area I have had as a result of previous nominations the appropriate credentials to get selected or elected but almost in every instance the nomination has been by another African American to my knowledge. Okay.

My very first award came from the Caucus of the Society for Research in Child Development. In 1987 they gave me an award for distinguished contributions to the field. So my first award about my contributions to the profession came from black people. Most recently jumping ahead to this appointment from 1994 to 1997 on the Board of Scientific Affairs in the American Psychological Association Margaret Spencer I believe nominated me for that. She had been a member of the Board of Scientific Affairs and she put my name in nomination. But then you see subsequently it was approved by the Board and then passed to the Council of the American Psychological Association and they voted and accepted it. Similarly most recently my name has been put in nomination for the Constance E. Clayton, Chair in Urban Education at one of the eastern universities and once again an African American made that nomination. So I feel I don’t have any doubts that I have been blessed to have the kind of experiences that I have had and therefore put forward the kind of credentials but when it comes time to getting the initial recognition and making that next step as far as I can tell in my own career it’s always been by black people. So this is what I have to say now, when it comes to say for example who nominated me to be on the National Institute of Mental Health, I really don’t know that one. That was certainly an important one, but nobody every told me how I got there on that one so a lot of times I don’t know and maybe that person was not by an African American maybe I only know when it is by an African American, maybe the other times I don’t know but at any rate I know that was a very good training experience.

Now it looks like we might be coming close to the end of this relative to my institutional contributions, right?

Andrews: Yes and I think well you may want to discuss what institutions, you’ve talked about the institutions you worked at and the agencies you worked for or been affiliated with and much of this is listed in your Bio and your article and unless you want to expand on it some more and there is beyond that, I mean there is much more to discuss in the next questions.

Slaughter-Defoe: Well, let me just for the sake of those who don’t look at the Bio, just say that my first post Ph.D. job, my prior commitment with my peer colleagues at the University of Chicago was at Howard University from 1967-68 and where I was an instructor in psychiatry. Then I went to Yale University, the Child Study Center where I was research associate (assistant professor) where I worked under the direct supervision of psychotherapist Dr. James Comer, as a research psychologist, as he was beginning to develop the model for what has now become known as the Comer School Improvement Program. For those of you in child development you understand that this was a very significant

location for me because Gesell who did the early studies of developmental changes in behavior and motor activities did his work at the Yale Child Study Center and that is also simultaneously the Psychoanalytic Center of the world and at the time that I was there it was quite customary for Anna Freud to visit there every year. So I had the privilege and honor of observing Anna Freud conduct case consultation on at least one occasion to the psychiatric residents in training. After that I had the desire, because I was just doing research at Yale Child Study Center to teach and at that point, 1968-70 which that was my first post Ph.D. job when I was at Howard University I was writing my dissertation but I had not yet finished it. The Yale University position there one of my committee members helped me get, Robert LeVine. He was a cultural anthropologist, cultural and personality anthropologist and I had him on my committee, I had taken a number of courses with at Chicago including I should mention a variant in African studies there, that he got me and I was a Fellow in African studies at the University of Chicago when I was a graduate student and so through him I took at least four special courses and had some exposure to African studies and African history. I had come up to Northwestern... Now LeVine because of the kind of extra special exposures I had asked him to basically be a fourth member on my dissertation committee although it wasn't cultural and he came through Washington D.C. where I was based at Howard and volunteered to facilitate me getting my first job and he had these connections with the Yale Child Study Center, and Dr. Comer, so he (LeVine) recommended me and I was hired. Interestingly enough, the person who competed with me for that and was offered the job before me and turned it down was Joyce Ladner. I say interestingly enough because she was the other student produced by Lee Rainwater who had been the student of Allison Davis. So if you look at the family tree that I talked about before Allison Davis produced Robert Hess and Lee Rainwater. Lee Rainwater's student, one of them was Joyce Ladner and Robert Hess, I was his student. Joyce Ladner and I both competed for the position at Yale and it was offered to her. She decided against accepting it and then as a result it was offered to me and I accepted it. Of course you know Joyce's training was in Sociology. I stayed there for two years and wanted to learn to teach, I'm laughing now about that and I wrote to the University of Chicago asking them did they know of any positions for me and to my surprise received a note back saying why don't you apply here. Well, my dissertation had just received the first Pi Lambda Theta Distinguished Research Award for best work done by a woman in reference to education in 1969 so I guess that was the kind of thing they wanted. So I did apply there and I also applied to the University of Illinois what was then called Circle Campus which is what I was really interested in because remember because of my civil rights commitment I wanted to be working in a facility where I would have more contact with more students who were more poorer so to speak. At any rate however, my assessment of that situation at the University of Illinois was much more elitist because they were sort of pretenders to the throne if you will and actually my alma mater embraced me. That was where people came out when I interviewed and so forth and so on and I was only offered at the University of Illinois Circle Campus, now know as the Chicago Campus after they learned that the University of Chicago was going to offer me one. At least as I thought about it at the time, and I wound up going back to Chicago where I then spent those seven years and then from there I, when I didn't get tenure, although I had recommended a name of one our students to Northwestern for this job that they had available, when I learned that I was not going to get tenure at Chicago, I contacted that chair of the search committee that I had spoken with, Dr. Karen Fuson, and said I think I would like to recommend myself for that job. She laughed and said go ahead. I did, I came up, I had just finished gathering all the data on that intervention study, and I had data on observations, people in the field and so forth. The students were enthralled and they offered me the position and I was hired.

