



DEVELOPMENTS

Newsletter of the Society for Research in Child Development

Volume 59, Number 1

January 2016

Global Perspectives

by Frank Kessel (Section Editor) and Angela Lukowski (Developments Editor)

This is the first of a projected occasional section in *Developments* that will provide reflections on issues central to SRCD’s mission and programmatic initiatives from the perspective of scholars with particular interests in and commitments to the global research community. The section is one of several expressions of the international dimension of SRCD’s evolving Strategic Plan (Dahl, 2015). That is prompted, in turn and for example, by the concern that our research is still disproportionately focused on “The weirdest [young] people in the world,” i.e., samples drawn from Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, and Democratic (WEIRD) societies (Henrich, Heine, & Norenzayan, 2010). More generally, we hope that the section will help prompt critical and self-critical consideration of the question of how to establish genuinely reciprocal relationships between the majority global community of researchers and “mainstream” developmental science.

Given such a goal, we could not have imagined a more appropriate focus for this inaugural section than Lonnie Sherrod’s reflections on “Developmental Science and Human Rights” in the July 2015 issue of

Developments. The commentaries provided here by Andy Dawes and Suman Verma, along with Lonnie’s response, will surely serve to promote productive conversations about SRCD’s contributions to help meet the great challenges faced by the majority of children, youth, families, and communities in an ever-globalizing world.

References

Dahl, R. (2015). President’s letter: SRCD taking aim on an exciting future. *Developments*, 58(4), 1-4.
Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 33, 61-83.

IN THIS ISSUE

Global Perspectives.....	1-6
Report from the OPC.....	7-8
Teachers’ Corner.....	9-10
SECC Update.....	11-12
Members in the Media.....	13
New Books by Members.....	13
Special Topic Meeting Update.....	14
In Memoriam: Lois Hoffman.....	15-16
In Memoriam: Brian Sutton-Smith.....	17-18
Submission Guidelines.....	18

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES - COMMENTARY 1

(cont. from p. 1)

A Coalition with a Truly International Agenda

by Suman Verma, Panjab University, Chandigarh, India

Lonnie Sherrod's article highlights the efforts of professional organizations to advance human rights through science. The AAAS Coalition initiative seeks to build effective partnerships with human rights communities and outreach services to create educational resources, develop programmatic tools, and address ethical issues while advancing the right to science.

Moving from vision to action, how will the Coalition identify issues and pathways to human development across diverse global settings to create economically productive, sustainable, well-governed and inclusive societies that can overcome complex and interrelated ecological threats? How can we form a programmatic agenda across countries, across educational institutions, and among young scholars who work across distant institutions? I offer observations from a majority-world (including low-income countries) perspective for the Coalition to consider.

UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) as a useful framework

The CRC is a useful conceptual framework for research, policy, and practice. Most countries have child protection mechanisms, yet instances of denial of child rights are all too common. Often a government inquiry is ordered without examining fundamental causes. In essence, there needs to be a radical reduction in central, over-bureaucratized prescriptions so that child protection professionals can move from a compliance culture to a learning culture, where they have greater freedom to provide locally-appropriate help (Munro, 2011).

A related consideration: Despite efforts to improve the policy framework to protect children, resources are inadequate across low- and middle-income countries. As a corollary, driven by outside donor-driven agendas, governments have little scope to implement self-defined priorities. Helping alter this dynamic could be an important priority for the Coalition, e.g., by providing evidence-based strategies for partnerships between governments, donor organizations and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that address children's welfare in contextually appropriate ways.

Effective partnerships and scientific expertise enhancement

We have much to learn from NGOs that improve professional practice and create adaptive environments for children and their families by respecting their perspectives and values. Among the Coalition's crucial contributions could be sharing practice-based knowledge of how to create conditions for professional development of field workers in diverse settings that enable them to make informed judgments regarding the best interests of a child, as well as promoting systems-based methodologies and constructing a typology of factors that contribute to adverse outcomes.

To be effectively international, the Coalition needs to engage a community of emerging scholars from across the majority world. This should allow for their full participation in research, notably by shaping their own questions with conjointly collected data grounded in local realities. Recent developments with cloud computing and mobile access are creating new opportunities for the meaningful contributions of scientists with relatively limited IT infrastructure. Such collaborative research can foster continued learning while providing experiences not otherwise available to many scientists. Conversely, collaboration would also enable those from resource-rich countries to enhance their knowledge of challenges and opportunities in the majority world. This can result in regional centers of excellence that

(cont. on p. 3)

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES - COMMENTARY 1 (CONT)

(cont. from p. 2)

respond sensitively to cultural needs and move beyond one-way training towards reciprocal partnerships (Cooper & Verma, 2009).¹

Prioritizing issues

There are numerous instances of children being denied the right of a decent life. The situation in Europe regarding refugee migrants or children caught up in armed conflicts presents a challenge for many countries to provide care and protection, especially for vulnerable children.

Under these circumstances, inter-disciplinary studies encompassing multiple-level perspectives on resilience and preventive interventions (Masten, 2015) can help deal with an obviously complex pattern of risk and trauma. Such research can augment understanding of context-specific vulnerability and protective processes in child development (Luther, Cicchetti, & Becker, 2000).

The Coalition can also strengthen the interface between science, policy, and society by intersecting with the United Nations. In 2016, the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) replace the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Key strengths of the MDGs were their focus on a few goals and a clear basis of action. In contrast, [17 SDGs have been approved, with 169 associated targets](#). Effective implementation of the SDGs will require adequate finances, sound principles with clear implementation strategies, and effective formative evaluation. The Coalition can thus inform understanding of such challenges and help provide tools for monitoring progress towards innovative solutions.

Conclusion

It is heartening to see scientists across the globe participate increasingly in discussions of societal development.² Sherrod's call to SRCD members to engage in this venture is timely, since each of us can play a pivotal role in connecting science to the dignity of human lives. In today's technologically global world, the opportunities for important advances are endless.

Those interested in receiving a longer version of this commentary can contact Dr. Verma at suman992003@yahoo.com.

References

Luther, S. S., Cicchetti, D., & Becker, B. (2000). The construct of resilience: A critical evaluation and guidelines for future work. *Child Development, 71*, 543-562.

Masten, A. S. (2015). *Ordinary magic: Resilience in development*. New York: Guilford Press.

