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Boyd McCandless
Young Scientist Award
The 2013 Boyd McCandless award was given to Dr. Nicole McNeil, ACE Associate Professor of Psychology at the University of Notre Dame, in recognition of her research on the development of mathematical thinking. Dr. McNeil uses experimental designs, longitudinal studies, structured interviews, and detailed analyses of children’s mathematics experiences to test theoretically driven hypotheses about why it is so difficult for children to learn abstract math concepts.

Her work has shown that children’s difficulties understanding mathematics are not always caused by something children lack relative to adults, such as general conceptual structures, working memory resources, or proficiency with basic facts, but that difficulties can emerge as a consequence of prior learning. She has hypothesized—and her research has shown—that learners tend to rely on their existing representations, concepts, and strategies, even when they are inefficient or incorrect. Using this “change-resistance” framework, she has enhanced our understanding of the nature of children’s difficulties with fundamental math concepts such as mathematical equivalence, variable, and cardinality. She has also made unique predictions about the best ways to structure the learning environment to help children learn these math concepts. A key contribution of her work has been to show that relatively minor differences in the structure of children’s early input can play a central role in shaping and constraining children’s understanding of fundamental concepts. Division 7 congratulates Dr. McNeil and looks forward to her continued success.

Mentor Award in Developmental Psychology
Dr. L. Alan Sroufe, Professor Emeritus of the Institute of Child Development at the University of Minnesota, is the recipient of the 2013 Mentor Award. Dr. Sroufe is among the most eminent developmental psychologists of the past half century and is internationally recognized for his exceptional contributions to the field as a scientist and scholar, teacher, and mentor for a host of talented Ph.D. students who have themselves achieved great success in the areas of attachment and emotional development more broadly, developmental psychopathology, and child clinical psychology. Perhaps best known for his leadership (alongside Dr. Byron Egeland and Dr. Andrew Collins) of the Minnesota Longitudinal Study of Risk and Adaptation, Dr. Sroufe has received many prestigious awards for his scientific and scholarly contributions, including the G. Stanley Hall Distinguished Scientific Contribution and the Maccoby Book Awards from APA Division 7, the Distinguished Scientific Contribution to Child Development Award from the Society for Research in Child Development and an honorary Doctorate from Leiden University in the Netherlands, as well as awards for outstanding teaching in the College of Education at the University of Minnesota.

Urie Brofenbrenner Award
Dr. Richard Lerner is the recipient of the 2013 Urie Brofenbrenner Award. He is the Bergstrom Chair as well as the Director of the Institute for Applied Research in Youth Development at the Eliot Pearson Department of Child Development at Tufts University. Dr. Lerner received his Ph.D. in developmental psychology from the City University of New York in 1971. Impressively, Dr. Lerner has published 500 empirical papers and book chapters, including 70 authored or edited books. His research interests include relating life course development to social change, as well as examining adolescents’ relationships with peers, family, and communities. Dr. Lerner has received countless distinctions including being named a fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the American Psychological Association,
G. STANLEY HALL AWARD FOR DISTINGUISHED CONTRIBUTION

The 2013 G. Stanley Hall award was given to Dr. Rand Conger, a distinguished professor in the Human Development and Psychology departments at the University of California, Davis. In addition, Dr. Conger is a Research Collaborator and Professor of Psychology at Iowa State University. Dr. Conger received his Ph.D. in sociology from the University of Washington in 1976. During his career, Dr. Conger has been extremely prolific, publishing over 300 journal articles and book chapters in the premier outlets in his field, and he has garnered over $50 million in extramural grant support. His research interests include the effects of social and economic stress on development, family interaction processes, and family research methods. He has examined these and many other processes in several large scale projects including the: (1) Family Transitions Project in Iowa, a study of over 500 Euro-American families who were experiencing the farm crisis in the late 1980s, a longitudinal study that continues to this day; (2) Family and Community Health Study, an investigation involving over 890 African-American families living in Iowa and Georgia; and (3) California Families Project, a study of 674 Mexican-origin families in central California. These projects have examined thousands of families ranging across generations exploring the effects of stress on life course development.

Dr. Conger has been awarded multiple distinctions including the Reuben Hill Research and Theory Award given by the National Council on Family Relations and the Ernest W. Burgess Award for career achievement in family research from the National Council on Family Relations. Dr. Conger has also served as a chairperson for the Mental Health Behavioral Sciences Review Committee of the National Institute of Mental Health, as well as co-chair for the subcommittee on interpersonal and family processes, behavioral sciences task force for the National Institute of Mental Health.

Please join us for Dr. Rand Conger’s invited address at the 2013 APA Convention
8/02 Fri: 9:00 AM - 9:50 AM
Convention Center
Room 326B

EARLY CAREER AWARDS

EARLY CAREER RESEARCH GRANT

Kara Sage is the recipient of the 2013 Early Career Research Grant. She is a visiting assistant professor of developmental psychology at Hamilton College. She earned her Ph.D. from the University of Oregon in 2012, and her M.Ed. from the University of Washington in 2008. Her research focuses on children’s learning from screen media and other humans. Read about her research, “iLearn: Can Utilizing Tablet Technology Reduce the 2D Deficit Effect in Children’s Learning?”, on page 21.

EARLY CAREER OUTSTANDING PAPER AWARD

The 2013 winner for the Early Career Outstanding Paper Award is John Best. John Best is a postdoctoral research fellow in the Department of Psychiatry at Washington University School of Medicine in St. Louis. His research interests broadly include the development of executive functions in childhood, the role of executive functions in health-related behavior (especially energy-balance behaviors such as eating and physical activity), and the impact of physical activity on children’s executive function. Read about the winning paper, “Exergaming Immediately Enhances Children’s Executive Function,” on page 9.
**Early Career Dissertation Grant**

The recipients of the 2013 Dissertation Grant are Gary Glick and Wendy Rote.

Gary Glick received his B.S. in psychology and sociology with honors from Drake University in 2006. He is currently a doctoral student at the University of Missouri, where he received an M.A. in developmental psychology in 2011. Read about his dissertation research, “Communication Withdrawal in Adolescent and Young Adult Romantic Relationships,” on page 13.

Wendy Rote received a B.A. in psychology from Whitman College in 2007. She is currently completing her doctoral training at the University of Rochester, where she earned a M.A. in developmental psychology in 2012. Her research broadly focuses on parent-adolescent interactions and communication processes. Learn about Wendy's dissertation, “Children's and Adolescents' Perceptions of Parental Guilt Induction,” on page 16.

**Early Career Dissertation Award**

The recipient of the 2013 Dissertation Award is David Yeager, an Assistant Professor of developmental psychology at the University of Texas, Austin. He received his PhD from the Stanford University’s School of Education in 2011. His research focuses on understanding the processes shaping adolescent development, especially how social cognitive factors interact with structural and physiological influences to create positive or negative trajectories for youth. He is also interested in learning how to influence these psychological processes, so as to improve developmental and educational outcomes for youth. Read about his award winning dissertation on page 21.

**Thank You For A Job Well Done**

**Boyd McCandless Committee**
- Bob McMurray (chair)
- Daniel Ansari
- Nancy Eisenberg
- Bob Lickliter
- Nathan Fox

**Maccoby Book Award Committee**
- Mary Rothbart (chair)
- Nancy Budwig
- Susan Crocker
- Paul Harris
- Nancy Eisenberg (ex officio)

**G. Stanley Hall Award and Urie Brofenbrenner Award Committee**
- Gail Goodman (chair)
- Andy Collins
- Grazyna Kochanska
- Jacque Eccles
- Henry Wellman
- Patricia Miller
- Nancy Eisenberg

**Mentor Committee**
- Susan Gelman (chair)
- Catherine Haden
- Judith Smetana
- Nancy Eisenberg

**Early Career Outstanding Paper Award Committee**
- Nancy Eisenberg (chair)
- Bob McMurray (co-chair)
- Philip Zelazo
- Michael Sulik
- Angela Duckworth

**Early Career Research Grant Committee & Dissertation Grant Committee**
- Jacquelynne Eccles (chair)
- Susan Gelman
- John Hagen

**Dissertation Award Committee**
- Catherine Haden (chair)
- Karl Rosengren
- Megan McClelland

**Many Thanks!**
The Division 7 website offers a wealth of useful information. In addition to general information about the membership, you will find:

**Listing of Graduate Programs in Developmental Psychology**

DOTDEP maintains a helpful list of graduate training programs in developmental psychology and related disciplines (with links to each department’s WebPages). This is a great resource for prospective graduate students or others interested in learning about or applying for graduate training. More than 70 graduate programs are now listed on our web site at: [http://ecp.fiu.edu/APA/div7/?f=gradprograms](http://ecp.fiu.edu/APA/div7/?f=gradprograms)

If you would like to have your graduate program added to the listing (or would like to make changes to it), the following information from an appropriate representative is requested: school name, program name, department or college affiliation, web site URL to link to relevant developmental or departmental program information, and e-mail address for an appropriate contact person. Programs concerned with graduate training in developmental psychology, whether located in a department of psychology, or a department or college of education, human development, pediatrics, or home economics, will be considered for inclusion if the above material is submitted. Please send the information to Judith Becker Bryant, judithbryant@usf.edu.

**Listing of online resources for developmental psychology** (journal homepages, other organizations, grant-seeking information...)

**Web-based e-mail mechanism to send questions/comments to various Division 7 committee members**

**For information concerning the Division 7 webpage, please contact our webmaster, Louis Manfra, manfral@missouri.edu.**
"Social scientists, humanists, and historians have long speculated about the impact of literacy on the way we think. Robert Levine and his colleagues show that literacy has an impact not just on thinking, but on the way that children are raised, and on whether they live or die...The book is a compelling example of how thoughtful anthropological and psychological analysis can illuminate global historical change."

-- Paul L. Harris, Professor, Harvard Graduate School of Education

"This book is truly exemplary and an outstanding study - the best in this field."

-- Thomas S. Weisner, Professor of Anthropology, Departments of Psychiatry and Anthropology, University of California, Los Angeles
About Division 7

Division 7 is the official subgroup of the American Psychological Association (APA) comprised of developmental psychologists and other members of APA from a variety of disciplines who study or work in the area of human development.

Mission Statement:

Division 7 was organized to (a) promote research in the field of developmental psychology; (b) facilitate the exchange of information about developmental psychology through the Division Newsletter, website, and APA Convention program; (c) enhance undergraduate and graduate education in developmental psychology, for example, through DOTDEP (Directors of Training in Developmental Psychology) and early career development (through grants and a communication network); (d) present awards to both new and established researchers for their outstanding contributions to developmental psychology; and (e) promote the use of scientific knowledge in both applied settings and public policy decisions relevant to the optimal development of infants, children, and adults.

Benefits of Joining Division 7:

- Receive the Division 7 newsletter, Developmental Psychologist, which is distributed twice a year, and other periodic notices and announcements
- Nominate for, and receive, a variety of awards and fellowships in recognizing important work in the area of developmental psychology
- Take advantage of the Division 7 website with useful links to other resources for developmental psychologists
- Network with other developmental psychologists and individuals interested in human development
- Assist with determining and communicating the scientific and social program for developmental psychology at the annual APA national conventions
- Serve the field in a variety of capacities as an officer or committee member in this and other organizations
- Profit from mentorship opportunities, both as Mentor and Mentee through the Division Mentorship Program
- Take advantage of all the regular benefits of membership in APA

We’re on Facebook!

Join us on Facebook! Visit http://www.facebook.com/groups/218878051489647/
Or search Facebook for: “APA Division 7 – Developmental Psychology”
**Early Career Research Grant**

**iLearn: Can Utilizing Tablet Technology Reduce the 2D Deficit Effect in Children’s Learning?**

Kara Sage, Ph.D., Department of Psychology, Hamilton College

---

**Background and Motivation**

Children are sponges; they absorb information around them at an impressively quick rate. Further, children are surrounded by a variety of 2D media (e.g., video) that provide an abundance of information. There is a vast literature investigating the usefulness of video in children’s knowledge acquisition. When comparing children’s learning from live to video sources, children under the age of 5 years typically learn actions better from live human sources than identically performed video sources (Flynn & Whiten, 2008; McGuigan, Whiten, Flynn, & Horner, 2007). This has been repeatedly documented (see Barr, 2010 for a review of the relevant findings). Potential reasons for the video deficit effect have included young children’s difficulty with symbolic reasoning (DeLoache, 1989), slower processing of 2D images over 3D objects (Courage & Seltliff, 2009), the lack of social contingency (Kuhl, Tsao, & Liu, 2003), and the failure of video to place children into a pedagogical learning stance where they are primed to learn (Sage & Baldwin, in press).

Researchers have attempted to enhance the potential of video as a learning medium. By giving children repeated exposure (Strouse & Troseth, 2008), experience with video cameras (Troseth, 2003), and making the video interaction more contingent as with close-circuit television (Troseth, Saylor, & Archer, 2006), researchers have been able to improve it as a learning medium and put it on par with children’s learning from a live person. These alterations to video have an underlying theme: they increase children’s engagement by either letting children re-watch the video or interact directly with video. Adding in a layer of interactivity may act to increase children’s ability to focus, see video as a meaningful learning source, reduce the cognitive load of processing 2D information, or a variety of other possibilities.

Arguably, there has been extensive work with adults investigating if video interactivity enhances adults’ learning. For instance, Zhang, Zhou, Briggs, and Nunamaker (2006) investigated college students’ e-learning with interactive video, non-interactive video, or without video in comparison to the traditional classroom environment. Of interest, adults in the e-learning environment with the interactive video performed better on memory tasks and reported higher learner satisfaction than students in the other conditions. Research with older children and adults has suggested that allowing learners to pace themselves through programs (Boucheix & Guignard, 2005; Hasler, Kersten, & Sweller, 2007) and pausing programs or showing them in segments (Mayer & Chandler, 2001; Schaffer & Hannafin, 1986) is beneficial for the learner when compared to less interactive and less self-controlled programs.

In a first attempt to explore a new medium that takes advantage of some of these interactive components with younger children, I recently compared preschool-aged children’s learning from self-paced slideshows on a computer to their learning from video (Sage & Baldwin, in press). The self-paced slideshow was a novel medium that took advantage of two traits of interactivity – self-pacing...
and pauses/segments – while presenting the action in a frame-by-frame fashion. Children paced through action sequences by clicking a computer mouse. Interestingly, the video deficit effect extended to the self-paced slideshows, providing tentative support for a larger 2D deficit effect in young children’s learning.