Now I want to make a point here. At the time that I was denied tenure at the University of Chicago and was hired at Northwestern University in the same role as assistant professor, basically a lateral move, I was at that point just being appointed to the Social Policy committee of the Society for Research in Child Development and within another couple of years, i.e. 1981 I was appointed (elected) to the Governing Council of the Society for Research in Child Development. In other words, from all indications relative to how I had conducted my professional life in the 70's at the level of the public arena I was at the top of my field. The way in which I was situated professionally was at the very top and at the same time simultaneously and at the same time I was scrambling and struggling for a job.

Having been denied tenure at Chicago and being fortunate enough from Northwestern's point of view to let me come in and start all over. This was the situation of the black scholar in my field at that time. Jean Carew who preceded me as the first chairperson of the Black Caucus of the Society for Research in Child Development, who had gotten more research money than myself, whom I called on as a consultant to my researches when I was on the faculty of at Chicago and at Northwestern relative to because she had conducted observational studies of mother/child interactions and whom I have already mentioned in this discussion had been the first black person to publish a monograph in the publications of the Society, she never had a tenure-track job at all. Her first hire was as a lecturer of something to that effect at the Harvard's Graduate School of Education and then she had various kinds of equivalencies of postdoc elaborate appointments or whatever at a couple of university settings in the Stanford area. At the last point just before she died she was encouraging me to come to California and work with her in developing this private institute that she was trying to develop. She had criss-crossed the country, she was originally from Trinidad, criss-crossed the country and had developed and understood thoroughly how to get herself funded because it meant the difference between eating and not eating because she was raising a young daughter at the time and she had given up any thought or possibility for herself having an academic appointment. For example, people tried to get her an appointment at the University of California, Irvine, it did not work and luckily for her I guess she was taken out of her misery and she died. Now at the time I didn't know to discuss this in the way I am discussing it with you. I am discussing it here because I want it on record, but at the time we were just living our lives and observing our situations and not really piecing it all together but the fact is that in my opinion now in hindsight and we are writing about this in our current history, our insistence on attention to diversity in child development and attention to kids from different backgrounds in child development caused us grief professionally. People in powerful and prestigious positions either kept us from having jobs or kept us from securing the jobs that we had or whatever. In other words every one of us, those of us involved engaged in this writing now suffered and we did not realize as we were living our lives just how much we suffered professionally for the initiatives that we took. Now, I mention that that's very important because at the time none of us, neither Carew, nor myself, nor any of the other individuals that I have mentioned, we didn't think that we were doing very much, after all we were not on the streets of Birmingham being eaten by dogs, okay, and we had three squares every day and we were living in nice comfortable circumstances. So we did not experience ourselves as being unduly punished, it's only in hindsight when you look at the level of destabilization that we experienced and consequence suffering that we experienced that we understand that we were indeed punished for the minuscule initiatives that we took. At the time I didn't see it like that, I saw everyone else because I lived through the civil rights, black power movement and the like. I saw everyone else experiencing the adverse consequences of protesting and resistance and demanding change and demanding that African American people and scholars whatever be on the block. I did not realize the price that we were paying because nobody yelled at us in our faces, nobody turned dogs on us, do you see what I am saying so that everything that was done was done to the extent that it was done and if it was done it was done, you just didn't quite get the job that you hoped to get. You just didn't quite get the tenured appointment that you expected to get and so forth and so on. Now however this is life, coming to Northwestern, being lucky enough and fortunate enough to come to Northwestern was the best thing that ever happened to me. You could look at it this way that although I received my degree in 1968 the first time I had a job was in 1977. The first job I had if you recall at Howard was pre-doctoral degree. The second job I had was a degree that one of my professors from my committee intervened for me on and got me considered there. The third job I had was at my alma mater. I got the Northwestern job on my own. In other words I came up here, nobody knew me, I didn't know anybody, I had done a certain amount of research that they liked and they were interested in, that's where I started to grow. So I would say that I got my first job, which I have now stayed in for twenty years, seven years after I got my Ph.D. That's one way to look at it. Now I came into Northwestern, also by that time I was smart enough to understand a little bit more that I was no longer the privileged beloved child of this intergenerational family of black women and my father, that I was out here a little black girl by myself and I was starting to butt up against some heavy obstacles so I came into Northwestern fighting and I have talked about this in other places and I don't think that this