Munro, E. (2011). *The Munro review of child protection: Final Report*. London: Department of Education. Accessed on November 12, 2015. www.education.gov.uk/munroreview/

Verma, S. & Cooper, C. R. (2009). The ISSBD workshop study: Insights from 19 Nations. *ISSBD Bulletin, 2*, 41-44.

Weurmler, A. J., Tubbs, C. C., Petersen, A. C., & Aber, J. L. (2015). Children and youth in low- and middle-income countries: Toward an integrated developmental and intervention science. *Child Development Perspectives, 9*, 1-6.

¹ One such initiative is the Human Development Intervention Network (Wuermler et al., 2015) aimed at creating a global developmental science integrated with intervention science.

² As one example, I am associated with the International Panel on Social Progress (IPSP) as one of the authors of a chapter on education. This Panel draws on the expertise of a few hundred academics offering perspectives of numerous disciplines and regions of the world on dimensions of social progress. The IPSP report, due in 2017 and addressed to all social sectors, organizations, politicians and decision-makers, will provide the best knowledge on issues related to positive social change (www.ip-socialprogress.org).

(cont. on p. 4)

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES - COMMENTARY 2

(cont. from p. 3)

The Interface of Rights and Knowledge?

by Andrew Dawes, Associate Professor Emeritus, University of Cape Town

In his *Note* for the July 2015 edition of *Developments*, Lonnie Sherrod invites engagement on the roles SRCD might play in a potentially exciting and valuable marriage of developmental science and human rights. The obvious question is how can developmental science best lend its knowledge to the advancement of children's rights as coded in the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC)? I would like to briefly draw attention to two issues, the first regarding variations in conceptions of rights, the second regarding the nature of the developmental science knowledge base. Though neither issue is new, they should cause us to exercise care as we pursue this agenda.

There is no doubt that the UNCRC has made significant contributions to global awareness of the challenges faced by children and to the introduction of measures aimed at enhancing their development and protection (UNICEF, 2004). There are a number of more and less recent examples of engagements between developmental knowledge and human rights (Aber et al., 2012; Benjamin and Crouse, 2002). In South Africa during the height of the HIV/AIDS pandemic, when the country's president was in denial about relevant knowledge, child rights provisions in national and international law enabled civil society activists armed with scientific evidence to mount a successful Constitutional Court challenge; that case compelled the national health service to provide life-saving medication to prevent mother-neonate transmission. And my own work has used knowledge of child development to support a rights-based approach to monitoring children's well-being in South Africa (Dawes & van der Merwe, 2007). The inclusion of early childhood indicators for the [U.N. Sustainable Developmental Goals \(SDGs\)](#) is another example. All this is to the good.

However, I caution that locally appropriate application of the knowledge-base of developmental science is required. Actions taken in the child's best interests need to be located in the child's total cultural and political context (Boyden, 1991). To signal the complexities involved, I point to the fact that even as the UNCRC was being developed, two regional charters came into being that reflected the desire of particular groups of societies to assert their own interpretations of children's rights. As an instructive illustration, in the late 1980s the League of Arab States and the Organization of African Unity adopted children's charters that, while overlapping with the UN Convention, contain articles that reflect their particular cultural world-views. For example, Article 31 of the African Charter specifies that children have a *duty* "to work for the cohesion of the family, to respect his parents, superiors and elders at all times and to assist them in case of need." Thus for adolescents in such societies a duty to respect elders (and their decisions about the young person's life choices) may be at odds with the importance accorded to the promotion of adolescent autonomy and psychological well-being in the developmental science of the global North.

Turning to my second issue, we do need to ask ourselves *whose* developmental science is being produced and disseminated in the evidence for rights engagement. Our knowledge is infused by the worlds of the children we study in the particular and varied contexts of their development (Rogoff, 2003). So as we go about the project of seeking connections between human rights and developmental science, we would do well to consistently ask ourselves: What is the origin and form of the knowledge base of the developmental science that will be brought to bear in the international human rights arena? Whose child does it represent (Boyden, 1990; Kessen, 1979)? What normative assumptions are embedded in our knowledge claims? And how does such self-critical reflection inform the manner in which we act both globally and locally in promoting a better world for children?

Those interested in receiving additional material related to this commentary can contact Dr. Dawes at adkinloch1@gmail.com.

(cont. on p. 5)

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES - COMMENTARY 2 (CONT)

(cont. from p. 4)

References

- Aber, L., Biersteker, L., Dawes, A., & Rawlings, L. (2012). Social protection and welfare systems: Implications for early childhood development. In P. Rebello, P. Engle, and C. Super (Eds.), *Handbook of early childhood development research and its impact on global policy* (pp. 260-274). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Benjamin Jr., L. T., & Crouse, E. M. (2002). The American Psychological Association's response to Brown v. Board of Education: The case of Kenneth B. Clark. *American Psychologist*, 57, 38-50.
- Boyden, J. (1991). Childhood and policy makers: A comparative perspective on the globalisation of childhood. In A. James & A. Prout (Eds.), *Constructing and reconstructing childhood* (pp. 184-215). London: The Falmer Press.
- Dawes, A., Bray, R. & van der Merwe, A. (Eds.) (2007). *Monitoring child wellbeing: A South African rights-based approach*. Cape Town: HSRC Press.
- Kessen, W. (1979). The American child and other cultural inventions. *American Psychologist*, 34, 815-820.
- Rogoff, B. (2003). *The cultural nature of human development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- UNICEF (2004). *Study on the impact of the implementation of the Convention on the Rights of the child: Summary Report*. Florence: UNICEF Innocenti Centre.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES - COMMENTARY 3

Commentary on Human Rights and Developmental Science: The Need for Attention to Diversity and to Responsibilities as well as Rights *by Lonnie Sherrod*

First, I'd like to express how flattered I am to have comments from two such distinguished developmental scientists on my July 2015 *Developments* article, "Developmental Science and Human Rights." Although Andy Dawes and Suman Verma raise many interesting points, I'd like to comment on two themes that emerge from their statements: The importance of diversity to developmental science, and the need for attention to both rights and responsibilities in child policy regarding rights.