One hypothesis for why this might be, outside of the same reasons for the video deficit effect mentioned earlier, is that the self-paced slideshows might place too high of a cognitive load on children by splitting their attentional focus; children have to attend to both the computer screen displaying the slideshows and to the mouse in their hand. This attentional divide might have eliminated any benefit that would have otherwise been derived from viewing the self-paced slideshows over the videos. One potential way to counteract this problem is to use a tablet device where children can touch the screen to induce change instead of click a mouse.

In our world of technological gadgets, the potential for making 2D media interactive and engaging seems to be at an all-time high. If you go to any supermarket, you are likely to see children playing on their parents’ smartphones or happily utilizing a tablet to play games. Can these media help children learn or are they just for entertainment? Given evidence highlighting the video deficit effect, the latter might seem like the more intuitive answer. However, there is still much to investigate and it is my belief that we do not yet have a full understanding of such media’s learning potential. To explore this question, my upcoming project will focus on children’s learning from tablets when compared to videos and live models.

**Research Questions**

1. **How does children’s learning compare among live, video, and self-paced slideshow demonstrations when the self-paced slideshows are presented via a tablet application?**

   Children will be randomly assigned to learn novel action sequences in one of 4 conditions: live, video, tablet slideshow, or no-demonstration control. I believe that touching the tablet screen may reduce children’s cognitive load and narrow their attentional focus when compared to viewing a computer screen while also clicking a mouse in-hand (as in my prior work). Thus, I predict that children’s learning from the tablet slideshows will supercede their learning from videos. I further predict that children’s learning from the tablet slideshows might rise to the level of their learning from a live person, given the enhanced interactivity. Learning will be measured via a verbal memory task and a physical imitation task. A media survey will also be given to parents, as prior exposure to 2D media might influence performance.

2. **At what age do children begin to effectively use such 2D media?**

   The video deficit effect has been documented in children under age 5. The proposed work has the potential to lower this age minimum for 2D media. To explore developmental differences, I plan to test children between ages 2-6. I predict that older children will more readily be able to use 2D media given their additional experience and knowledge. However, I also predict that even the youngest children will be able to utilize the tablet slideshows and learn better from the slideshows than the videos, given their interactivity.

**Significance and Contributions**

Determining how well children learn from the new technological gadgets available in our modern society is an important endeavor. Many children have regular interaction with such technology, but it remains a mystery how effective such media are for learning. This work will contribute to our knowledge of the video deficit effect and whether or not it can be more accurately labeled as a 2D deficit effect. If such work continuously establishes that young children learn better from live sources than 2D sources, then this would provide support for a 2D deficit in
learning. If, however, work like this were able to show that children can learn just as well from some 2D media as they can from live people, this would negate a broader 2D deficit in learning. By investigating a wide age range, this work will also determine at what the age a 2D deficit is evident, and whether children can learn from certain 2D media at a younger age than they can from video. Should this work support that 2D media is a viable learning option for young children, the educational benefits are clear. Especially in environments like preschools where there is often one teacher for many children and individualized learning via one-on-one interaction with the adult is not always feasible, having valid 2D options would be welcomed.

References


E COVID-19 OUTSTANDING PAPER AWARD

Exergaming Immediately Enhances Children’s Executive Function

John Best, Department of Psychiatry, Washington University School of Medicine

Background

Executive function (EF) refers to the set of cognitive processes that allow for controlled, goal-directed cognition and behavior (Banich, 2009). Because EF involves overriding automatic responses, it is effortful and costly in terms of energy consumption (Suchy, 2009). As such, EF is optimal when the individual has a sufficient pool of attentional resources that can be allocated to the task at hand. The current study (Best, 2012) examined an often-overlooked activity—physical activity (PA)—that may contribute to children’s EF. In reviewing the literature, we
have posited two primary underlying mechanisms by which PA may benefit children’s EF (Best, 2010). The first is physiological arousal. PA stimulates the sympathetic nervous system and the release of certain neurotransmitters, thus increasing the child’s arousal. This increased arousal represents a larger pool of available attentional resources, which facilitates performance on effortful, EF-intensive tasks (Audiffren, 2009; Hillman et al., 2009). The second is cognitive engagement (CE), which is likely present in group games and other complex activities that require goal-directed behavior and adaptive play (Budde, Voelcker-Rehage, Pietrařyk-Kendziorra, Ribeiro, & Tidow, 2008; Pesce, Crova, Cereatti, Casella, & Bellucci, 2009). These sorts of activities may prime EF for subsequent use.

The current study sought to determine the independent and interactive effects of PA and CE using a novel methodological design. Using a 2 (PA: high, low) X 2 (CE: high, low) within-subjects experimental design, children (N = 33, 6 to 10 years old) completed different video-based activities during separate experimental sessions that varied systematically in PA (active video games [exergames] versus sedentary video activities) and in CE (challenging games requiring adaptive play versus activities requiring repetitive actions and/or passive watching). This design ensured a high level of control across the experimental sessions and across children. It also allowed children to complete each condition individually, avoiding the confounding of individual versus group activity with variables of interest. Children’s cognitive function, including EF, was assessed after each experimental activity using a modified flanker task, the Child Attention Network Test (ANT-C) (Rueda & M., 2004). This task contains trials that require EF to resolve visuospatial interference (incongruent trials) and trials that do not (congruent trials). EF is assessed selectively by subtracting congruent trial performance (either response time or response accuracy) from incongruent trial performance. With respect to response time (RT), an ex-Gaussian approach (Brown & Heathcote, 2003) was used to estimate the mean and standard deviation of the normal portion of the RT distribution (μ [μ] and sigma [σ], respectively), as well as the mean and standard deviation of the right tail of the distribution (τ [τ]). Whereas μ and σ characterize the most frequent, fastest responses, τ characterizes unusually slow responses, which often result from lapses of attention to the task (Unsworth, Redick, Lakey, & Young, 2010). This analytic approach provides a clearer idea of how RT differs across groups (e.g., in frequent, fast responses or infrequent, slow responses).

Method

Children participated in four experimental sessions, in which they completed all activities individually. Each session was approximately 1 hour long, occurred at approximately the same time of day, and was separated from the previous session by an average of 9 days. Children were asked to maintain a similar level of PA during the day before the session on all testing days. The order of the activities was counterbalanced to minimize systematic carry-over effects. Each activity (see description below) lasted approximately 23 minutes and was followed by completing the ANT-C at a computer station. The aerobic intensity of each activity was assessed using heart rate monitoring and a measure of perceived exertion; the level of CE was assessed using behavioral observation and self-report measures.

Low CE, low PA (Video). The child sat comfortably and watched an age-appropriate video on healthy living habits.

High CE, low PA (Mario). The child sat comfortably and played a sedentary video game using a handheld controller on a Nintendo Wii. This game is a platform game, in which the child moves his/her character across the screen from left to right. The child used the controller buttons to jump over obstacles, duck to avoid obstacles, and to collect items (e.g., turtle shells) for use against op-
ponents. As the child progressed through the game, it became more difficult (e.g., presence of stronger and/or more opponents).

**Low CE, high PA (Marathon).** The child played an exergame for the Nintendo Wii, in which the child’s virtual character is challenged to run as far as possible in 10 minutes. The child’s responses were recorded via pressure-sensitive buttons on a response mat. To play this game, the child moved the character forward, down a straight corridor, by jogging in place on the response mat. The child was asked to maintain a steady pace, and a speedometer in the lower right corner of the screen displayed the character’s virtual speed.

**Figure**

![Figure](image)

Note: Comparison of the incongruent RT distribution (in bold) to the congruent RT distribution following sedentary activity (A) and following PA (B) demonstrates that PA reduced the difference in \( \mu \) between congruent and incongruent trials.

**High CE, high PA (Mini-Exergames).** The child played a different exergame that used the same response pad used as in the previous activity. The child jogged in place to move the character, moved from side to side to move the character horizontally on the screen, and jumped to avoid pits, rolling logs, or other obstacles. The game became more difficult (e.g., obstacles approached more randomly and/or more unpredictably) as the child progressed. Thus, it required adaptive play similar to that required in Mario and high PA like in Marathon.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

An initial analysis of heart rate, perceived exertion, observational, and self-report data indicated that overall PA and CE were successfully manipulated by the four experimental conditions. The main analyses examined the effects of PA and CE, independently and in combination, on ANT-C performance. To examine the effects on EF selectively, interference scores were calculated by subtracting a given performance parameter on congruent trials from its corresponding parameter on incongruent trials. PA decreased the \( \mu \) interference score. The decrease in the \( \mu \) interference score suggests that the difference in the leading edge between the incongruent and congruent RT distributions is reduced following high PA relative to low PA. In other words, the cost of incongruent stimuli to children’s fastest RT, relative to congruent stimuli, is less following high PA than following low PA. This is shown in the Figure by the fact that there is greater overlap in the normal component of the incongruent RT distribution (thicker red line) and congruent RT distribution (thinner blue line) following high PA (Panel B) in comparison to low PA (Panel A). CE had no effect on any interference score, nor were there significant interactions.

A question that arises from these effects of PA is whether they resemble age differences in ANT-C performance. To examine this question, younger children (up to age 8 years, 0 months) were compared to older children (older than 8 years, 0 months) on their ANT-C performance averaged across all 4 experimental sessions. Com-
pared to younger children, older children showed faster overall RT on incongruent and congruent trials. None of the RT interference scores differed between the two age groups. However, older children’s greater accuracy than younger children’s was specific to the EF trials, as shown by improvements in accuracy on incongruent trials, but not congruent trials, and by a smaller accuracy interference score. These findings suggest that acute PA has a different effect on EF than age-related maturation, which is sensible. Acute PA is thought to exert transitory neuro-modulation via increased physiological arousal. Long-term EF development, however, likely is not driven by increasing physiological arousal with age but instead by changes in the structure and functionality of the neural networks underlying EF (Durston et al., 2006; Gogtay et al., 2004) and in changes to the metacognitive strategies children employ on EF tasks (Davidson, Amso, Anderson, & Diamond, 2006). These changes—especially in the metacognitive strategies employed—may allow older children to modulate their RT between trials that require less and more EF in order to respond with a high level of accuracy across trials. These results support this notion.

The current study’s unpacking of physiological and cognitive aspects of children’s activity is important for theoretical and practical reasons. Regarding theory, the current findings draw attention to PA’s influence on children’s EF, adding to the list of daily childhood experiences that may contribute to the development of EF. Whereas research on early cognitive development often recognizes the coupling of movement and cognition (Robertson & Johnson, 2009), developmental research on older children typically pays little attention to this coupling, despite experimental evidence for its importance. The current study highlights the physiological arousal induced by PA as a mechanism by which PA transiently influences EF. Regarding practice, the findings provide compelling evidence that children should participate in PA to prime EF in order to exert control over their cogni-
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Communication Withdrawal in Adolescent and Young Adult Romantic Relationships

Gary Glick, Department of Psychology, University of Missouri, Columbia

COMMUNICATION WITHDRAWAL IN ADOLESCENT AND YOUNG ADULT ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS

Developmental psychologists have increasingly stressed the importance of romantic relationships in adolescence and young adulthood (see Collins, Welsh, & Furman, 2009). Data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (i.e. Add-Health) revealed that over two-thirds of late adolescents report having ever been in a romantic relationship and that almost 60% of these relationships lasted for 11 months or more (Carver, Joyner, & Udry, 2003), figures that increase throughout young adulthood (see Furman & Winkles, 2012). In addition, romantic partners are rated as among the most important sources of support (Furman & Buhrmester, 1992) and most frequent social interaction partners (Laursen & Williams, 1997) during adolescence and young adulthood. Although research on these relationships has made considerable strides, relatively few studies have examined the specific ways partners communicate with one another and the outcomes that these communication styles predict, particularly among adolescents.

This gap in research is all the more striking because adolescents themselves identify communication as one of the most difficult barriers in interacting with romantic partners (Grover & Nangle, 2003). For some adolescents, a common response to these novel, potentially uncomfortable interactions may simply be to withdraw from communication. My dissertation research will provide an in-depth look at communication withdrawal, conceptualized as a “breakdown” in communication in which one partner ceases to continue talking, withholds grievances from a partner, or refuses to discuss certain topics (see Gottman, 1999). The study I have proposed will draw from research on communication withdrawal in adult romantic relationships in order to examine developmental differences in the communication styles of adolescent and young adult romantic partners not tested in prior research.

DEVELOPMENTAL DIFFERENCES IN COMMUNICATION WITHDRAWAL

Peggy Giordano and colleagues (Giordano, 2003; Giordano, Manning, & Longmore, 2006) posit that romantic relationships represent “something of a new ballgame from a developmental standpoint” during the adolescent years. By comparison, young adults report more past ro-
romantic experience than their adolescent counterparts, as well as having dated their current partner for a longer period of time (Giordano, Flannigan, Manning, & Longmore, 2009; Seiffge-Krenke, 2003). Past romantic experience has been linked to stronger communication skills in adolescents’ romantic relationships (Collins & Sroufe, 1999; Neider & Seiffge-Krenke, 2001). Adolescents with more romantic experience may be better equipped to communicate with their partner and less likely to withdraw from discussions with him or her. Yet it is important to note that considerable variability exists in past romantic experience in populations of both adolescents and young adults (Carver et al., 2003). Therefore, it is hypothesized that adolescents will withdraw from communication more frequently than young adults but that this difference will be partially accounted for by past romantic experience.

**Motives for Communication Withdrawal**

Communication researchers have identified a variety of motives for why adults might withdraw from communication with romantic partners (see Afifi & Afifi, 2009 for a review). This research found that individuals often withhold grievances and suppress their opinions in order to avoid conflict, for fear that such comments might jeopardize the well-being or future of the relationship. Studies of adult couples also find that individuals frequently withdraw from communication with partners as a means to avert embarrassment or inhibit their own emotional distress (Caughlin & Afifi, 2004). Evidence also suggests that conflict with a romantic partner may be accompanied by emotions so aversive than one or both partners simply “shuts down” and is unable to continue talking (see Ekman, 1984; Gottman, 1999). Adolescents may be similarly motivated to use withdraw as a means to protect a relationship or regulate their own distress, although no existing research has addressed this. Moreover, other factors that might uniquely explain withdrawal in adolescent couples have not been explored in the adult relationship literature. Since adolescents have less experience in romantic relationships it may be that they are simply less skilled as responding to their partners in the midst of a discussion or conflict. Therefore, it is hypothesized that adolescents will be more likely than young adults to report that their withdrawal is motivated by a lack of communication skills.