really pertains to this but I know when I walked in the door at Northwestern I understood that this was a turf that I put myself on, I wanted to stay in Chicago it's a good institution, an elite institution and I was going to make a home here and nobody was going to push me around anymore. That was it. Now it says for persons connected with well-known research sites describe the changes that occurred during your time the objectives, achievements and frustrations in the role in developmental research... Well I think that we have a research site here that is not the same as for example the institute for research in child development at the University of Minnesota but with Bernice Neugarten, myself and a couple colleagues, Fay Cook, Dan Lewis we founded the program on human development and social policy in 1981, an interdisciplinary program committed to looking at the impact of social policy on human lives and how human lives in consort can impact social policies and policies in the arena of both health and welfare as well as education. We have now graduated with doctorate degrees, you know, over 30 students. We have an average annual entering class of somewhere between 5-7. I have been the coordinator for the last three years. This year will be the final year. In this particular year we admitted nine students; several of them (former students), maybe ten or so, have careers in one form or another in some aspect of applied child development, child development research in terms of the Society (SRCD) itself, probably the best known is Dr. Deborah Johnson but there are others, but of course during my time at the University of Chicago a number of students were graduated in this area. Just to name a few, Dr. Margaret Spencer (graduate) and Dr. Bertha Holliday (undergraduate, I think) who is presently playing a very active role in the American Psychological Association. I don't know there have just been many students; it's all on my resume.

I certainly have discussed achievements and frustrations. I haven't experienced the glass ceiling relative to gender nearly as much as I have the glass ceiling relative to race and I want to emphasize this again in another way because times have changed but physically as a woman I have never had any doubt that men whatever their background, black, white or otherwise found me when I was a younger woman attractive so that I may have had doors opened to me at least people willing to hear me talk simply because they liked at that time how I looked when I did talk because I was not any less caustic than I am now. So I would say that gender per se was not a barrier but certainly my advocacy, my politically advocacy for social causes regarding black children and families was not well received so I was... as a woman and of course child development is a good field for that right... But the mission or the cause that we were bringing forward relative to consideration of children of color that was a different story.

Describe an experience as a teacher... the courses I have taught and the like are on my resume and I don't think I want to spend a lot of time going on about that. I have been privileged to work in elite institutions and as such I have not been burdened with an excessive amount of teaching and I have been privileged to have the opportunity to relate my own research to my teaching. I have taught as you would gather from what I have said courses in the area of child development generally, child development and social policy, and the development of African American children and families. In the 1980-81 -- and I developed a course that was on that issue that was subsequently awarded accommodation by black studies organizations at that time and I institutionalized it here at Northwestern. Presently Philip Bowman teaches the first part of that course, now a two-quarter sequence although most students typically take one quarter. The first quarter is the development of African American children and families, theories and research, Philip Bowman teaches that course and the development of African American children and families, research and policy, as you can well imagine, I teach that course. I decided that I would do a course on women and childcare in the African Diaspora. That was probably my most recent innovation that was somewhere in the mid 80's something like that when I developed that course and about every two years I teach that. This year I am looking forward to this unique venture where Darlene Clark Hine may collaborate with several of us on doing black women's history and then each of us do our own particular courses, a particular variant on that with me focusing on women in child care in the African Diaspora. So these are the courses I have taught I have taught a course on the role of play in the development of the child, that is of course, my interest in play directly evolved from the fact that I conducted observation research that had children

in play settings, so I began to read into that literature and I taught courses in that and of course various pro-seminars and so forth and so on. I have awards for my relationships with students so this is sort of one of my strong points; you know the Spencer Foundation gave me \$50,000.00 a couple years ago because of being an exceptionally good mentor, a couple years later the SRQP, Summer Research Opportunity Program of the CIC they gave me a plaque because I was only one of two faculty members here at Northwestern who have consistently served in relation to that program and getting younger people interested in research and so forth over the past years. So I don't experience... for example, I'm not a person who walks into the office saying "God I wish I could not teach today so I could do my research", nor do I walk into the office saying, "God I wish I could not do my research so I could teach". You know I have been very privileged in that when I walk into my office now I say, "God I can hardly wait until this year of administrating this program is over so that I can go back to my writing, my teaching and my research".

Thank you very much, I think we covered everything or is there anything that we have not covered?
Thank you Dr. Andrews!