Interest in rights as well as social justice is increasingly prevalent in our field. In addition to the AAAS Coalition on Human Rights, which was the topic of my *Developments* article, SRCD's newest committee focuses on equity and justice in developmental science. This committee has held a large conference and a volume is now in preparation to address the place of justice in our science. The 2014 meeting of the Society for Research on Adolescence (SRA) was organized around a theme of social justice. And the two commentaries mention several current research undertakings focused on either rights or social justice. This increased interest results in part from the two themes I wish to address.

A concern for rights demands an appreciation of context. Our field has witnessed a rather dramatic increase in concern for and attention to diversity across the past few decades. The varying conditions under which diverse children grow up are now a centerpiece of developmental science across the globe. This has not always been the case. I like pointing out that our science has moved from studies

(cont. on p. 6)

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES - COMMENTARY 3 (CONT)

(cont. from p. 5)

of white rats to research involving middle class white children (often in university lab schools) to a scientific concern for children who vary across a number of dimensions such as socio-economic status, race and ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation (to mention a few). Yet it is only recently - within my professional lifetime - that journals such as our *Child Development* (CD) required specification of the author's sample across all these dimensions. The current CD editor, Cynthia Garcia Coll, has launched a socio-cultural policy that moves us one step further in this direction.

The concern for equity and justice grows out of this concern for diversity; our new Equity and Justice Committee originated from a task force on diversity. However, the internationalization of our science has revealed a very serious shortcoming in our attention to diversity, viz., the inadequacy of our attention to global diversity. Both commentary authors allude to the fact that, for the most part, children in the majority world are left out of our developmental science; estimates are that 95% of our knowledge is based on 5% of the world's children. In their editorial preface, Frank, Angie, and Jon refer to the articles that address this issue as reflecting a focus on "WEIRD" samples. As one of the major professional organizations in developmental science, SRCD needs to worry about this problem, and we hope that our [new strategic plan](#) will guide us.

Our attention to children's rights also needs a developmental lens, and it should be integrated with concern for responsibilities. There is a good sized literature on the social cognitive development of children's understanding of abstract ideas like rights. Piaget, of course, launched such attention but it has grown across the past few decades. This line of work is based almost exclusively on WEIRD samples, but this is a topic that demands attention to global context. I raise it here to also point out that it has not been integrated as fully as it should be with our concern for providing children with rights. So, e.g., how does children's understanding of rights interact with their awareness and exercise of those rights and with their recognition of and belief in the importance of different types of rights? Though the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) is a very important policy, none of its tenets vary by age of the child; yet a preschooler and adolescent differ dramatically in their ability to understand their rights, recognize that they have them, and hence act on them. Furthermore, rights and responsibilities are in many ways two sides of the same coin; yet we worry much more about the provision of rights than we do about encouraging responsibilities. And attention to responsibilities requires a similar developmental lens and concern for diversity as do rights.

Hence, although our concern for rights is growing in our science, and this is a good thing, we also need to examine the social cognitive development of children's understanding of rights and ask how this should influence our provision of rights for children. At the same time, we should encourage concern for responsibilities, the other side of rights, as we offer rights to children of different ages.

I urge SRCD members to use our various social media (Society for Research in Child Development on Facebook; @SRCDtweets on Twitter) outlets to comment on these three statements and expand our discussion about the important topic of science and human rights. Where do you see the interface between human rights and YOUR developmental science?

REPORT FROM OFFICE FOR POLICY & COMMUNICATIONS

Every Student Succeeds Act: Building on and Leaving Behind No Child Left Behind *by Martha Zaslow, Nighisti Dawit, and Hannah Klein*

On December 10th, President Barack Obama signed the [Every Student Succeeds Act \(ESSA\)](#) into law, reauthorizing the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* of 1965 for the first time since passage of the *No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act* in 2002. ESSA passed both chambers of Congress with substantial support (359 to 64 in the House; 85 to 12 in the Senate). ESSA, which has been authorized through 2020, is the result of a bipartisan effort in Congress to provide a federal framework for education policy in the United States.

In announcing passage of ESSA, the [U.S. Department of Education](#) noted progress in key areas of education in recent years, with high school graduation rates at a historic high and dropout rates at a historic low. The Department of Education indicates that NCLB had provided a basis for progress, particularly in shining “a light on where students were making progress and where they needed additional support, regardless of race, income, zip code, disability, home language, or background.” However, NCLB’s “prescriptive requirements became increasingly unworkable for schools and educators. Recognizing this fact, in 2010, the Obama administration joined a call from educators and families to create a better law that focused on the clear goal of fully preparing all students for success in college and careers.”

The purpose of this column is to take stock of where the new law builds on and where it departs from the previous reauthorization of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act*, both building on and leaving behind *No Child Left Behind*. This column draws heavily on Education Week’s summaries and analysis, written in anticipation and following the passage of the new law (articles of [November 30th](#), [December 3rd](#), [December 8th](#), [December 10th](#), and [December 18th](#)), to which readers are referred for further details. Please see especially the excellent overview by Alyson Klein of [November 30th](#).

U.S. Representative Bobby Scott summarized the changes and consistencies in the new law in terms of its continued emphasis on standards but a new focus on flexibility in how to reach them. [According to Representative Scott](#) (as quoted in the Education Week article of December 8), the new law “maintains high standards for all children, and requires states to put into place locally designed evidence-based strategies that meet the unique needs of schools.” Below we provide some further details without trying to be exhaustive, illustrating both the consistencies and the changes.

What are Examples of Key Features of NCLB that are Maintained under the New Law?

Annual testing. The new law will require annual testing in reading and math in grades 3 through 8 and also once in high school. Results will need to be reported publicly by school as well as by key subgroups. As in NCLB, schools are required to test 95% of their students and this percent also applies to subgroups. Tests need to be aligned to state standards and assess higher order thinking skills.

Standards. As in NCLB, states are called upon to adopt “challenging” academic standards. However, the U.S. Secretary of Education is prohibited from requiring a particular set of standards, or even encouraging the use of particular standards. Thus Common Core Standards are among those states can consider, but they do not have to be selected.

Focus on low performing schools. As in NCLB, the new law directs states and districts to focus efforts on turning around low performing schools, schools with high dropout rates, and schools in which key subgroups of students are not faring well.

What are Examples of How the Every Student Succeeds Act Differs?

Greater role of states in accountability. Under the new law, states have discretion in setting goals.