**Topic Specificity of Communication Withdrawal**

In addition, withdrawal may be used as a technique to avoid specific topics, particularly those that are uncomfortable to discuss (see Baxter & Wilmot, 1985). Adolescents’ relative inexperience romantic contexts may, in part, account for this. For instance, for youth with limited sexual experience, contraceptive use may be difficult to discuss. In addition, discussing concerns that pertain to the “label” of the relationship (e.g., girlfriend, boyfriend) also may be stressful, especially to youth with little experience in these relationships. It is hypothesized that adolescents and young adults will withdraw from partners most frequently when discussing these topics. Moreover, the tendency to withdraw from discussing difficult topics will be greater among adolescents and individuals with less romantic experience.

**Communication Withdrawal and Relationship Adjustment**

Withdrawing from communication with one’s partner may be indicative of an unhealthy and/or deteriorating relationship. Communication patterns that inhibit intimacy and self-disclosure in romantic relationships, such as withdrawal, have been linked to poor relationship quality and an increased likelihood of relationship dissolution in both young adult and married couples (see Gottman, 1999; Noller & Feener, 1998). It is likely that these associations extend to adolescent romantic relationships as well, although little research exists to support this claim. Yet the association between withdrawal and poor relationship quality may be weaker in adolescence if with-
draw is more normative in adolescent relationships. Perhaps withdrawal is less damaging to these relationships because adolescents’ standards for openness with romantic partners are lower than those of young adult partners. Therefore, it is hypothesized that communication withdrawal will be associated with poor relationship quality and relationship dissolution but that this association will not be as strong for adolescents as young adults.

**Proposed Study**

Four research questions will be tested: (1) Do adolescents withdraw from romantic partners more than young adults? (2) Do adolescents and young adults report different motives for withdrawing from romantic partners? (3) Are adolescents more likely than young adults to withdraw from discussing uncomfortable topics (e.g., contraceptive use, the status of the relationship)? (4) Is the association between withdrawal and relational adjustment (i.e., poor relationship quality, relationship dissolution) similar for adolescents and young adults? The role of relationship experience and gender in these associations also will be tested.

I will test these questions with a mixed-method design that utilizes self-report data from both partners, as well as data from an observed conflict task. For this task, romantic partners will each generate an issue in their relationships for which they desire change. They will then be given 10 minutes to discuss both partners’ issues. An overall withdrawal score will be assigned to each partner based on observations of the discussion. The topics that partners withdraw from discussing also will be coded during the observational segment. Afterwards, each partner will rate how much they withdrew from the discussion, as well as how much they perceived that their partner withdrew from the discussion. They will then be contacted six months and one year after completing the study to assess whether their relationship is still intact. Data will be analyzed using actor-partner interdependence models.

**Significance and Implications of the Proposed Study**

The proposed study has the potential to make important contributions to understanding the links between communication styles and adjustment in early romantic relationships. Withdrawal may represent an interpersonal style that is carried over from early romantic relationships into adult relationships. If the roots of communication withdrawal, and similar maladaptive interpersonal styles, can be detected in adolescent and young adult romantic relationships it could inform interventions (e.g., relationship education) that might enhance the communication skills needed to maintain close relationships in adulthood. In addition, if withdrawal is linked to poor relationship quality or relationship dissolution in adolescence this finding would have important clinical implications; adolescent breakups are the most common precipitating factor in major depressive episodes (Monroe, Rohde, Seeley, & Lewinsohn 1999) and suicide attempts (Fordwood et al., 2007). An inability to communicate with romantic partners, specifically with respect to difficult or uncomfortable topics, may even be viewed as a health-risk factor. For example, failing to discuss contraceptive use with a partner could be linked to an increased risk of unwanted pregnancy or sexually transmitted infections.
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Children’s and Adolescents’ Perceptions of Parental Guilt Induction

Wendy Rote, Department of Psychology, University of Rochester

Research Summary:

Parents can instill feelings of guilt in their children as they attempt to teach their children the relation between their actions and negative outcomes and to help them empathize and behave prosocially towards others (Baumeister, 1998; Hoffman, 2000; Williams & Bybee, 1994). Consequently, research on parenting and moral development has focused on the role of guilt in child development. However, researchers have conceptualized parental guilt induction in conflicting ways, leading both to a lack of clarity as to whether guilt has adaptive or maladaptive consequences for development and to conflicting advice for parents and clinicians.

In research on moral development, guilt induction is considered to be an aspect of inductive discipline. It is distinguished from negative forms of love-oriented discipline and is associated with more advanced moral development and increased prosocial behavior (Hoffman, 2000; Zahn-Waxler, Radke-Yarrow, & King, 1979). In contrast, research on parental discipline, guilt induction is considered to be a form of psychological control and is linked with love withdrawal and greater internalizing and exter-
nalizing problems in children (Barber, 1996; Barber, Stolz, & Olsen, 2005).

Although both of these theoretical perspectives focus on guilt inducing parenting, the two versions predict different correlates because the guilt inducing messages are assumed to be communicated differently by parents and thus are likely to be perceived differently by children. For example, depending on how the parenting messages are communicated, the children may perceive guilt induction as either psychologically controlling or as a child-centered parenting practice. In my dissertation, I focus on the link between the ways and situations in which guilt is induced and children’s and adolescents’ perceptions of parental guilt induction.

Potential Factors Impacting Perceptions of Guilt Induction

Three aspects of parental communication likely impact children’s perceptions of guilt induction. The first is the type of behavior over which guilt is induced. Guilt appears to be adaptive in situations in which there is a general consensus that the person should feel guilty but maladaptive in situations in which the average person would not feel guilt (Ferguson & Stegge, 1998). According to social domain theory (Smetana, 2006; Turiel, 1983), moral issues, which affect the welfare of others, are recognized by the broader society as right or wrong and are legitimately regulated by parents and society. In contrast, personal issues, which primarily affect the actor, involve individual preferences or choices and appear psychologically controlling when restricted by parents (Kakihara & Tilton-Weaver, 2009; Smetana, 2006; Smetana & Daddis, 2002). Finally, multifaceted issues, which entail conflicting personal and moral, conventional, or prudential concerns, are viewed as less objectively wrong but legitimately regulated by others for younger children (Smetana & Asquith, 1994). Thus guilt induced over moral issues may be more adaptive and perceived as less psychologically controlling than guilt induced over personal, and with increasing age, multifaceted behaviors.

Second, when using inductions, parents can either focus solely on the child’s behavior (inducing guilt) or insinuate that the child’s behavior is indicative of negative attributes of the child as a person (inducing shame; Tangney, 1998). Guilt tends to inspire prosocial behavior and has few links with poor adjustment outcomes, whereas shame inspires self-focused and defensive behaviors and is linked with increased internalizing and externalizing problems (Ferguson, Stegge, Eyre, Vollmer, & Ashbaker, 2000; Tangney, Stuewig, & Mashek, 2007). Thus, children may perceive inductive messages that focus on specific behaviors and refrain from impinging on the child’s sense of self as more appropriate and less psychologically controlling than messages that implicate their personality or beliefs.

Finally, parents can focus their inductions on the person or process immediately affected by the child’s behavior (the direct victim) or on second-order harm to themselves, which involves inferences about how the child’s behavior reflects upon or makes the parent feel (Horton, Ray, & Cohen, 2001). Compared to direct-victim oriented inductions, second-order parent-oriented inductions are more likely to elicit anxiety about loss of parental love, less likely to scaffold children’s understanding of the direct effects of their actions, and less likely to appear preventable, fair, appropriate, and child-oriented (Hoffman, 2000; Horton et al., 2001). Thus, children should perceive guilt induction that focuses on the direct-victim of the child’s behavior, rather than second-order parental victimization, as more appropriate and less psychologically controlling. Indeed in a pilot study with college-aged students, I found that young adults were sensitive to all three of the above mentioned factors when judging the extent to which a hypothetical parental message was psychologically controlling. However, it is unknown whether these differences generalize across younger, more diverse samples.
Thus, in addition to the above mentioned communication factors, I also examined the potential moderating impact of individual and relationship attributes. These factors included children’s age, sex, prior experience with psychologically controlling and supportive parenting, and personal adjustment, including internalizing and externalizing problems. These factors are associated with children’s perceptions of parenting behavior and experience of moral emotions, such as shame and guilt (Barnett, Quackenbush, & Sinisi, 1996; Ferguson et al., 2000; Horton et al., 2001; Williams & Bybee, 1994) and thus are likely to impact the way children perceive parental inductive communication.

**Methods**

For my dissertation, I experimentally manipulated the previously described aspects of parents’ guilt inductive communication using hypothetical vignettes (see Table 1 for examples). Each vignette consisted of a child (matched in sex and age to the participant) performing a behavior, followed by the child’s mother speaking about the behavior in a guilt-inductive manner. Youth read and responded to six separate vignettes of this format, which included two each of moral, multifaceted, and personal behaviors, half of which were direct-victim-oriented and half were 2nd-order parent-oriented. Additionally, participants’ were assigned to read vignettes in which the mother purely criticized the child’s behavior or the mother criticized the child as a person as well.

Consistent with prior assessments of children’s perceptions of parenting (Barber, Xia, Olsen, Mcneely, & Bose, 2012; Barnett et al., 1996; Padilla-Walker & Carlo, 2004), children and adolescents evaluated the mother’s hypothetical responses in terms of psychologically controlling disrespect for the child, appropriateness, implied parental intentions, effectiveness of preventing repeat child behavior, and effect on children’s feelings of guilt and shame. Additionally, participants reported on their own experience of parental support and psychological control (CRPSI; Barber, Stolz & Olsen, 2005), as well as on their internalizing, externalizing, and prosocial behaviors (SDQ; Goodman, Meltzer, & Bailey, 1998).

One hundred fifty-six middle-class, primarily Caucasian children and adolescents participated in the study. Youth lived in the suburbs of mid-sized city in the NorthEastern United States and were relatively equally distributed between primary (49 3rd and 4th graders), middle (45 7th graders), and high school (62 10th and 11th graders). Data were analyzed using a series of repeated measures ANCOVAs.

**Table 1. Example vignettes for a moral issue**

**Child Behavior:** Spreads a nasty rumor around school about another student.

**Mother Response:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior-Focused (guilt)</th>
<th>Person-Focused (shame)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct-Victim</strong></td>
<td>I’m really disappointed. Think about how you would feel if someone spread a rumor around school about you. That girl/boy must be pretty upset right now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m really disappointed. Think about how upset that girl/boy must be feeling right now. You must not care much about others to do something like that.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2nd-Order Parent</strong></td>
<td>I’m really disappointed. I thought I raised you to make better choices. When you act like that you make me feel like a bad mom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m really disappointed. I thought I raised you to make better choices. You clearly don’t care about how your actions make me feel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results

Domain. As expected, the domain of behavior over which guilt was being induced had a significant impact on the ways in which children and adolescents perceived guilt induction. Youth generally preferred inductions focused on moral and multifaceted issues than personal issues. Specifically, when comparing inductions across domains, youth perceived inductions about moral issues as the most acceptable, most effective at preventing repeat (mis)behavior, and the least disrespectful form of guilt induction. They also believed that mothers’ inductions regarding moral issues were more likely to stem from parent-, child-, and relationship-centered motives than were inductions about other types of behaviors. In contrast, youth perceived inductions regarding personal issues as the least acceptable, least effective at preventing repeat (mis)behavior, most disrespectful, most likely to increase feelings of shame and guilt, and least likely to stem from child-centered motives. Ratings about inductions regarding multifaceted issues typically fell between ratings for moral and personal issues, although, consistent with age related changes in the personal domain (Smetana, 2006), distinctions between multifaceted and moral issues were more pronounced for middle school- and high school-, than elementary school-aged participants.

Victim orientation. Youth distinguished between inductions that were 2nd-order parent-oriented and those that focused on the direct-victim of the child’s behavior, although many of these effects were only significant for certain situations. Generally youth preferred direct-victim oriented inductions. Consistent with theorizing that direct-victim oriented inductions are more effective at developing empathy and prosocial behavior, youth perceived mothers as more purposely trying to help children understand why their behavior was wrong when inductions were direct victim-oriented rather than 2nd-order parent-oriented. Direct victim-oriented inductions were also perceived as more acceptable and less disrespectful than 2nd-order parent-oriented inductions but only when issues were multifaceted or when parents also criticized the child as a person. Finally, youth expected that children would experience greater increases in feelings of guilt and shame when mothers used 2nd-order parent-oriented inductions than direct victim-oriented inductions, although for shame this difference only reached significance for personal issues. In addition, there was an age effect such that adolescents, compared to children, were more likely to perceive mothers’ 2nd-order parent-oriented inductions about personal issues as also showing more desire to improve the parent-child relationship than similar victim-oriented inductions.

Criticism focus. Consistent with theoretical distinctions between guilt and shame (Tangney, 1998), participants predicted that hypothetical children would experience greater increases in feelings of shame but not in feelings of guilt when mothers criticized the child as a person rather than purely focusing on the child’s behavior. Furthermore, they found such person-focused inductions to be less acceptable and more disrespectful than inductions that focused purely on the child’s behavior, although these differences were only significant for 2nd-order parent-oriented inductions and for high-school students’ ratings of moral issues. Additionally, participants viewed behavior-focused inductions, compared to person-focused inductions, as stemming more from parental motives to improve the parent-child relationship and less from motives to make children feel bad about themselves or to help children understand why their behavior was wrong, although mainly for moral issues and more so for females.

Parenting and adjustment. Perceptions of guilt induction varied by participants’ prior experiences with parental support and psychological control, as well as participants’ internalizing and externalizing symptoms. In general youth differentiated more between domains and
between person-focused and behavior-focused inductions when either perceived parental support or perceived parental psychological control was high. For instance, at high, but not low levels of perceived parental support and perceived parental psychological control, youth rated behavior-focused inductions as more likely than person-focused inductions to stem from parent-centered motives.

As might be expected, children higher in internalizing and externalizing symptoms tended to perceive parental inductions more negatively. Specifically children higher in internalizing symptoms predicted increased feelings of shame from both person-focused and behavior-focused inductions and youth lower in internalizing symptoms predicted increased feelings of shame when inductions were person-focused. In addition, higher internalizing children and adolescents, compared to lower internalizing, attributed more parent-centered motives (such as trying to make children feel bad) to parent-oriented than victim-oriented inductions. Likewise, youth with more externalizing symptoms tended to view 2nd-order parent-oriented and person-focused inductions as more disrespectful, less acceptable, and more attributable to parent-centered motives than did children with fewer externalizing symptoms.