(cont. on p. 8)

REPORT FROM OFFICE FOR POLICY & COMMUNICATIONS

(CONT)

(cont. from p. 7)

They would submit accountability plans to the Department of Education, beginning in 2017-18 academic year, setting their own longer term as well as interim goals in the areas of proficiency on tests, English proficiency, and graduation rates. The goals need to include closing gaps in achievement and in graduation rates for those furthest behind. States will be able to set a limit on the amount of time students can be tested. Up to seven states will be allowed to apply to try out local tests with the permission of the Department of Education, and states can also get permission from the Department of Education to use nationally recognized tests (such as the SAT and ACT) locally at the high school level. States will no longer have to evaluate teachers on the basis of student outcomes.

Greater role for states in determining how to help low performing schools. Under ESSA, states and districts will have greater discretion in the way they intervene with low performing (bottom 5%) schools and high schools with low graduation rates. Districts would work with schools to develop an evidence-based plan for improvement. States would monitor results and step in within four years with a plan if schools continue to struggle. But states would have latitude in the steps they could take. When subgroups of students are struggling, the school would have to come up with an evidence-based plan. Here districts would monitor progress by the subgroups, and would need to step in with a plan if progress isn't made, though no particular timeline is articulated. If subgroups struggle chronically, the state and district would need to develop a comprehensive improvement plan.

More limited role for federal government. According to the [November 30th Education Week summary](#), the authority of the U.S. Secretary of Education “is very limited, especially when it comes to interfering with state decision making on testing, standards, school turnarounds... But regulations will be key in determining implementation.” The federal government would have no role in teacher evaluation under the new law. Education Week also notes that the NCLB “highly qualified teacher” requirement would be officially a thing of the past.

Separate consideration of subgroups. Rather than being able to combine results for different subgroups into a “supersubgroup” as under NCLB, results for each key subgroup will now need to be reported on separately. According to the [November 30th Education Week summary](#), this is considered a victory for civil rights groups, increasing the transparency of educational progress for key subgroups.

Moving from emphasis on a single test to multiple measures. The new law calls upon states to emphasize student test scores (and graduation rate for high schools) but also to take into account other factors, like school climate and safety, teacher and student engagement, and student access to advanced coursework, with the balance of measures differing for elementary and middle schools vs. high schools. States will determine the weight of each indicator, though academic factors need to be given the greatest weight.

Block grant to states with funding for specific programs. Under the new law, funding is consolidated from approximately 50 programs into a block grant to states. However the law provides separate funding for a few specific programs, such as 21st Century Community Learning Center Programs, Promise Neighborhoods, a full service community school program, and a parent engagement program. Funding for early childhood programs is sustained through the continuation of the Preschool Development Grants. This program would be placed in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services with joint administration with the U.S. Department of Education.

Implementation will be Central

As with any new law, implementation will be critical. The U.S. Department of Education has just released a [“Dear Colleague”](#) letter to states to begin to provide guidance on the process of implementation. Early reactions to the greater flexibility on student assessments, as discussed in a very recent Education Week column (available [here](#)), express concern about some issues, such as whether combining results from interim assessments into summative score will result in valid scores. For SRCD members, an important issue will be how the term “evidence based” is actually used in selecting and implementing approaches to support struggling schools and subgroups of students.

TEACHERS' CORNER

Want to Teach or Conduct Research on a Global Scale?

Apply to be a Fulbright Scholar!

by Tasha R. Howe, Ph.D., Professor of Psychology, Humboldt State University
Two-Time Fulbright Scholar (Cyprus, 2008; Croatia, 2014)



The current migration crisis in Europe shows just how wide the reach of developmental psychology can be in improving lives on a global scale. If you want a direct role in developmental progress in other countries, the Fulbright Scholarship could be your path.

What is a Fulbright Scholarship? These awards were named after the great Senator J. William Fulbright, who was a passionate advocate for diplomacy over warfare. The goal is to build bridges: academic, intellectual, political, and personal.

Applying for a Fulbright Scholarship seems like a daunting task and many people tell me they are afraid to apply because they think it's too competitive and that they don't stand a chance. The truth is that it is quite competitive, but if you are willing to work in a country where people are not mostly from a European background and who don't mostly speak English, your chances increase. I encourage people to take risks, to get out of their comfort zones, to

seek connections with cultures different from their own, and to conceive of projects that are creative, daring, and really help the given country meet their own needs.

What do you do on a Fulbright Scholarship? I have an affinity for post-conflict countries and helping them move beyond sectarian partisanship and into a more inclusive social welfare system, so I obtained two Fulbright Core Scholarships to teach in countries that had experienced recent political conflicts.

In Cyprus, my work was "bicomunal," trying to bring members of the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities together. I taught a developmental psychopathology course at Near East University in the Turkish community, and *Introduction to Child Abuse and Neglect* at the European University of Cyprus in the Greek community. Beyond the classroom, I gave public lectures, trained social workers on the skills of violence prevention, promoted APA's [ACT Raising Safe Kids Program](#), and connected my Greek students to a residential treatment center in the Turkish community where both parties worked on child abuse prevention projects across the dividing line.

In Croatia, I trained several hundred helping professionals on neurodevelopmental approaches to assessment and treatment of childhood psychopathology, as well as on the ACT program. I trained both Croatian and Bosnian professionals and taught a course in child abuse prevention at the University of Zagreb. I gave public lectures and met with academics and helping professionals across many sectors of society. I am currently trying to help Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia work together to implement the ACT program in both countries.

Both of my Fulbrights were of five months duration. However, if you can't get away for that long, you can join the Fulbright Specialist Roster. This list is a roster of scholars who can work on short-term projects for 2-6 weeks, doing anything from higher education improvement to social welfare to water quality enhancement. Although the roster does not list a specific "psychology" discipline, I enrolled under "social welfare" and "higher education improvement." Through this roster, I was recently invited

(cont. on p. 10)

TEACHERS' CORNER (CONT)

(cont. from p. 9)

to apply for a grant to help a European nation with their strategic plan for integrating migrants into their culture and helping them adapt and thrive.

How do you select a project and apply? It's imperative that your project be of value to the given country. If you read through the [Fulbright website](#), you will see that every country has specific requirements and desired qualifications. Start the process by choosing a few countries that interest you. Then look at their country page and see if psychology or your given area would be of interest. Many countries have "All Disciplines" awards so you throw them an idea and see if it sticks.