Summary

In summary, my dissertation is a first step towards unpacking specific aspects of parental guilt induction that make it a more or less adaptive and effective parenting practice. In line with prior research highlighting the interaction between parenting practices and child attributes in determining child outcomes (e.g. Kochanska, 1993), my results suggest that features of the communication message, the context in which it is delivered, and the child him-or herself all impact children’s perceptions of parenting behaviors, which, in turn, might influence the child’s subsequent adjustment. I plan to continue to explore how guilt induction both positively and negatively affects individuals, depending on how it is expressed. Additionally, I hope to extend my research to consider the ways in which features of other parent-child interactions are subjectively interpreted by individual members of the dyad, and to pinpoint specific factors that influence these perceptions. Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to Division 7 for providing me with a dissertation grant to help fund this project and to my mentor, Dr. Judi Smetana, for her guidance and support throughout this process.
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Peer victimization is one of the most critical problems currently affecting the development of children and adolescents. Apart from the human toll, peer victimization has lasting effects on internalizing and externalizing symptoms as well as on academic achievement (Crosnoe, 2011; Reijntjes et al., 2010; 2011). Interestingly, not all students who encounter or worry about peer victimization suffer its consequences. Some are resilient. In light of this, my dissertation proposed a social-cognitive explanation for why some adolescents develop negative outcomes while others respond more productively. My aim was to understand and then influence adolescent resilience (for a review of the studies, see Yeager & Dweck, 2012).

Specifically, the dissertation proposed that adolescents’ implicit theories of personality—their beliefs about whether people’s traits are things that are fixed versus malleable—could affect their responses to peer victimization or exclusion. It advanced the hypothesis that a belief in fixed traits (an entity theory of personality) might lead adolescents who face peer victimization or exclusion to retaliate more aggressively and cope more negatively. That is,
for adolescents holding more of an entity theory, victimization or exclusion may be seen as done by and to people who cannot change—for example, by a “bully” to someone who is considered a “loser.” Under these conditions, harming the transgressor may seem satisfying. Moreover, from an entity theory perspective, one’s own victimization may be seen as a lasting and permanent feature of one’s life, leading to greater depression, stress and under-performance.

In contrast, a belief in the potential for personal change (an incremental theory of personality) may lead adolescents to think of peer victimization as done by and to people who can change over time. Learning an incremental theory may reduce aggressive retaliation and problematic coping more generally by allowing adolescents to see their future as more hopeful and by creating a greater desire to understand or perhaps influence transgressors.

It was especially important to investigate implicit theories of personality among adolescents in high school. With development, adolescents seem to believe that it is less possible to change traits such as meanness and aggression (e.g., Lockhart, Chang and Story, 2002; Hymel, Wagner, & Butler, 1990; Killen, Kelly, Richardson and Jampol, 2010). In light of this, one might expect that when school-based programs do not explicitly address beliefs about the fixedness of people’s characteristics then they may be less effective in reducing aggression. In fact, in a new meta-analysis, we are finding that while anti-bullying interventions tend to be effective for younger children, effectiveness of drops dramatically to an average of zero in 8th grade and beyond (Yeager, Fong, & Espelage, invited submission), the age when fixed beliefs about traits seem to be heightened (e.g., Killen, Kelly, Richardson and Jampol, 2010).

The dissertation began by investigating whether high school-aged adolescents who endorsed more of an entity theory would give more vengeful responses to recalled and hypothetical conflicts. To deepen our theoretical understanding of these effects, it also explored, for the first time, the cognitive and emotional mediators of this process (Yeager, Trzesniewski, K., Tirri, K., Nokelainen, P., & Dweck, 2011). Studies 1-2 collected data from diverse samples from the U.S. and from Finland. Study 1 showed that, across cultures, a measured belief in an entity theory (a belief that “bullies and victims are types of people that can’t be changed”) predicted a stronger desire for revenge after a variety of recalled peer conflicts. Study 2 extended these results to a hypothetical conflict that specifically involved bullying.

Next, Study 3 experimentally induced a belief in the potential for change (an incremental theory). This resulted in a reduced desire to seek revenge, demonstrating a causal role of implicit theories in shaping vengeful responses. This effect was mediated by reductions in feelings of shame and hatred, in labeling of the perpetrator as a “bad person,” and in the belief that vengeful ideation is an effective emotion-regulation strategy.

Study 4 examined the crucial theoretical and applied question of whether implicit theories could affect actual aggressive behavior in high school contexts over
time (Yeager, Trzesniewski, & Dweck, 2013). Study 4’s intervention sought to shift beliefs toward more of an incremental view and examine school behavior. This double-blind randomized field experiment was conducted with a predominately Latino and low-income sample of high school students (N = 230). It compared a 6-session intervention teaching an incremental theory to a control group that taught students extensive coping skills, and to a second control group that provided no treatment.

One month post-intervention, students’ aggression was measured using a standard procedure: students were excluded during a virtual game of catch (the “Cyberball” paradigm; Williams & Jarvis, 2006) and then had the opportunity to retaliate by making the excluding peer eat food he or she did not like—in this case, uncomfortably spicy hot sauce. On this ostensibly unrelated task one month post-intervention, students in the incremental treatment group—who learned that people have the potential to change—allocated 40% less hot sauce to the peer who excluded them, indicating less aggression.

Participants then had the chance to pass the peer a note. Some students chose to write friendly notes, while other students did not (see Figure 3). Treated students were three times more likely to write friendly notes to the peer who left them out of the game.

Study 4 also found that, at the end of the school year, several months post-intervention, the incremental theory group was more likely to be nominated by teachers for improved conduct.

Study 5 asked whether an incremental theory, by making victimization and exclusion seem changeable, could reduce stress following peer exclusion. If this were the case, then during developmental transitions that were rife with social stress—such as the transition to high school, when social networks are being re-formed (Cairns & Cairns, 1994) and adolescents at nearly every level of popularity are victimized (Faris & Felmlee, 2011)—then learning an incremental theory may cause an overall reduction in stress-related outcomes, such as academic under-performance and depression. Indeed, past developmental research has shown that peer victimization can lead to social stress and, as a consequence, underperformance in school (Crosnoe, 2011).

Study 5 tested whether delivering an incremental theory intervention during the first month of school—one that taught students that people’s traits have the potential to change—might cause an inflection point in adolescents’ adjustment trajectories across this developmental transition. Study 5 was initially conducted with 78 students at a middle class suburban high school and it has since been replicated with 150 students at a low-income urban high school. The design was a double-blind, randomized field experiment that taught an incremental theory to freshmen in the first month of high school via an abbreviated (two-class-session) version of Study 4’s intervention. Next, roughly two days later, students participated in the labora-

**FIGURE 2.** AN INCREMENTAL THEORY OF PERSONALITY REDUCES HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS’ AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOR 1 MONTH POST-INTERVENTION; A STANDARD COPING SKILLS INTERVENTION DOES NOT.

![Graph showing the reduction in aggression after an incremental theory intervention](image)

**FIGURE 3. A HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT IN THE CONTROL CONDITION WHO DID NOT WRITE A FRIENDLY NOTE AFTER CYBERBALL EXCLUSION (NOTE THE SMEAR OF HOT SAUCE ON THE PAGE).**

![Image of a note with the text: “I gave you a lot because you don’t like spicy!!”](image)
tory experience of peer exclusion (again, the “Cyberball” paradigm; Williams & Jarvis, 2006). The incremental intervention reduced reports of stress by roughly half of a standard deviation. Next, a survey conducted in May, eight months later, showed that global stress (the feeling that problems in life are more than you can handle) was reduced, also by half of standard deviation.

Finally, I tested the hypothesis that if social stress could be reduced, then, during this time of great social adversity, adjustment and overall functioning might be improved. First I examined prevention of the onset of clinical levels of depression. Pre-intervention, there were no differences between groups in terms of depression. However by May, at the end of Freshman year, 36% of bullied teens met the clinical threshold for depression, compared to 14% in the intervention condition, a nearly 2/3 reduction (see Figure 4). This is important because recent meta-analyses have found that despite immense investments in depression prevention, there are no examples of replicable universal, preventative interventions for high school adolescents (Stice et al., 2009).

Next I examined students’ grades in core classes (English, Math, and Science). I found that in the control group there was a steady decline in grades over the year. However, for those in the incremental theory treatment group, who reported less social stress, this decline in grades was slowed substantially, resulting in a difference in grades of roughly a third of a grade point versus the control group over the year. This effect of the incremental theory treatment on achievement was fully mediated both by stress following the laboratory experience of exclusion and by stress at the end of the school year (see Figure 5)

FIGURE 5. AN INCREMENTAL THEORY OF PERSONALITY SLOWS THE DECLINE IN GRADES COMMONLY SEEN DURING THE TRANSITION TO HIGH SCHOOL.

The dissertation concludes with an essay discussing how seemingly “small,” developmentally-tailored psychological interventions such as those in Studies 4 and 5—that is, interventions rooted in developmental theories and drawing on social psychological insights—can lead to substantial improvements in aggression, stress, depression or achievement even months or years later (Yeager & Walton, 2011). Looking broadly across the present studies as well as past psychological intervention studies, interventions can have effects when they target key, developmentally-relevant subjective experiences (such as a worry about the meaning of peer victimization), when they use persuasive methods for conveying psychological ideas, and when they tap into important self-reinforcing social and relational processes. At the transition to high school, be-
liefs about fixedness of others’ traits are increasing, and at the same time there is a heightened concern with one’s social status and the labels that one applies to oneself. In this context, even a small intervention that reduces the fixedness of one’s beliefs about traits could lead to substantial differences in psychological interpretations of social exclusion and, by doing so, have wide-ranging implications for adjustment.

This research justifies hope for addressing major problems facing teens. It is also evidence that it can be important to convey to teens that people are not fixed but have the potential to change.
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**BRINGING RESEARCH HOME:**
**PLAIN ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF CURRENT DEVELOPMENTAL RESEARCH**

**What is “Tiger” Parenting? How Does it Affect Children?**

Su Yeong Kim, Department of Human Development and Family Sciences
University of Texas at Austin

---

**WHY ALL THE FUSS AROUND “TIGER PARENTING”?**

As far as we know, the term “tiger parenting” did not exist until the publication of Amy Chua’s (2011) book, *Battle Hymn of the Tiger Mother*. Amy Chua, a Yale law professor with two daughters, writes about her Chinese heritage and the way in which it has influenced her parenting choices. Her daughters are not allowed to watch TV or play computer games, have sleepovers or playdates, or get any grade less than an A. Chua claims that these strict policies are the reason why her children have been so successful in school and in their music studies and argues that this type of parenting is common in Asian families.
People have had a strong reaction to her book. Chua’s supporters believe that her parenting methods are justified by the extraordinary academic and musical successes of her two daughters. Chua’s critics, on the other hand, feel that her parenting methods will not lead to optimal developmental outcomes in children. One concern is that the evidence presented in Chua’s book is based on her personal experience and not on scientific research that can take into account the differences across families and the variety of possible outcomes. This is especially problematic when reinforcing stereotypes about groups, and when giving advice to mothers around the world.

**Why is the study of Asian American parenting an important scholarly endeavor?**

Asian American parenting started gaining scholarly attention with the landmark publication of Ruth Chao’s (1994) paper in the journal *Child Development*, one of the leading journals for developmental psychology. Her study was one of the first to ask the question, “Why are Asian American children performing so well academically, given that their parents are more likely to be classified as authoritarian in parenting style?” This was an important issue to untangle, because authoritarian parenting, characterized as very strict or harsh without much warmth, often goes hand-in-hand with poor academic outcomes in European American children. Also, research on Asian American children had begun to uncover an achievement/adjustment paradox: despite their academic success, these children had lower levels of socio-emotional health. Thus, it is crucial to be clear about what we mean when we talk about “successful outcomes” in children.

**What have we learned tiger parenting?**

Tiger parenting is a little different than authoritarian parenting in that tiger parenting includes high levels of negative parenting (e.g., strict rules) and high levels of positive parenting (e.g., warmth and support). Scholarly research on “tiger parenting” began after the publication of Amy Chua’s book in which the concept of tiger parenting was introduced. In March 2013, the Asian American Journal of Psychology, one of the American Psychological Association’s journals, published a collection of six empirical papers and two commentaries – using samples of Hmong, Chinese, and Korean American parents all aimed at testing the new theory of “tiger parenting.” The goal was to use scientific methods to test whether tiger parenting is a common parenting style in Asian families, and to test whether tiger parenting leads to positive outcomes for children.

Overall, these studies showed that parenting in each of these cultures is a mix of power-assertive type parenting and supportive parenting. The purely power-assertive type of parenting described in Chua’s book was not common.

But, what about the children? What kind of parenting is best for child outcomes? The best way to answer
this question is to have a large sample, so that there are a variety of types of parenting represented, and we want data over time. We want a large sample so that we can link different types of parenting with different child outcomes. We want a longitudinal study; that is, we want data over time so that we can see how different types of parenting influence a child’s development over time. If we only have data from one time point, then we cannot say whether parenting is leading to child outcomes or perhaps different types of children influence how their parents behave. Fortunately, we had a longitudinal study we could use to address these questions. (see Figure 1).

We defined tiger parents as those who practice positive and negative parenting strategies simultaneously. Tiger parents are engaging in some positive parenting behaviors; however, unlike supportive parents, tiger parents also scored high on negative parenting dimensions. This means that their positive parenting strategies co-exist with negative parenting strategies.

Tiger parents and harsh parents are alike, in that both use negative parenting strategies. Unlike tiger parents, however, harsh parents do not engage in positive parenting strategies. Easygoing parents have a more “hands-off” approach, and do not engage as much with their children, either positively or negatively.

**WHAT ARE THE MAIN STUDY FINDINGS?**

Despite the popular perception of Asian American parents as “tiger” parents, we found that supportive parents made up the largest percentage of parents at each data collection wave.

Although there is a popular perception that the secret behind the academic success of Asian American children is the prevalence of “tiger moms” like Amy Chua, we found that children with tiger parents actually had a lower GPA than children with supportive parents. In fact, children with supportive parents show the highest GPA, the best socio-emotional adjustment, the least amount of alienation from parents, and the strongest sense of family obligation among the four parenting profiles. Thus, our findings debunk the myths about the merits of tiger parenting. Children with supportive parents show the best developmental outcomes. Children of easygoing parents show better developmental outcomes than those with tiger parents. Children with harsh parents show the worst developmental outcomes.
**What is the reaction from parents?**

The response among Asian Americans has been generally positive; some have said that they are pleased to see the stereotype of Asian Americans being challenged by our data. Amy Chua’s book gave some Asian Americans the “license” to be as strict in order to ensure the success of their children in today’s competitive global economy, but our study findings are a wake-up call to these tiger moms and dads, because they suggest that the average tiger parent will not produce extraordinarily successful children. Some European American parents have told me that they felt guilty about being too lenient after they read Amy Chua’s book, and wondered whether adopting Amy Chua’s methods would make their children more successful in school. After learning about my study, however, they feel better about their own parenting, and are glad to know that their children are better off with supportive parents, just as they always suspected.

Many parents have asked me, “If I am a supportive parent, will my children be as successful as the Chinese American students in your sample, whose average GPA in middle school is 3.4?” The answer is, “Not necessarily.” Ruth Chao’s work has demonstrated that relationship closeness explains why authoritative parenting is related to better academic performance among European American adolescents, while children’s recognition of parental sacrifice may be the key to understanding the academic performance of Asian Americans. Work by Eva Pomerantz suggests that Chinese mothers think, “My child is my report card,” and that they see the academic success of their children as a chief parenting goal. The reasons why a particular type of parenting works in one cultural group may not translate to another cultural group, partly because parenting goals are different in different groups.

**What is Amy Chua’s critique of our research?**

Jeff Yang, a columnist for the Wall Street Journal, writes about Amy Chua’s reaction to the research findings. Jeff Yang and Amy Chua criticize the research for implying that Chinese parenting is the same as Western parenting. They also suggest that the lower median income of the study sample explains why “tiger” parenting was ineffective. They feel that parents of working class backgrounds, who made up about 50% of our sample, cannot provide the time, energy and money required to groom their children for success. Finally, they say the study can’t explain why Asian Americans are over-represented in the Ivy Leagues and in music conservatories.

**What is our response to Amy Chua’s reaction to the research?**

“Supportive” parenting, as defined in our study, is not the same as Western parenting. While seven of the eight parenting dimensions we used would be considered “etic” dimensions, or general measures of parenting, there is one “emic” dimension, or culturally specific measure of parenting: shaming, which Heidi Fung (1999) defines as a culturally specific type of Asian parenting in which parents actively pressure their children to internalize feelings of shame for not conforming to norms or for failing to perform as parents expect.

About 30% of the study sample had an income at or above the median income of Asian Americans in the U.S. The study statistically controlled for parental educational level. Our findings are therefore demonstrating that “tiger” parenting is less effective than supportive parenting, regardless of parents’ level of education.

Vivian Louie’s study on working-class Chinese immigrant mothers suggests that even if they can’t directly help their children with homework, their social networks help children “make it” to the best public schools. In a similar vein, Cynthia Garcia Coll highlights the “immigrant paradox” that is apparent among groups such as Asian Americans, who tend to outperform their native-
born counterparts despite their lower socioeconomic status. This may be the reason why so many of the children in our sample (90% had immigrant parents) are able to achieve in school despite having fewer economic resources.

**If “tiger parenting” is not the answer, what explains why Asian Americans are over-represented in the best universities and science competitions?**

Carol Dweck’s work suggests that Asian Americans may be more likely to endorse an “incremental” view of intelligence, whereas European Americans are more likely to endorse an “entity” view of intelligence. Angel Harris’s work suggests that the success of Asian Americans can be attributed to their schooling behaviors rather than to prior skills. Collectively, these scholars are suggesting that Asian Americans are more likely to endorse the idea that academic success is due to effort instead of innate ability, and that they are more likely to believe that putting effort into school work will result in better academic outcomes. Andrew Fuligni’s work suggests that Asian American children’s strong sense of family obligation may be another key to understanding their academic success.

**What is the take home message for the average parent?**

Regardless of how we analyze the data, we find that supportive parenting always comes out on top: parents who scored high on the positive parenting dimensions and low on the negative parenting dimensions had the most well-adjusted, successful children. Thus, we encourage parents to consider using supportive parenting techniques.

Being warm, using reasoning and explanation when disciplining children, allowing children to be independent when appropriate, and monitoring children’s whereabouts and activities are all good parenting strategies. Parents should also ensure that they minimize shouting or yelling at their children, shaming their children by comparing them to other children, expecting unquestioned obedience from their children, and blaming their children or bringing up past mistakes.


**Columns**

Honoring your Years of Service: Adam Winsler

Dr. Adam Winsler is professor of applied developmental psychology at George Mason University in Fairfax, Virginia, USA. He is currently the listserve administrator, in Division 7 and has been serving the division in this role the past 14 years! Division 7 thanks him for his years of service!

We wanted to highlight Dr. Winsler’s service and let everyone get to know him, so I, Kali Trzesniewski, newsletter editor, interviewed Dr. Winsler for the Division 7 Newsletter.

**How did you become the listserve administrator?**

I became a student member of APA and Division 7 in 1988, then became webmaster/listserve administrator
for APA Division 7 in 1999, before it was a position on the executive committee. I served as the division’s first webmaster on the executive committee until 2006 when I happily turned over the webpage work to my then PhD student, Louis Manfra (Division 7 webmaster ever since), who was WAY more talented and technologically proficient than I ever was. And we decided to split the positions with the webmaster position remaining a member of the executive committee and the listserv admin position just being volunteer service. I have continued as listserv administrator for APA Division 7 continually since then so am now in my 14th year managing the list. And am now an APA Fellow.

I enjoy managing the list – I have always been a person who forwards announcements to all the students (and sometimes faculty) in my department since my first faculty position at the University of Alabama. I still forward all div7 posts to our current graduate students after they go to the list. I am a member of various other listserves from other groups and organizations so I can forward things on to people in Division 7.

I see that you have over 80 publications. Will you please give us an overview of your research?


What have you learned from your research?

Children often talk to themselves during play or problem solving situations. Such private speech is thought to play an important role in the development of self-regulation and in the transfer of autonomy/responsibility from others (teachers, parents) to the self. I have conducted research on private speech and parent-child scaffolding in typical children as well as young children with behavior problems, ADHD, and/or high-functioning autism. Private speech follows a particular developmental course, and its use is related to task difficulty, child task performance, and the quality of adult scaffolding. Children with ADHD and autism do use private speech in relevant ways and it is helpful for them, however, for such children, there may be a developmental delay in speech internalization. Children with autism, and especially children with ADHD, experience poorer-quality parent-child scaffolding which is related to children’s subsequent private speech use and performance.

Can you please tell us about a project that you are currently working on?

My more recent and externally funded research has been in the context of the Miami School Readiness Project (MSRP), a university-community applied partnership in which essentially the entire county of about 58,000 children in 5 cohorts/years of children, either low-income families receiving subsidies to attend center-based, family childcare, or informal care in the community, or children who attended public school pre-K programs, or children attending pre-K programs for children with disabilities have been followed for many years as they progress through the public school system.
**What can you tell us about the listserve?**

There are 3 APA division 7 listserves:

1) **div7** (announcements list). This has about 700 members who have voluntarily signed up for fairly frequent (approx. 10/week) email announcements (job announcements, grant/funding opportunities, conferences, policy news etc.). To add yourself to the Div7 listserv, email awinser@gmu.edu with this request and please briefly describe your relevant position in the email (the list is “closed/moderated” to avoid spammers getting on the list). To remove yourself from this list, simply send the following message to listserv@lists.apa.org in the body of the message (with nothing in the subject field): ‘signoff div7’. To post something (of relevance to developmental psychologists and members of Division 7) as a member to this list, send the message to div7@lists.apa.org

2) **div7exec** (Div 7 Executive committee). This is just for the folks on the executive committee (EC) of Div7 and is used for EC leadership emails and business. I update this list twice a year when new people come on and off the EC as their positions expire and start.

3) **div7membership**. Everyone who is an official member of div7 according to APA central’s records is on this list - this list gets populated quarterly by division services at APA and emails are updated periodically according to APA’s current records. We promised members when we set this up a couple of years ago that they would not get many emails from this list because that is what most people seemed to want. We only send maybe 8-10 emails a year - just important voting matters, div7 programs at APA, div7 newsletter, award nominations etc.

**Finally, what do you do when you are not forwarding emails to the world?**

I like to play bridge, tennis, and guitar, and I enjoy a fine scotch.

---

Emerging Adults and Their Parents: New Results from a National Study

Jeffrey Jensen Arnett, Clark University

---

I’ve been researching emerging adults (ages 18-29) for the past 20 years, but only last year did I finally have the opportunity to conduct a national study, the Clark University Poll of Emerging Adults. I’ll be writing up the results in journal articles for years to come, but I’d like to share some of the most notable findings here.

In my original theory of emerging adulthood (Arnett, 2004), I proposed five features that distinguish emerging adulthood from other life stages: identity explorations, instability, self-focus, feeling in-between, and a sense of wide-open possibilities. These features were based on hundreds of interviews I had conducted, mainly in central Missouri and San Francisco, but the Clark poll allowed me to see if they applied to a broader national sample. Table 1 shows that four of the five features were supported by a majority of 18-29 year-olds.

The fifth feature, feeling in-between, was asked in a somewhat different format. The question was “Do you feel that you have reached adulthood?” and the response options were “yes,” “no,” and “in some ways yes,
in some ways no.” Overall, 49% answered “yes,” 5% “no,” and 47% “in some ways yes, in some ways no.” The “feeling in-between” response of “in some ways yes, in some ways no” decreased with age, from 62% among 18-21-year-olds to 41% among 22-25-year-olds to 30% among 26-29-year-olds.

Overall, then, the five features of emerging adulthood seemed to be evident in this national sample. Of course, whether these five features apply distinctively to 18-29-year-olds remains to be shown, in studies that assess other age periods on the same items. I hope to do so in future Clark polls. (For more on the 2012 Clark poll, see Arnett & Schwab, 2012).

In recent years, my research focus has been on the parents of emerging adults, culminating this year in the publication (with my co-author Elizabeth Fishel) of a parents’ guide to emerging adulthood, When Will My Grown-Up Kid Grow Up? Loving and Understanding Your Emerging Adult (2013, Workman). The 2012 Clark Poll contained a number of questions on relations with parents, generally showing that emerging adults and their parents get along remarkably well. More than half (55%) of emerging adults stated that they are in contact with their parents “every day or almost every day,” reflecting the closeness of their relationship as well as the ubiquity (and low cost) of modern technology. About three-fourths (76%) stated that they get along better with their parents now than they did in their mid-teens, indicating the improvement in relations from adolescence to emerging adulthood.

This year I conducted another Clark poll, this time on the parents of emerging adults. We have just begun to examine the results, but so far the findings are consistent with the Clark poll of emerging adults in showing close, harmonious relations. For example, in contrast to the widespread perception that parents don’t want their emerging adult children at home, 61 percent of parents in the Clark poll said their response was “mostly positive” and only 6 percent “mostly negative” to an arrangement where their 18-29-year-old child was living at home or had moved back home. Nearly 67% of parents said that a consequence of their emerging adult kids living with them now is that they feel closer to them emotionally, and 66% reported they have more companionship with their child. A majority (62%) also said their emerging adult helps with household responsibilities. But it’s not all good when emerging adults live at home: 40% of parents report that a consequence of their kids living at home is that they have more financial stress.

Next year I hope to direct a Clark poll on 25-39-year-olds. I have become increasingly curious about what happens after emerging adulthood, in young adulthood (we probably need a new name for this, too), after people have entered enduring adult responsibilities of long-term work, marriage, and parenthood. There is actually a lot of research by now on midlife, most notably by the MacArthur project, so the thirties are now the decade of life that

| Table 1 |
| FEATURES OF EMERGING ADULTHOOD |
| Identity explorations |
| “This is a time of life for finding out who I am.” |
| 77% |
| Instability |
| “This time of my life is full of changes.” |
| 83% |
| Self-focus |
| “This is a time of my life for focusing on myself.” |
| 71% |
| Possibilities |
| “At this time of my life it still seems like anything is possible.” |
| 81% |

% = “somewhat” or “strongly” agree
is perhaps the most under-researched and the least understood. Eventually I hope to have national data stretching from age 10 to 70, which could shed light on a whole range of questions about the course of lifespan development.

References


Methodological Reform 101 for Developmental Researchers

M. Brent Donnellan, Richard E. Lucas, R. Chris Fraley and Glenn I. Roisman

Over the past few years, there has been growing concern about methodological practices in psychological science. These concerns were spurred, in part, by the publication of an article that supposedly provided evidence in support of psychic phenomena in the Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, failures to replicate highly cited and newsworthy findings, and reports of data fabrication by a few accomplished researchers. In some quarters, there is a sense that the typical ways of conducting, reporting, and reviewing psychological research has limitations that need to be addressed. These discussions about methodological reform often generate disagreement (and perhaps even a few eye rolls). The issues, however, are important to consider for any field dedicated to the pursuit of scientific knowledge.

Like many other areas of psychological science, developmental research involves three ingredients that, when combined in specific ways, can create problems for a field: (a) sample sizes that are often constrained; (b) large numbers of data analytic choices that do not have obvious answers (e.g., how to combine data collected across multiple assessment waves, which covariates to include in a statistical model, whether to allow residuals to co-vary in ways that are not specified in advance), and (c) considerable pressure on both new and established investigators to publish as much as possible. These factors are by no means unique to developmental research but we believe there is an important opportunity to use on-going methodological controversies to engage in a constructive dialogue about the field and to consider the adoption of new research standards—both at the level of individual research labs and in the editorial process. Doing so has the potential to improve research integrity in developmental psychology and to better protect the sub-discipline from some of the concerns that have emerged with respect to other areas of psychology.

This brief essay offers an introduction to the recent methodological discussions and provides general advice for researchers. The focus is practical and aimed at helping researchers approach these issues for themselves. We also provide an annotated guide to important recent publications about methodological reforms.

Seven Principles and Practices to Consider Adopting in Your Own Work

1. Commit to Total Scientific Honesty. Lykken (1991) wrote a prescient essay foreshadowing current discussions about methodological reform. He also offered useful advice for improving the field. His most overarching and challenging recommendation boiled down to a sustained com-
commitment to scientific honesty and integrity. His advice followed from the principles espoused by the Nobel Prize winning physicist Richard Feynman (see e.g., Feynman, 1985, p. 341). The basic idea is to avoid fooling yourself and your scholarly peers when conducting scientific research. Scientific integrity involves full disclosure and maximum transparency. The mandate is to provide all of the details of a given study and to resist the temptation to ignore evidence inconsistent with your preferred perspective.

This is no easy task. A sustained commitment to scientific integrity requires self-awareness and equanimity. Self-awareness is needed to guard against confirmation bias and post hoc rationalizations. Equanimity is needed to prevent oneself from getting emotionally invested in the outcome of a research study. The focus and energy should be directed at the process of designing the best study possible without undue investment in obtaining any particular result.