You can usually apply for projects that are anywhere from 3-12 months long. Each country has its own time period, its own benefits package, and its own requirements. Some countries require language fluency, others don't. Some countries provide tuition assistance for children's schooling, others don't. Some countries provide campus housing, others don't. So research the situation that fits best with your lifestyle.

I had no connections in either Cyprus or Croatia before I started preparing my application. Both countries required a letter of invitation, so I started emailing chairs of psychology departments to see if anyone was interested in free labor (Fulbright pays your salary so the university only provides an office space). Many people expressed interest, but only a few actually submitted letters. I crafted my project statement based on their needs. In Croatia, I worked closely with the non-profit sector as well as academia so I got letters inviting me specifically for professional trainings as well as for teaching. If you want to do research, you would get research collaborators to state that they invite you to develop your research with them. Keep in mind that teaching scholarships typically pay more because you are really assisting the host country, instead of just building up your own vitae by doing research. You can also apply for combination teaching/research grants.

Once you get your letter of invitation (keep in mind some countries don't require one!), you are ready to apply. The Fulbright website has step-by-step instructions and excellent webinars to help you with every step of the process. The program has staff for every world region who promptly answer emails and phone calls regarding your questions. You need to begin the process about a year to 18 months before you plan to leave the country. Applications are typically due August 1st and you find out their final decision by May 1st, to leave the following fall or spring.

How did the Fulbright experience change you and your family? During both Fulbright semesters, my children went to international schools and met children from all over the world. My husband took time off of work to be a stay at home dad. We traveled extensively on both trips and saw everything from beautiful coastlines to historic mosques to war-ravaged city centers in Nicosia to Sarajevo. I could go on and on about our own experience and how it changed me profoundly, how it globalized my thinking, how it made connections between our cultures and theirs, how it made xenophobia a little less likely in each community, and how it expanded my children's worldview. But this piece is only partly about me. It's mostly about you! I want to convince you to apply for a Fulbright Scholarship.

I would love to walk you through the process and make suggestions in any way that are helpful to you so please feel free to email me at th28@humboldt.edu. Despite the long and involved application process, this is truly one of the greatest things you will ever experience in your academic life. Bon voyage!

SECC UPDATE

Co-mentors and Unofficial Mentors: Meeting Advisors and Collaborators Outside of Your Lab

by Diana Meter, Post-Doctoral Researcher, The University of Texas at Dallas



You may be lucky to have attentive, supportive mentors who provide you with opportunities to grow and develop as a junior scholar. Even among those who are in this opportune position, there are many reasons to form relationships with mentors outside of your lab. Here are three main benefits of outside mentors:

- **Build a more diverse committee:** As a graduate student, you will need to find individuals to serve on your committees and provide feedback on some of the most important documents of your graduate student career. Researchers and faculty from diverse disciplines who have a knowledge of theories and perspectives beyond those in your lab or department can help you design and execute research that is creative, interdisciplinary, and cutting-edge.
- **Expand your resources, expand your network:** Meeting potential mentors from around your department or beyond can give you access to datasets you are hoping to work with or help you develop new skills (e.g., data analysis, physio measures). Multiple mentors help you expand your network beyond who your primary mentor knows. Each of these mentors can introduce you to collaborators and potential employers.
- **Open up new possibilities:** It is good to keep your options open. Mentors go on sabbatical, take new positions, or may no longer have grant funding to employ you as a research assistant. Already-established relationships with co-mentors and unofficial mentors can help you navigate these speed bumps and provide you with advice and even employment.

Ways to Meet Advisors and Collaborators Outside of Your Lab

- **Attend campus-wide events:** Attend colloquia, brown bags, and special committee meetings in your department and across campus. These events will provide opportunities to learn about what other research is being conducted around campus, what type of data faculty are working with, etc. Typically after these events there is an opportunity to meet the speakers, as well as also others in the room who are interested in the same topic. Faculty may even advertise if they are looking for collaborators at these events.
- **Go to departmental events:** There are endless department events including welcome potlucks, dissertation defenses and celebrations, and goodbye parties. Go to each. These parties provide the opportunity to network, present your skills, and talk about research with potential mentors in a relaxed, low-pressure environment.
- **Ask your primary mentor:** Many mentors understand the benefits associated with having co-mentors. Your mentor may be able to introduce you to potential mentors at conferences or set up a meeting with someone who is across campus or who is difficult to reach at another university.
- **Ask your friends:** Some of your student colleagues may have connections with faculty from institutions they attended as undergraduates or as Masters students. As you develop relationships with other graduate students at conferences through national and international organizations, most would

(cont. on p. 12)

SECC UPDATE (CONT)

(cont. from p. 11)

be happy to introduce you to their mentor and other faculty in their departments. Visit their posters and presentations, where their mentors are likely to be present, and don't be shy in asking for an introduction.

Next Steps: What to Do Once You've Met A Potential Co-Mentor

Once you meet a potential co-mentor, let them know what you have to offer. You may have particular skills that could be helpful on a project, such as knowledge of approaches for dealing with missing data. You may come with a set of skills looking to gain additional ones, such as practice collecting physiological data. In many cases, you can begin by asking to volunteer on a project. You can be up front about the amount of time you can commit. Few faculty would turn down free labor, and most are excited to learn that graduate students are interested in their work. This initial volunteer work can introduce you to new faculty and peers outside your lab, let you know if you want to pursue this new research area, and set the stage for future, more in-depth collaborations.

It is important to be open and honest with your primary and other mentors about the commitments you would like to make to other supervisors. As a graduate student, your time is precious, and it is important that you spend it in ways that will best prepare you for your career. However, it is also important to maintain good relationships with your multiple mentors and collaborators. It goes without saying how important it is to follow through on your promises and not to overcommit. Especially in the beginning of a new relationship with an unofficial mentor, it is important that you make the time spent training you worthwhile to your new mentor. Help their projects be successful, and it will be easy for them to introduce you to their network and help you, too.

Leaving the comfortable confines of your lab or department can seem like a big step, but once you make the leap, you will see that potential co-mentors and unofficial mentors are excited to work with you as well. It never hurts to ask!