2. Be Aware of the Impact of Researcher Degrees of Freedom. Researchers should acknowledge the myriad decisions they face when designing studies, analyzing data, and reporting research. In an ideal world, confirmatory studies (those testing specific hypotheses) would be planned in great detail and any deviations from the plan (including departures from the planned data analytic strategy) could be evaluated by objective readers. In reality, however, this type of pre-registration rarely occurs in psychological studies (although preregistration of replication attempts is being implemented at Perspectives on Psychological Science; see: http://www.psychologicalscience.org/index.php/replication). In addition, sticking to an inflexible plan might hinder discovery at early stages of research. However, when multiple options are available, confirmation bias can lead researchers to selectively attend to results that support their pre-existing beliefs and ignore results that are inconsistent with these ideas.

These biases often occur outside of conscious awareness. In addition, because positive findings tend to be valued more than negative findings (and hence, are more likely to be publishable), flexible analyses, combined with HARKing (hypothesizing after results are known) can lead researchers to prefer analytic choices that “work,” even if these were not the analyses that had been planned ahead of time. Equally troubling, the preferred and reported results may not even be representative of the results of the full range of analyses that were conducted. Thus, researcher degrees of freedom increase the likelihood of introducing false positives to the literature.

One way to address these issues is to approach your own research as if pre-registration was necessary. Think carefully about which analyses are most appropriate and create a detailed plan before seeing the results, as well as (for example) a syntax-based documentation of the full set of analyses actually conducted. If the planned analyses result in publishable findings, you can be more confident that your findings are not the chance result of examining the data from multiple angles. However, if in the process of conducting analyses, deviations from the plan are required, you should consider shifting to a more exploratory mode. Alerting readers to the analyses that did not work may give a more complete picture of the robustness of the effects; and replication in additional datasets might be a wise choice.

Although there are some methodological questions that have clear right or wrong answers, many decisions fall on a continuum from more to less reasonable. Increased transparency allows others to judge the appropriateness of your decisions and helps provide some context regarding the number of alternatives that were tried before the final analyses were chosen. Researchers should therefore document their procedures and materials and make those available to peers. More and more journals allow for on-line supplements that make the
dissemination of such material quite easy. In addition, although the sharing of de-identified data can involve a set of thorny issues, this is one of the best ways to combat problems associated with researcher degrees of freedom, and one that developmental scientists can take pride in having been at the leading edge of by way of large, publicly available datasets like the NICHD Study of Early Child Care and Youth Development. We strongly encourage the leading journals in developmental psychology to consider ways to facilitate the process of open reporting, data archiving, and pre-registration.

3. Focus on Effect Size Estimation Rather Than Statistical Significance. A call to focus on effect size estimation is inherently tied to criticisms of conventional null hypothesis significance testing (NHST). Unfortunately, discussions about the limitations of NHST often either fall on deaf ears or amount to preaching to the choir. Hopefully, this is changing as a result of the increasing recognition of the importance of estimating effect sizes with precision (see e.g., Cumming, 2012; Fraley & Marks, 2007; Kline, 2013).

To be clear, most of the interesting questions in psychological science concern the strength of the association between two variables or the magnitude of the difference between groups (either experimentally induced or otherwise naturally occurring groups). Questions of this sort are not answered by the p-values that accompany NHST. Instead, they require effect size estimates. It is perhaps easiest to see how a concern with effect sizes is critical when evaluating the results from some of the large scale national studies common in developmental journals or in epidemiological research. Given a large enough sample size, virtually any association or mean difference can attain statistical significance – trivial or substantial. The task is to evaluate the theoretical and practical importance of the statistical association or difference. There is no reason this perspective on interpretation should be limited to large scale studies; indeed, we believe this approach should be the focus of virtually all research conducted in psychology.

A focus on effect size estimation has other benefits. Once researchers routinely attend to effect sizes, there is likely to be a desire for effect size estimates that are more precise (i.e., have narrower confidence intervals) and to test theoretical models that generate risky hypotheses, using a falsificationist approach to science under which larger samples actually represent a greater risk of refutation for the proposed theory. These are good things for a field.

4. Understand That Sample Size and Statistical Power Matter. This recommendation is closely related to the issues surrounding parameter estimation and concerns with significance testing. For instance, a desire for a more precise understanding of effect sizes will likely motivate researchers to use larger sample sizes. This is critical because concerns over sample sizes and statistical power have a long history of being ignored in psychological research. Unfortunately, many of the methodological issues that have come to light in recent years can be traced to an inattention to statistical power and the problems with research based on small sample sizes.

There are at least three problems that arise when researchers conduct research using small sample sizes. First, such studies are likely to be underpowered and, consequently, unlikely to detect critical effects of interest. Second, small sample sizes are likely to provide biased estimates of population effect sizes if results are screened through a significance test filter (i.e., the estimate from a given study is likely to be larger than the true association because only relatively large effects can attain statistical significance in this case). If one is earnestly interested in a parameter estimate (e.g., the expected difference in academic performance between rejected and non-rejected children), this problem is of obvious importance. But,
even if one is not interested in the parameter estimates per se, this second problem with small samples has other unintended negative consequences. The most notable one is that other investigators seeking to build upon and extend the original findings might base their sample size decisions using inflated effect size estimates. This starting point will lead researchers to design future studies with inadequate power. Such a practice will increase the possibility of null findings and contribute to confusion in the literature. It may also perpetuate bad design practices if other researchers follow norms created by small sample size research.

Third, and perhaps most importantly for the scientific literature as a whole, the rate of false positives for published findings is higher in literatures based on underpowered studies than in literatures based on high powered studies. This claim often strikes people as counter-intuitive. Researchers often assume that, although low powered studies might make it more challenging to detect real effects, effects detected by lower powered studies should be real. Ioannidis (2005) and others have shown why this assumption is incorrect. Low powered studies both decrease the likelihood that researchers will detect the effects they hypothesize and increase the likelihood of Type I errors (false positives) in the research literature, often by creating perverse incentives to hunt for statistically significant differences around which a story can be constructed post hoc. Low powered studies hurt not only the investigator in question, but the integrity of the research literature as a whole.

What can be done about these issues? The first step is to gain a better understanding of the concerns over small sample sizes by developing an intuition for how illusionary findings emerge when sample sizes are low (Cumming, 2012). Second, researchers can begin to consider what kinds of effects one might expect in a research area and select sample sizes that will allow those effects to be estimated with reasonable precision (Fraley & Marks, 2007). There are costs and benefits involved with sample size selection. But it is imperative to appreciate the hidden costs in conducting underpowered research. Finally, editors and reviewers can demand that investigators justify the sample sizes they have selected (e.g., Simmons et al., 2011). One solution is for editors to adopt minimal thresholds for the sample sizes, statistical power, or confidence bands of research published in their journals. For example, if there is agreement among researchers in a given field that trivial associations (e.g., $r < .09$) are of relatively little theoretical interest, then studies might be expected to include at least enough participants to have adequate power to determine whether relevant associations exceed that cut-off (it may surprise some scholars that $80\%$ power to reliably differentiate an $r = .10$ or larger from zero requires 617 participants, assuming a directional prediction). Regardless of how this issue is handled, researchers, reviewers, and editors should appreciate that sample size is one of the most important factors in research design, even if, historically, it has been the most often neglected.
5. Review Papers for Methodological Completeness, Accuracy, and Plausibility. One common theme in the report issued by the committee investigating the fraud committed by social psychologist Diederik Stapel (see http://www.tilburguniversity.edu/nl/nieuws-en-agenda/finalreportLevelt.pdf) was the presence of many implausibly large effect size estimates. It is possible that greater attention to effect size estimates and the methodological details of these papers by the research community might have raised red flags earlier in the process. Even strong proponents of NHST should be able to acknowledge that routinely computing and reporting effect size estimates can serve as a useful check on the plausibility of a result. Sometimes effects can be too big to be believed and simply involve mistakes in reporting like substituting standard errors for standard deviations.

In light of concerns about the methodological rigor of psychological research, researchers should commit to reviewing papers for methodological accuracy in addition to theoretical coherence and plausibility. There is a perhaps a natural tendency to want journal articles to tell a coherent and engaging story. The material in Method and Results sections is critical to the credibility of that story. Attending to these issues in the work of others may help researchers attend to these issues in their own studies (and vice versa).

6. Focus on Reproducability and Replication. The term replication is becoming saddled with baggage and even controversy. This is unfortunate because the importance of testing whether results can be duplicated (i.e. producing effect sizes of roughly the same magnitude) using the same procedures or very similar procedures is a core scientific value. It is often quite illuminating to run the exact same experiment or simple correlational study multiple times to observe how results fluctuate across trials. Likewise, testing how well results generalize to different kinds of samples and different operational definitions is critical for scientific progress. In short, researchers should strive to make sure their own results are sturdy. Researchers may also consider dedicating a fraction of their time each year to replication studies of outside findings. Increasing
the frequency and visibility of these efforts at meaningful duplication will ultimately improve the rigor of scientific psychology.

7. Think Critically about Sampling Strategies and Generalizability. Scholars have raised concerns about the kinds of samples frequently used in psychological research and how these samples constrain the inferences drawn from contemporary studies (e.g., Arnett, 2008; Henrich, Heine, & Norenzayan, 2010). A thorough discussion of these issues deserves its own column. We simply suggest that developmental researchers continue to be cautious and forthright about the limitations imposed by common methods of drawing samples. This suggestion fits well with the themes of transparency and self-criticism emphasized in this column. For example, consider the complex set of issues that arises when developmental researchers use college students enrolled in social science courses as their stand-in for “adults” when making comparisons with samples of children, adolescents, and individuals past retirement age. College student samples often come from a different population in these comparisons besides just age because of their socioeconomic background, education level (naturally!), and experiences with social science research.

Conclusion

The goal of research in developmental psychology is to contribute new knowledge to the field. Researchers want to base their discipline on findings that replicate and stand up to reasonable critical scrutiny. Researchers also want their findings to generalize beyond the particulars of a given sample. These desires lie at the heart of the recent methodological discussions in psychological science. The suggested readings and recommendations in this essay are designed to help researchers approach these discussions in an informed fashion. Ultimately, each researcher must make informed decisions about how to approach his or her craft and some readers may disagree with many of these suggestions and recommendations. However, we hope these ideas serve as a useful entry point and cause for reflection on the critical issues that face the entire field of psychological science. The six recent readings in the sidebar might be son and Heene (2013), and Nosek, Spies, and Motyl (2013) are broad in scope and likely to be of wide interest.

Schimmack, U. (2012). The ironic effect of significant results on the credibility of multiple-study articles. Psychological Methods, 17, 551-566. DOI: 10.1037/a0029487

This article draws attention to the importance of statistical power when evaluating published research. Schimmack describes a tool for potentially detecting publication bias or the practice of presenting only those studies that support theoretical ideas rather than all available evidence (see also Francis, 2012; Ioannidis & Trikalinos, 2007). In essence, a set of published studies can be too good to be completely true if a large number of positive “hits” from underpowered studies are collected together in a single package. Recommendations for improving the rigor of psychological studies are provided including paying increased attention to statistical power and changing institutional incentives to reward researcher effort rather than the attainment of statistically significant results.


This brief article acknowledges the reality that researchers face a large number of choices when designing studies and analyzing data. The ability to make multiple alternative decisions (the phenomenon of researcher degrees of freedom) increases the possibility of finding illusionary results and often leads to biased effect size estimates. Simmons et al. offer six requirements for authors and four guidelines for reviewers for helping to curb the negative impact of researcher degrees of freedom. Although their guidelines might, at first glance, apply more to experimental studies than long-term longitudinal investigations, their basic concerns about flexibility in the way that data are analyzed and their emphasis on transparency are worth considering for all psychological researchers.

Thanks to Aidan Wright and Chris Hopwood for helpful comments. Thanks to Jacquelynne Eccles for reminding us about the importance of sampling issues. Questions or comments can be directed to donnel59@msu.edu.

Check our next newsletter (January 2014) for further discussion of sampling issues by Jacquelynne Eccles.
of additional interest for developmental scientists who wish to learn more about the issues we have summarized above.
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Teaching humans about development: What’s change got to do with it?

By Katherine Conger, UC Davis

Winner of the 2008-2009 Human Development Faculty of the Year Undergraduate Teacher Award
Department of Human & Community Development, University of California, Davis

This fall, thousands of students will file into classrooms and sit down to learn about developmental psychology. When you look at the scope of what we cover, namely human development across the lifespan and in multiple contexts, it is a bit daunting to think about introducing this topic to students who are looking for a major, fulfilling a requirement, or simply sitting through what they hope is an easy class because they did not get into what they really wanted! But professors try, each term, to impart their enthusiasm for a topic that captured us when we went to college, attended graduate school and became an academic. Whether you teach an introductory course, an upper division course for interested majors, or teach a graduate seminar, our mission is to get students to absorb some of the information presented in class and to appreciate how we go about studying and understanding humans across domains and across time.

First, you have to provide structure for students, some of whom are negotiating college coursework and their own schedules for the first time. Although it is tempting to start this discussion by waxing poetically about theories of development and philosophies of teaching, I find one of the most useful tools is a detailed syllabus which is handed out and discussed on the first day as well as posted on the course website. My syllabus includes a description of the class, my expectations of them as students, what to read, dates for exams, details about class communication, university holidays, and so forth; the more detail, the better. I have found over the years that the syllabus serves as scaffolding for students and for teaching assistants who are usually only a few years older than the students in your class. From a developmental perspective, it is useful to keep in mind that undergraduate students are making the transition from adolescence to early adulthood, and providing structure and limited choices can be a good thing. Once this structure is in place, students can concentrate on the information regarding development that is the focus of the course.

In addition to providing structure, of course, teachers have to provide content. And this content needs to come in forms that students can take in and process, which usually requires a professor to juggle multiple roles such as entertainer, educator, and storyteller. When someone asks me what teaching college students is like, I say it is like doing a two hour stand-up routine twice a
week with an audience, most of whom would rather be watching a TED talk! This has never been truer than today with students who are wired into social media 24/7 with multiple devices, and some would say short attention spans. Some people do not like the idea of entertainment as part of the educational process, however, before you can educate, you need to get their attention. Gaining the attention of students who want to be there is easy; it is the students sitting in the back with their tablet, smart-phone, or laptop and access to plenty of distractions who you need to reach.

Once we have their attention, how do we as psychologists, sociologists and educators inculcate a developmental perspective on a specific stage of the life span or a particular domain of development? Although written materials such as articles, reviews, and textbooks are useful, the professor is the linchpin in getting students to think from a developmental point of view. This brings me to the role of educator, and teaching from a developmental perspective.