MEMBERS IN THE MEDIA

The **SRCD Office for Policy and Communications** is interested in highlighting SRCD members and publications featured in the news media. The following are the most recent submissions:

All links below are to news articles:  TV or Radio Interview or  Op-Ed Piece

This [NPR](#) article features research conducted by **Lucy Sorensen** and **Kenneth Dodge**, which finds that teaching at-risk youth soft skills, like self-control, can prevent future adverse outcomes. It was also the topic of this SRCD [press release](#).

Suniya Luthar is cited in this article in [The Atlantic](#), which discusses the prevalence and potential causes of teenage suicide in Silicon Valley.

This [New York Times](#) article about “teaching peace in elementary school” cites research on social and emotional learning conducted by multiple SRCD members.

Rachel Farr and **Charlotte Patterson** won Wiley’s 2015 Alexis Walker Award for their [paper](#) published in *Child Development*.

This [Time Magazine](#) article focuses on research exploring teenage mood stability conducted by **Hans M. Koot** and **Dominique F. Maciejewski** and featured in this SRCD [press release](#).

This [Scientific American](#) article about the psychological origins of child prodigies cites the research of **Ellen Winner**.

Lisa Guernsey and **Michael H. Levine**’s new book *Tap, Click, Read* is the feature of this [NPR](#) article. The book discusses ways that media can be used to encourage literacy and critical thinking skills in children.

We strongly encourage and welcome all members to report recent noteworthy mentions of their research in the media. Information may be emailed to opc@srcd.org.



NEW BOOKS BY SRCD MEMBERS



Moore, D. S. (2015). *The developing genome: An introduction to behavioral genetics*. New York: Oxford University Press. (Winner of the 2016 American Psychological Association’s Eleanor Maccoby Book Award)

SRCD SPECIAL TOPIC MEETINGS UPDATE

Look for the Call for Submissions to be posted soon on the [website](#) for these Special Topic meetings! Both submission sites will open in early March with a deadline of early April.

Babies, Boys, and Men of Color **October 6-8, 2016, Tampa, Florida**

Organizers: Diane L. Hughes, New York University; Oscar Barbarin, University of Maryland, College Park; Velma McBride Murry, Vanderbilt University; Howard C. Stevenson, University of Pennsylvania

Beginning early in life, boys and young men of color are at risk because of their race/ethnicity and their gender, with numerous data sources underscoring the additive and interactive risks that boys of color encounter. This special topic meeting will focus on some of the critical issues currently affecting the developmental status of babies, boys, and men (emerging adults) of color, with a strong emphasis on understanding how experiences across multiple key contexts shape their development. The broad goals of this conference are to summarize the state of knowledge in the area and to identify key directions needed for knowledge and action.

Technology and Media in Development **October 28-30, 2016, University of California, Irvine**

Organizers: Stephanie M. Reich, University of California-Irvine; Kaveri Subrahmanyam, California State University; Rebekah A. Richert, University of California-Riverside; Katheryn A. Hirsh-Pasek, Temple University; Sandra L. Calvert, Georgetown University; Yalda T. Uhls, University of California-Los Angeles; and Ellen A. Wartella, Northwestern University

The use of digital devices and social media is ubiquitous in the environment of 21st century children. From the moment of birth (and even in utero), children are surrounded by media and technology. This meeting will provide a forum for intellectual and interdisciplinary exchange on media and technology in development and is designed to appeal to a range of researchers from the seasoned media researcher to technology developers to developmentalists who need to understand more about the role of technology and media in children's lives.

SAVE THE DATE!

SRCD Biennial Meeting
Austin, Texas, USA
April 6-8, 2017



SRCD Book Authors/Editors

SRCD Members are invited to notify either editor, JSanto@UNOmaha.edu or alukowsk@uci.edu, about their new publications. These will be listed in the newsletter.

IN MEMORIAM



Lois Wladis Hoffman (1929-2015)

by Herbert Zimiles, Emeritus Professor, Arizona State University

One month away from her 86th birthday, Lois Wladis Hoffman died after a protracted bout with Alzheimer's disease. She had continued to maintain her primary residence in Ann Arbor following her retirement from a long and distinguished career in the Psychology Department at the University of Michigan.

While still engaged in doctoral study in sociology at Michigan during the mid-1950s, Lois began an extended research collaboration with Ron Lippitt at the Institute for Social Research designed to investigate the influence of varying parenting styles on children. Most notable among their joint publications was a Handbook chapter commissioned to provide a comprehensive overview of efforts to measure family life variables. Recognizing that her professional interests lay more closely with the field of developmental psychology, but without abandoning her sociological perspective, Lois underwent a shift in professional affiliation and identity.

Soon after the termination of her ISR appointment, she was invited to join the then budding, now flourishing and eminent, Developmental section of the Psychology Department, where she rose to the rank of full professor (and served as its chair at one point during her tenure there).

Rare as it is to contribute to a turning point in one's field of study, Lois succeeded in doing so more than once. Together with her first husband, Martin Hoffman, she edited the two landmark volumes of the *Review of Child Development Research* (1964 and 1966). Sponsored by the Russell Sage Foundation when interest in issues pertaining to development was beginning to emerge, these works had a powerful and intended stimulating effect. By outlining the main dimensions of child development research, then a largely-unstructured domain, and by offering a compendium of its promising and provocative research findings, the volumes armed young psychologists with the theoretical perspective and framework of knowledge to enter a field that soon came into an extended and continuous period of growth.

Lois's second major contribution, the one for which she will be most remembered, was in pioneering and progressively deepening the study of the effects of maternal employment. After publishing her own work in this area, she and Ivan Nye authored a book examining what was then known and thought about the psychological ramifications of mothers' working outside the home, in the process headlining an issue of great, and still growing, psychological and social significance. That topic became the focal point of Lois's research career.

Soon she published a series of papers that examined the factors contributing to the increased interest in and motivation for mothers' working, and outlined the conceptual and methodological issues surrounding this area. She also reported studies aimed at understanding the scope of maternal employment's impact, i.e., the effects of women working on themselves, their children, and their husbands, as well as how this influence could be most comprehensively and effectively assessed. Lois's career-long exploration of this area culminated in the most rigorous study then yet conducted of the psychological impact of maternal employment on children. The study's results were reported in the book *Mothers at Work: Effects on Children's Well-Being*, that was co-authored by Lisa Youngblade and included contributions by a participating team of graduate students.

Because of the central significance of Lois's early research to the then-budding Women's movement, it served as a major foundation for the Department of Women's Studies at the University of Michigan. Her work also led to active participation in the national meetings and the publications of Division 9 of APA (devoted to the study of social issues). And as a sign of the depth of interest in her writings and of how widely her thinking was valued, one of her articles was reprinted in fourteen different books of collected readings, while numerous others were chosen for inclusion in different anthologies.

(cont. on p. 16)

IN MEMORIAM (CONT)

(cont. from p. 15)

As one of several related initiatives, Lois played a central role in a study designed to investigate cross-national variations in the meaning and value of children to parents, serving as the American research representative of a multinational investigation headquartered in the East-West Institute of the University of Hawaii and staffed by a team of Asian psychologists (representing Taiwan, Korea, Singapore, Thailand, Indonesia, the Philippines, and Turkey). Prompted by the need to address the problems posed by impending patterns of overpopulation, the research aimed to shed light on parents' motivation to be invested in having large numbers of children, and on how cultural and ecological variations combined with economic forces influenced parents' decision to bear children. The results of this social policy-driven study were widely reported.

Among the wide range of other issues and problem areas encompassed by Lois's research and writings: The nature of achievement motive in women; factors affecting fear of success in both males and females; the effects of childbearing on the woman's role; factors which affect sex roles and occupational behavior in women; gender differences in moral development; and the nature of cross-sex friendships during the middle years of childhood. In one way or another, almost all of her research was directed at examining the effects of social change on children and parents; some of her writings dealt explicitly with that issue. The breadth of her knowledge and understanding of the nature of social-emotional development in children and the dynamics of family life was on full display in the six editions of *Developmental Psychology Today*, a textbook co-authored with Scott Paris and Elizabeth Hall.

Believing that the rising tide of genetically based explanations of psychological functioning was tending to obscure, if not entirely deny, the role of the experiential forces to which she had devoted a lifetime of study, in 1991 Lois published a widely cited and much lauded *Psychological Bulletin* article aimed at countering what she regarded as the unwarranted claims of genetically-based explanations of behavior. Her thesis was based in part on her own previous writings about the changing gene-socialization balance and an exploration of why siblings reared in the same family by the same parents may show wide, environmentally determined psychological differences.

Among the honors bestowed on Lois: Election to Phi Beta and Sigma Psi; the J.R. Lewis Award of the National Philosophical Society; Distinguished Scholar, Radcliffe College; Scholar in Residence, Rockefeller Bellagio Research Center; and also numerous awards for teaching excellence. She served on a range of editorial boards and research review committees and as a consultant to government agencies, and was elected President of two APA divisions – Division 7 (Developmental Psychology) and Division 9 (Society for the Study of Social Issues).

Lois's impact as a mentor to graduate students was an important feature of her professional career. From the standpoint of instructional effectiveness, her mentoring gifts lay in the incisiveness of her logical and analytic reasoning and the precision of language she applied in examining the tenability of a theoretical construct or a research proposal. It would be a mistake, however, to overlook the impact of the emotional support and encouragement she almost effortlessly provided, by virtue of her natural friendliness and informality, and the good cheer she radiated. Especially during the early days of her career, when female graduate students were justifiably inclined to feel they were treading on alien, even exclusionary, turf, it was an important source of comfort for them to have access to a welcoming, clearly respected, and accomplished faculty member who quite naturally celebrated her femininity. Watching Lois cavort in the hallways outside her office in her stocking feet after having seen her arrive after bicycling to work in high heels surely went a long way in enabling students to relax and feel at home. Lois just being herself gave them permission to do likewise. Her roguish sense of humor, her readiness to chat about such mundane matters as hair styling, combined with her own casually expressed concern with her own physical attractiveness, her frequent references to her own children and to her own childhood in the small upstate New York town of Elmira... all these contributed a sense of ease and spontaneity that served to lessen the distance between where graduate students were coming from and the new, murky destinations toward which they were heading. She is remembered with great affection and gratitude by many former students.

Lois is survived by her husband, Herb Zimiles, two daughters, Amy Kilroy and Jill Hoffman, and five granddaughters.

IN MEMORIAM



Due to an editing error, a section of this memoriam article was deleted when it was published in the October 2015 issue.

Brian Sutton-Smith (1924-2015)

by Anthony D. Pellegrini, Professor Emeritus, University of Minnesota and Jeffery Goldstein, University of Utrecht

Brian Sutton-Smith, Emeritus Professor at the Graduate School of Education at the University of Pennsylvania, died from complications associated with Alzheimer's disease on March 7, 2015, in White River Junction, VT. He was 90.

Born and educated in New Zealand, Brian received his undergraduate and graduate degrees in educational psychology at Wellington Teachers College, Victoria University, and the University of New Zealand. Before completing his Ph.D. he was awarded a Fulbright Scholarship to the University of California, Berkeley to work with Fritz Redl and Bruno Bettelheim. His doctoral

dissertation, completed in 1954, was on children's play and games and published in 1959 by University of California Press.

In 1957, Brian moved to the USA and taught at Bowling Green State University, later at Columbia University Teachers College, and finally at the University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Education. He retired to Sarasota, FL, where he continued to write, consult, and play tennis before moving to Vermont.

His early work on children's games and play, conducted in the 1960s at Bowling Green and in collaboration with Roberts and Rosenberg, marked the start of a highly creative, interdisciplinary career. These topics were then, as now, not widely studied by psychologists. In this and subsequent work, Brian drew from both anthropology and folklore.

At the start of his career, Brian was a traditional and successful developmental psychologist. He published papers in the archival journals in the field and in 1966 debated Piaget in *Psychological Review* on rival interpretations of the value of fantasy play (and from one point of view, got it right). Yet Brian was in many ways an outsider. He was, at root, an inductive rather than deductive thinker. He looked at what children did and tried to give it meaning; thus his close and long-standing identification with anthropology. And his insights were prescient indeed, providing psychologists with many hypotheses to test. For example, in 1967 and 1968 he wrote two papers (in *Young Children* and *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, respectively) on the role of play in children's cognition and creativity. These papers laid the groundwork for a series of widely cited experimental studies on the role of play in cognition and creativity.