And not just change as a general concept, but change across domains of development such as cognitive, biological, and social-emotional and types of change such as micro - macro, typical - atypical, normative - non-normative. And as individuals change, the families, social relationships, community and societal contexts in which they are embedded also are changing. When you think about it, it is a lot of ideas and information for students to take in, especially if it is their first exposure to these ideas.

Here is where storytelling comes in – the professor has to make those connections in how they approach presenting materials in class, and how they guide discussions in class. For example, you tell stories or provide examples about how a particular prenatal insult will affect development over the life of an individual from childhood to adulthood. I frequently revise lectures to reflect current events, popular culture, and up-to-date research findings relevant to the course. I believe all of these activities and strategies combine to enhance the educational experience and learning opportunities for students.

Getting students to think about development – applying development to their own lives – is one way to get them engaged in the learning process. Most under-grads are focused on their own journey through development, or just surviving the next round of mid-terms, and one way to get their attention is to make development real – make it personal. To make it personal, I use a combination of topical reading assignments, in-class writing assignments, and directed class discussions to maintain students’ interest as well as to promote class participation. There are two primary strategies I use to provoke participation and discussion; questions posed to the class as a whole, and questions posed in a format I call 4 by 4s. First, as a regular part of my lectures, I pose questions related to the day’s topic to the whole class, usually 200 students, and then wait for someone to answer. Invariably, someone will break the silence and then a number of students will contribute examples from their life experiences which help to make development real. I start this early in the course so students acclimate to talking in class. Second, I ask students to break into groups of four and I pose four specific questions designed to provoke discussion. I call this activity 4 x 4s (see sidebar on next page).

“One of the first things to keep in mind is the notion of change; that is, when you teach about individual development, you need to help students understand what change has to do with development.”

One part of storytelling includes occasional stories about my own development as a family member (first born sister with two younger brothers), and as an academic (degrees in Human Development and Sociology). Thus, I conclude with bit of storytelling about my journey towards a developmental perspective.
My undergraduate training in human development required coursework in biology, chemistry, microbiology, physiology, and genetics along with the typical courses in development across the lifespan. However, it was exposure to Bronfenbrenner's ecological view of the developing individual early in my college career which indelibly altered my view of individual development in multiple, interconnected contexts. As I remind my students; it is nature and nurture! Courses often require that we disaggregate development into specific stages such as middle childhood or adolescence, or into domains such as cognitive, bio-psycho-social, and personality; we forget that students come into developmental psychology and human development classes without the background that we professors have built up over the years. What comes as second nature to many of us may seem like a foreign language to undergraduates. But this also offers great opportunities to make the study of humans from conception to death - or sperm to worm if you want to get their attention - a learning experience for students and for ourselves. My teaching and research draws on both human development and sociology, and I feel context is an integral part of understanding, and teaching, development. As humans we play many roles, live in multiple environments, and have to negotiate the intersection of competing demands on our attention and our time. Students who take our classes because they want to, as opposed to have to, are the ones who seem to get it; that development happens. They are the ones with questions, who come to office hours, who participate in class; it is exciting to observe them developing as young adults before our very eyes.

**4 x 4's**

“I ask students to break into groups of four and I pose four specific questions designed to provoke discussion – such as how are developmental experiences in childhood linked to developmental outcomes in adolescence? How do experiences with siblings during childhood affect the course of development of all siblings in the family? Why are siblings so different? This one often provokes the liveliest discussions. It is helpful to make the questions specific so students have a reference point. For example, think about your relationship with a sibling (or a close friend) during 8th grade and then compare it to what that relationship is like now as a college student – look at the developmental stage of each person involved in the relationship. By posing a question with a specific time frame, it makes the context real and the use of family and friends is one way to get students to relate to development.”

---

**IN MEMORIAM**

**Herbert L. Pick, Jr. (1930—2012)**

Herbert L. Pick, Jr., Professor at the University of Minnesota’s Institute of Child Development, passed away unexpectedly on June 18, 2012, two weeks after a Fest-schrift in his honor was held in Minneapolis at the International Conference on Infant Studies.

For more than 49 years, Herb was an inspiration to generations of students and fellow faculty at the Institute and to other colleagues in the field. Throughout his path-breaking career, he helped establish the field of perceptual development as a core discipline in developmental...
science, pioneer the study of cognitive mapping in children and adults and open communication between Western and Soviet Psychology at the height of the Cold War and maintain that dialog subsequently. The review chapter he co-authored with his wife Anne for Carmichael’s Manual of Child Psychology (1970, Wiley) identified the relevant theoretical issues and set the stage for many of the discoveries in perceptual learning and development in the decades that followed.

Herb was an ecological psychologist. He received the Ph.D. at Cornell University, where he trained and conducted research with, among others, Eleanor J. Gibson, James J. Gibson and Richard D. Walk. Indeed, the ecological perspective of the Gibsons, in one way or another, informed virtually all of Herb’s research. Herb was interested in how perception and/or action function as a system and in a related vein, how organisms apprehend an information-rich environment that can be used to guide adaptive action in the world. For Herb, the ecological perspective also meant that he conducted research in real world as well as laboratory settings—often on the same problem, and that the line dividing basic from applied research was arbitrary at best.

These themes are evident throughout Herb’s career. In his early classic work on prism adaptation, he sought to examine how perceptual and/or motor abilities are systemically organized by describing patterns of transfer when, for instance, information gathering in one modality is perturbed. In subsequent work with his students, he looked at children’s and adults’ everyday activities, such as handwriting, locomotion, object exploration, speech production and wayfinding. Again, across these activities, the questions that he posed were similar: how are systems of perception and action organized and how does the underlying pattern of organization change with development. The studies that he played a large part in devising with his students to address these issues were clever, systematic and elegant. He inspired students to think deeply about problems and do their best work.

Herb was recognized during his career for his accomplishments as both a researcher and teacher. In addition to being elected President of Division 7 of the American Psychological Association, Herb was the recipient of the first Division 7 Mentor Award from the American Psychological Association—not just for being a mentor to undergraduate and graduate students, but to many colleagues in the field. He was honored again in 2002, jointly with his wife Anne D. Pick, with a Minnesota Symposium on Child Psychology based on a central theme of their work, action as an organizer of learning and development.

In Institute circles and beyond, Herb was also famous for co-leading a winter camping trip to Northern Minnesota. Generations of students and colleagues participated in these winter adventures filled with good conversation, good cheer and literally, cold feet. Although Herb was already gone this past January, his wife Anne, current students, former students and colleagues continued the tradition and gathered again in Northern Minnesota for another winter camping trip. Herb’s presence was still deeply felt.

Jeffrey J. Lockman, Tulane University
John J. Rieser, Vanderbilt University
Psychology Benefits Society - PI’s New Blog - Has Launched

**APA’s Public Interest** (PI) directorate is proud to bring you our newest venture into social media - the Psychology Benefits Society blog. The blog’s message is that applied psychological science benefits society. Information is a powerful tool. By providing information consistent with psychology’s evidence on human behavior, health, and mental health, the blog will show how the field contributes to lasting and powerful social progress.

To carry that message far and wide, the blog will:

1. Provide fresh, frequent coverage of psychological research that addresses health and social justice issues
2. Highlight PI activities, programs, publications and resources that speak to our mission
3. Feature testimonials from public interest psychologists and other mental health professionals on why they are passionate about the work they do
4. Identify and discuss public policy in which psychology plays a role
5. Offer opportunities for training, fellowships, membership in APA governance and more

As we launch this blog, your feedback and engagement will be essential. We want to hear from you! Feel free to comment on our posts and share them with your friends or colleagues.

**Let us know:**

1. What issues you want to see covered
2. How you think psychology can benefit society
3. If you want to contribute a guest post

You can also connect with us via Twitter or send an email to eandoh@apa.org. And don’t forget to subscribe to the blog’s RSS feed and our “In the Public Interest” newsletter.

**New APA Working Group on Health Disparities in Boys and Men**

APA’s Health Disparities Initiative launches the Working Group on Health Disparities in Boys and Men. By the Health Disparities Initiative, The members of APA’s National Steering Committee on Health Disparities and the Public Interest Directorate are proud to announce the launch of the new Working Group on Health Disparities in Boys and Men. Boys and men from health disparity populations (e.g., low socioeconomic status, racial/ethnic minority communities) have some of the worst health outcomes in the country. Through the work of this group, we hope to develop strategies on how APA and psychology can better address health disparities and needs of underrepresented boys and men in the United States. The working group consists of a multidisciplinary team of scholars with expertise in a range of health issues facing boys and men from underserved populations. Members, which include two graduate students, are Arthur W. Blume, PhD (Washington State University), Stephanie Cook (Columbia University), Will Courtenay, PhD, LCSW (Men’s Health Consulting, Berkeley, Calif.), Derek Griffith, PhD (Vanderbilt University), Perry Halkitis, PhD (New York University), Waldo Johnson, PhD, MSW (University of Chicago), Arik Marcell, MD, MPH (Johns Hopkins University), Eric Mankowski, PhD (Portland State University), Randy Quinones-Maldonado (Carlos Albizu University, San Juan, Puerto Rico), Roland Thorpe, Jr., PhD (Johns Hopkins University), Daphne Watkins, PhD (University of Michigan). The Working Group Chair is Wizdom Powell Hammond, PhD (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill). The members’ inaugural meeting will be held in early summer 2013.

**SSEA New Journal**

Introducing the Society for the Study of Emerging Adulthood. The society has a new journal and 200 members enrolled so far.

**About the American Psychological Foundation (APF)**

APF provides financial support for innovative research and programs that enhance the power of psychology to elevate the human condition and advance human potential both now and in generations to come.

Since 1953, APF has supported a broad range of scholarships and grants
Developmental Psychologist

for students and early career psychologists as well as research and program grants that use psychology to improve people’s lives.

APF encourages nominations from individuals who represent diversity in race, ethnicity, gender, age, disability, and sexual orientation.

About the APF Division 37 Diane J. Willis Early Career Award

The APF Division 37 Diane J. Willis Early Career Award is named after Dr. Willis, to honor her life-long advocacy on behalf of children and families. Dr. Willis’s work cuts across many areas including clinical child, pediatric, developmental and family psychology. Through her publications, clinical work, and mentoring/teaching she has changed policy at the local, national and international level. She has advocated for children’s rights at the United Nations, developed programs on prevention and early intervention for Native American children living on reservations, and established services promoting the wellbeing of children with developmental disabilities, chronic illness, and those who have suffered from maltreatment.

The APF Division 37 Diane J. Willis Early Career Award supports talented young psychologists making contributions towards informing, advocating for, and improving the mental health and well-being of children and families particularly through policy.

Program Goals

The APF Division 37 Diane J. Willis Early Career Award Advances public understanding of mental health and improve the well-being of children and families through policy and service. Encourages promising early career psychologists to continue work in this area.

Funding Specifics

One $2,000 award

Eligibility Requirements

Applicants must be: psychologists with an Ed.D., Psy.D., or Ph.D. from an accredited university no more than 7 years postdoctoral

Evaluation Criteria

Nominations will be evaluated on: Conformance with stated program goals and qualifications stated above-Magnitude of professional accomplishment in advancing public understanding of mental health and improves the well-being of children and families through policy and service.

Nomination Requirements

Nomination letter outlining the nominee’s career contributions: Current CV, Two letters of support, Nomination must be submitted as a single PDF document.

Submission Process and Deadline


Please be advised that APF does not provide feedback to grant applicants or award nominees on their proposals or nominations.

Please contact Parie Kadir, Program Officer, at pkadir@apa.org with questions.

CYF Call for Nominations (2014-2016)

The Committee on Children, Youth, and Families (CYF) is anticipating two vacancies in 2014. CYF welcomes nominations from individuals interested in issues advancing psychology as a science and profession in the area of promoting the health and human welfare of children, youth and families. The Committee is interested in candidates with substantial experience and demonstrated experience in applying psychological knowledge to the well being and optimal development of children, youth, and families. Candidates are sought who have particular expertise in contemporary issues facing children, youth, and families in the context of their socio-emotional and cognitive development and mental health. Additionally, candidates who have particular expertise in culturally and linguistically diverse, understudied, underserved and diverse populations are especially encouraged to apply. The Committee also strongly encourages candidates with expertise in partnering with community, professional, government, or other types of organizations to apply

Members are expected to participate in targeted committee projects directly related to CYF’s work and mission and to APA as a whole. The current theme of Committee projects is “systems affecting families.” The Committee has adopted a broad focus on evidence-based behavioral integration within the health care system, including program delivery in settings most often frequented by children on a regular basis. This focus includes consideration of multi-cultural concerns and approaches, and attention to the parent-child dyad/family as the unit of analysis and focus of services or programs. Candidates are encouraged to visit the CYF website (http://www.apa.org/pi/families/committee) to learn more about CYF’s mission.

The Committee places a priority on maintaining representation within the Committee’s membership that reflects the diversity of psychology and society (e.g., ethnicity, culture, gender, age, disability, sexual orientation, geographic location, and those who are employed less than full time). The candidates selected to serve on the Committee will serve for three
years and will be required to attend two Committee meetings a year in Washington, DC, with expenses reimbursed by APA, and to participate in conference calls. The successful candidate is expected to attend, if possible, the informal CYF meeting held during the APA convention at the member’s own expense. In addition, members are expected to work on projects and Committee business between meetings.

Each candidate must submit:

(i) a letter indicating his/her willingness to serve;

(ii) a brief statement describing the applicant’s expertise and interest in one or two contemporary issues facing children, adolescents and families that they would bring to the Committee;

(iii) two letters supporting their nomination; and

(iv) a current curriculum vita.

Nomination materials including a letter from the candidate indicating a willingness to serve, an issues statement, two letters supporting their nomination, and a current CV must be received by:

Call for Nominations for the American Psychological Foundation’s 2014 Division 37 Diane J. Willis Early Career Award

**MONDAY, AUGUST 26, 2013.**

Nomination materials received after August 27 will be held for consideration the following year. Material may be sent to CYF Nominations, c/o Amani Chatman, Public Interest Directorate, American Psychological Association, 750 First Street, NE, Washington, DC, 20002-4242, by email achatman@apa.org or fax (202) 336-6040.

**Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation (OPRE)**

The Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation (OPRE) studies Administration for Children and Families (ACF) programs and the populations they serve through rigorous research and evaluation projects. These include evaluations of existing programs, evaluations of innovative approaches to helping low-income children and families, research syntheses and descriptive and exploratory studies.