Similarly, Brian's interests in folklore led to a series of studies of children's narratives, published in the mid-1970s, that pre-dated by a decade the later rush to study children's narrative by a wide range of other scholars. His ground-breaking studies of children's informal games and playground behavior, though activities very important to children (according to them, anyway), still have not been extensively explored by developmental psychologists. Indeed, as late as 2011, he stated that the most thorough descriptions of children's play and games were provided in the 1950s by the English folklorists Peter and Iona Opie.

All this being said and recognized, there was also a dark chapter in Brian's career. And this article provides an opportunity to set the record straight on this unfortunate set of events. Brian was accused of plagiarizing parts of his 1973 textbook, *Child Psychology*, from another text, *Child Development and Personality*, by Mussen, Conger, and Kagan. A federal judge ruled against Sutton-Smith. As a result of

(cont. on p. 18)

IN MEMORIAM (CONT)

(cont. from p. 17)

this case, Brian was dismissed from Columbia (despite letters of support from notable colleagues), and moved to the University of Pennsylvania. There his career became even more catholic in its foci. As a founding member of the International Toy Research Association he studied not only play, but toys, along with organized sports, narratives, festivals, the school recess period, and play fighting.

While we never spoke to Brian about this case, one of us (AP) did consider it with two of his fellow play researchers. Both noted that he had agreed to have the book “ghost written” while he was occupied with a serious illness in his family. He admitted that this was a mistake, and that he should have paid closer attention to what had been written. According to *The New York Times*, the court found that Brian was not directly involved in the writing or the plagiarism. (We might note that the practice of textbook publishers employing ghost writers is still in place. And when authors are unable or unwilling to write revisions for a later edition, their names can still be used by the publishers.)

Brian himself was a very playful person. He once quipped that people who studied play should be more playful themselves! We would like to think that his playful outlook contributed to his academic creativity, an interpretation also proposed by the pre-eminent play theorist, Robert Fagen. Like a playful child, Brian turned things upside down to examine them, seldom looking at things conventionally.

He was also an avid participant in sports, especially tennis, which he continued to play late into his retirement. And he shared with one of us a story illustrating the personal value of participating in one sport, boxing, as a boy in New Zealand: Many years later, walking in New York City and assaulted by a would-be robber, Brian returned a blow without thinking... and the assailant fled. An example, he said with a devilish grin, of childhood play preparing one for adulthood! That ubiquitous grin was contagious, as was Brian’s enthusiasm for whatever happened to be his current academic interest. Let’s toast his memory.

SRCD Contact Information

Membership:

Tel: (734) 926-0617

Fax: (734) 926-0601

Email: membership@srcd.org

Biennial Meeting Program:

Tel: (734) 926-0610

Fax: (734) 926-0601

Email: programoffice@srcd.org

Meeting Registration

Tel: (734) 926-0612

Fax: (734) 926-0601

Email: biennialmeeting@srcd.org

Website:

Email: webmaster@srcd.org

Member Engagement

SRCD needs your help - be active by voicing your views. Please share your comments and suggestions [here](#).

LET US KNOW YOUR NEWS!

SRCD Members:

Please share your prestigious awards and memberships with us!

Feel free to share this information and send your announcement to either *Developments* editor at, JSanto@UNOmaha.edu or alukowsk@uci.edu.

Important Notice

- Journals are not forwardable. If you do not notify the SRCD Membership Office of a change of address, you will stop receiving your journals.
- Do not send your change of address to Wiley Publishers.
- Contact the SRCD Membership Office (Tel: (734) 926-0617; Fax: (734) 926-0601; E-mail: tandrade@srcd.org if you have concerns or questions regarding your publications or your membership.
- Membership applications are available on the SRCD website.

Change of Address Notification

Name: _____

Mailing Address: _____

Phone: _____

Fax: _____

E-mail: _____

Effective date: _____

Send to: SRCD Membership, 2950 S. State Street - Suite 401,
Ann Arbor, MI 48104; or fax to: (734) 926-0601

Developments' Submission Guidelines

Text: Provide your material in unformatted text blocks only, preferably using "Trebuchet" 10-pt font in Word or WordPerfect. Word limit for a one page article is 775 words. A photo of the author or topic or both to accompany the article would be greatly appreciated.

Photographs: 300 DPI, "tif" files only. If you do not have a scanner to produce the photo quality we need, loan us your photo; we will scan it for our use, and then return it to you. Please send materials to Jonathan Bruce Santo, JSanto@UNOmaha.edu or Angela Lukowski, alukowsk@uci.edu.

Ads: Contact Amy Glaspie, aglaspie@srcd.org; 734-926-0614 for information and an order form. General ad specs:

- 1/8-page display ad is 2" x 3.5" and contains up to 75 words plus a 2-line header
- 1/4-page display ad is 3.5" x 4.5" and contains up to 175 words plus a 2-line header
- 1/2-page display ad is 4.5" x 7.25" and contains up to 325 words plus a 2-line header
- Full-page display ad is 7.25" x 8.75" and contains up to 650 words plus a 2-line header

SRCD Developments

Editors

Angela Lukowski
alukowsk@uci.edu

Managing Editor

Amy Glaspie
aglaspie@srcd.org

In Memoriam Editor

Frank Kessel
kesfam@pdq.net

Teachers' Corner Moderator

Katharine Blackwell
katharine.blackwell@salem.edu

SECC Column Moderator

Erin Hillard
ehillard@nd.edu

Governing Council

President	Ron Dahl
Past President	Lynn Liben
President-Elect	Marc H. Bornstein
Secretary	Natasha Cabrera
Members	Robert Crosnoe
	Michael Cunningham
	Kenneth Dodge
	Andrew Fuligni
	Mary Gauvain
	Frosso Motti
	Seth Pollak
	Deborah Vandell
SECC Rep	Natalia Palacios
Ex Officio	Lonnie Sherrod
	Martha Zaslow

The Newsletter is published four times a year: Circulation is approximately 6,000. The newsletter is distributed to all members of the SRCD including researchers, practitioners in the field of child development, social and behavioral sciences, social workers, administrators, physicians, nurses, educators, and students.

The newsletter publishes announcements, articles, and ads that may be of interest to members of the Society, as space permits.