**Spotlight on Teen Pregnancy Prevention**

**Evaluating a New Federal Teen Pregnancy Prevention Initiative.** Although teen birth rates are improving, in 2011 more than 300,000 children were born to teen mothers, ages 15 to 19, in the U.S. OPRE is building knowledge about what works to reduce teen pregnancy through an evaluation of a new federal initiative, the Personal Responsibility Education Program (PREP). The PREP program was created through the Affordable Care Act of 2010 and is designed to educate adolescents about both abstinence and contraception for the prevention of pregnancy. It is a tiered, evidence-based program. OPRE and the Family and Youth Services Bureau in ACF are collaborating to oversee an evaluation of the program.

The PREP Evaluation will

1) document how state PREP programs are designed and implemented,

2) measure and report on program performance, and

3) conduct rigorous impact evaluations of selected sites to estimate program effectiveness on key outcomes, such as rates of sexual initiation and abstinence, contraceptive use, and teen pregnancy. Beginning in 2013, reports will be released periodically.

**Understanding How to Prevent Repeat Teen Births.** Approximately 1 in 5 to teen mothers, ages 15 to 19, in the U.S. give birth to another child within 24 months of their last pregnancy. Such rapid repeat births can damage maternal health, child health, family economic self-sufficiency, and other outcomes. For teen mothers, rapid repeat births are correlated with not finishing high school. OPRE is overseeing two projects that address this outcome:

1. **The Home Visiting Evidence of Effectiveness** project is a systematic review of the effectiveness of home visiting program models on maternal and child outcomes. The review identified two home visiting models that affect the spacing between births: Nurse Family Partnership and Oklahoma’s Community-Based Family Resource and Support Program.

2. **The Mother and Infant Home Visiting Program Evaluation** (MIHOPE) is a national random assignment study looking at the impact selected Mother, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting program (MIECHV) models on a range of outcomes. The study will examine whether participation in home visiting programming has impacts on mothers’ reproductive health, including their access to contraceptives and spacing of subsequent births. The results of this study will be published in 2017. You can sign up for updates on the project here.

**Other News**

Policy Forum on Early Development and Education of Dual Language Learners: Recent Research Findings and Recommendations
On May 14, the Center for Early Care and Education Research: Dual Language Learners (CECER-DLL) will host a Policy Forum on Capitol Hill to highlight and expand the work of the CECER-DLL in relation to research and policy. The Center is a cooperative agreement awarded by OPRE to the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill. The primary goal of the Center is to advance the research field to improve assessment, child care, and education for dual language learners (DLLs) from birth through five years of age.

16th Annual Welfare Research and Evaluation Conference.

Registration is open for OPRE’s 16th Annual Welfare Research and Evaluation Conference (WREC) to be held May 29 - 31, 2013 at the Omni Shoreham Hotel in Washington, DC. This year’s WREC features a dynamic agenda highlighting research in several areas, including:

- TANF Education, Training and Success in the Labor Market
- Child and Youth Well-Being-Fatherhood, Relationships and Strengthening Families
- Building and Using Evidence on Social Programs
- Approaches to Alleviate Poverty and Strengthen the Safety Net

Other conference highlights will include:

- Keynote address by Dr. Jack Shonkoff (Harvard Center on the Developing Child) on the lingering effects of adverse early childhood experiences
- Facilitated roundtable discussions on diverse topics, including TANF-funded subsidized employment, using performance management data, social impact bonds, and many more.
- Emerging Scholars Poster Session highlighting the work of scholars who are early in their careers.

The WREC, which is free and open to the public, is intended for a broad audience, particularly Federal, State and local government practitioners and researchers. For those unable to attend in person, select sessions will be live streamed via the internet.

To register or to find out more, please visit www.wrconference.net. Advance registration will be open through May 10th.

OPRE’s Behavioral Interventions to Advance Self-Sufficiency (BIAS) Initiative Highlighted in Government Executive. A recent Collaborative Forum event examined behavioral interventions in government. In response, an article in the Government Executive newsletter highlights three projects applying and examining behavioral interventions. The article, “3 Governments Playing on Human Nature to Improve Program Performance” discusses efforts underway in the UK, OPRE’s Behavioral Interventions to Advance Self-Sufficiency (BIAS) project and work done by the Texas Child Support Division as part of the BIAS project.

Recently Released Reports. Report to Congress on Dual Language Learners in Head Start and Early Head Start Programs.

In response to a requirement in the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007 (P.L. 110-134), this report describes the characteristics, services received, and well-being of Head Start children and families who speak a language other than English at home, approximately a quarter of all children served by Head Start in the 2007-2008 program year. Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. assisted ACF in compiling and analyzing data to develop the report. The full Report to Congress and an Executive Summary are available on the OPRE website.

A Framework for Thinking about Job Search Assistance Programs. How can federal programs support low-income and low-skilled individuals find and keep employment? OPRE released a new brief that describes an overarching framework for thinking about job search assistance programs, including an overview of service delivery methods, key program components, and the key steps that make up the job search process. This brief was written by Robin Koralek and Jacob Klerman and produced by Abt Associates. Read Full Brief.

Two Reports on disseminating findings from human services research OPRE released a review of literature, titled "Human Services Research Dissemination: What Works? A companion piece”, “The Value-Added Research Dissemination Framework” builds on this literature to construct a framework for dissemination. The literature review and framework are designed to assist researchers in ensuring that their work reaches its intended audiences. Both products were authored by Jane Macoubrie and Courtney Harrison and created by Public Strategies. Read Full Reports.

GO TO PAGE 58 FOR MORE INFORMATION ABOUT THE 2013 APA CONVENTION!
FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES

The Science Directorate of the American Psychological Association is managing two award programs for graduate student research in 2013. For both awards, applications are welcome from graduate students of psychology in any research specialty area.

The application deadline for both awards is Sept. 16, 2013.

If you have questions, please contact the Science Directorate via email (science@apa.org) or telephone at (202) 336-6000.

APA Dissertation Research Awards

The Dissertation Research Award assists science-oriented doctoral students of psychology with research costs. In 2013, the Science Directorate will grant up to 30 awards of $1,000 each, as well as several awards of up to $5,000 each to students whose dissertation research reflects excellence in scientific psychology.

For more details about this award, including eligibility requirements and application materials, visit:


Early Graduate Student Researcher Awards

The Early Graduate Student Research Awards, sponsored by the APA Science Student Council, recognize students who demonstrate outstanding research abilities early in their graduate training (i.e., within the first three years of doctoral study). Both overall research experience and specific completed research projects are considered in selecting awardees.

Up to three awards are given each year, drawn from basic science, applied science, and interdisciplinary science areas. Each Early Graduate Student Research Award is in the amount of $1,000.

For more details about the awards, including eligibility requirements and application materials, visit:

http://www.apa.org/about/awards/scistucoun-earlyre.aspx

ELIZABETH MUNSTERBERG KOPPITZ FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

About the American Psychological Foundation (APF)

APF provides financial support for innovative research and programs that enhance the power of psychology to elevate the human condition and advance human potential both now and in generations to come.

Since 1953, APF has supported a broad range of scholarships and grants for students and early career psychologists as well as research and program grants that use psychology to improve people’s lives.

APF encourages applications from individuals who represent diversity in race, ethnicity, gender, age, disability, and sexual orientation.

About the Elizabeth Munsterberg Koppitz Fellowship Program

The Elizabeth Munsterberg Koppitz Fellowship Program provides fellowships and scholarships for graduate student research in the area of child psychology.

APF supports original, innovative research and projects. Although APF favors unique, independent work, the

Foundation does fund derivative projects that are part of larger studies.

Program Goals

The Elizabeth Munsterberg Koppitz Fellowship Program

- Nurtures excellent young scholars for careers in areas of psychology, such as child-clinical, pediatric, school, educational, and developmental psychology
- Supports scholarly work contributing to the advancement of knowledge in these areas

Funding Specifics

- Several fellowships of up to $25,000 each
- Support for one year only
- Only one application accepted from any one institution in any given year
- Tuition waiver/coverage from home institution

APF does not allow institutional indirect costs or overhead costs. Applicants may use grant monies for direct administrative costs of their proposed project.

Eligibility Requirements

Applicants must:

- Have completed doctoral candidacy (documentation required)
- Have demonstrated research competence and commitment in the area of child psychology
- Receive IRB approval from host institution before funding can be awarded if human participants are involved

Evaluation Criteria

Proposals will be evaluated on:

- Conformance with stated pro-
gram goals
- Magnitude of incremental contribution
- Quality of proposed work
- Applicant’s demonstrated scholarship and research competence

Proposal Requirements
Title and description of proposed project to include goal, relevant background, target population, methods, and anticipated outcomes
- Format: not to exceed 5 pages
- 1 inch margins, 12 point Times New Roman font;
- Relevant background, literature review, specific aims, significance;
- Methods section (The method section must be detailed enough so that the design, assessments, and procedures can be evaluated);
- Implications section
- Timeline for execution
- Full budget and justification
- Current CV
- Two letters of recommendation (one from a graduate advisor and the other from the department chair or Director of Graduate Studies)

Submission Process and Deadline
Submit a completed application online at http://forms.apa.org/apf/grants/

Submission Deadline: November 15, 2013

Please be advised that APF does not provide feedback to applicants on their proposals.

Questions about this program should be directed to Samantha Edington, Program Officer, at sedington@apa.org.

FUNDING OPPORTUNITY
Fordham University invites proposals for the "New Perspectives on the Psychology of Understanding" funding initiative.

Our aim is to encourage research from both new and established scholars working on projects related to understanding in its many forms. This $1.2 million RFP is intended to support empirical work in cognitive, developmental, educational, and other areas of psychology. Proposals can request between $50,000 and $225,000 for projects not to exceed two years in duration. We intend to make 7-8 awards. For more information, please visit: www.varietiesofunderstanding.com

Letter of Intent Deadline: November 1st, 2013

THE 2013 FACULTY LOAN REPAYMENT PROGRAM (FLRP)
The 2013 Faculty Loan Repayment Program (FLRP) application cycle is scheduled to open soon. If you know of a health professions faculty member who may be eligible, refer them to the email signup page to receive future Faculty Loan Repayment Program notifications.

Who is eligible? Faculty members from disadvantaged backgrounds with a professional health care degree/certificate may receive up to $40K in loan repayment assistance in exchange for teaching at educational institutions that provide training for health care professionals.

For more information: Check out the FLRP factsheet. As in previous years, this program is expected to be competitive. If there are more qualified applicants than available fund-

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS: LIZETTE PETERSON-HOMER MEMORIAL RESEARCH GRANT
This program supports research into the psychological and behavioral aspects of the prevention of injuries for children and adolescents. Both intentional and non-intentional injuries are of interest, and illustrative topic areas include etiological precursors and contextual contributors to injury, development of measurement tools, development and evaluation of interventions, and dissemination/implementation of such interventions.

APF supports original, innovative research and projects. Although APF favors unique, independent work, the Foundation does fund derivative projects that are part of larger studies.

Program Goals
The Lizette Peterson-Homer Memorial Research Grant:
- Increases understanding of the nature and etiology of injuries in children
- Supports development and evaluation of intervention techniques in this area
- Supports dissemination and implementation of proven techniques in this area

Amount: Up to $5,000

APF does not allow institutional indirect costs or overhead costs, principal investigator stipends, travel or publication-related expenses. Ap-
Applicants may use grant monies for direct administrative costs of their proposed project.

**Eligibility Requirements**

Applicants must:
- Be a student and/or researcher who deals with the psychological components of injury and death in children, and/or the prevention of physical injury in children and adolescents
- Have demonstrated research competence and area commitment
- Obtain IRB approval from host institution before funding can be awarded if human participants are involved

**Evaluation Criteria**

Proposals will be evaluated on:
- Conformance with stated program goals
- Magnitude of incremental contribution
- Quality of proposed work
- Applicant’s demonstrated scholarship and research competence

**Proposal Requirements**

A research proposal, four single-spaced pages (all in one MS Word document). To include:
- A 100-word abstract
- Description of the project with introduction, methods, and procedure
- A detailed budget, and
- References
- A current curriculum vitae
- Supporting faculty supervisor letter (if the applicant is a student), and
- Proof of IRB approval or statement that IRB approval is pending.

Submit a completed application to:
Paul Robins, Ph.D.
robins@email.chop.edu
Phone 215-590-7594

**Deadline: October 1, 2013.**

Questions about this program should be directed to Parie Kadir, Program Officer, at pkadir@apa.org.

Please be advised that APF does not provide feedback to applicants on their proposals.

**DISSERTATION GRANT**

With support from the National Science Foundation (NSF), the AERA Grants Program announces its Dissertation Grants competition. The program seeks to stimulate research on U.S. education issues using data from the large-scale, national and international data sets supported by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), NSF, and other federal agencies, and to increase the number of education researchers using these data sets. The program supports research projects that are quantitative in nature, include the analysis of existing data from NCES, NSF or other federal agencies, and have U.S. education policy relevance.

**Description**

AERA invites education-related dissertation proposals using NCES, NSF, and other federal databases. Dissertation Grants are available for advanced doctoral students and are intended to support the student while writing the doctoral dissertation. Applications are encouraged from a variety of disciplines, such as but not limited to, education, sociology, economics, psychology, demography, statistics, and psychometrics.

The Governing Board for the AERA Grants Program has established the following four strands of emphasis for proposals. Applicants are encouraged to submit proposals that:

- develop or benefit from new quantitative measures or methodological approaches for addressing education issues
- incorporate subject matter expertise, especially when studying science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) learning
- analyze TIMSS, PISA, or other international data resources
- include the integration and analysis of more than one data set

Research projects related to at least one of the strands above and to science and/or mathematics education are especially encouraged. Other topics of interest include policies and practices related to student achievement in STEM, contextual factors in education, educational participation and persistence (kindergarten through graduate school), early childhood education, and postsecondary education. The research project must include the analysis of data from at least one of the large-scale, nationally or internationally representative data sets such as those supported by NCES, NSF, and the U.S. Department of Labor, the U.S. Census Bureau, and the National Institutes of Health. The data set(s) of interest must be available for analysis at the time of application (public or restricted-use files are permissible). Additional data sets may be used in conjunction with the obligatory federal data set. If international data sets are used, the study must include U.S. education.

**Eligibility.**

Applicants for Dissertation grants...
Grants may be U.S. citizens or U.S. permanent residents enrolled in a doctoral program. Non-U.S. citizens enrolled in a doctoral program at a U.S. institution are also eligible to apply. Applicants should be advanced doctoral students at the dissertation writing stage. Underrepresented racial and ethnic minority researchers are strongly encouraged to apply.

Awards

Awards for Dissertation Grants are up to $20,000 for 1-year projects. Grants are not renewable. In accordance with AERA’s agreement with the funding agency, institutions may not charge indirect costs on these awards.

In addition to the dissertation grant award, grantees will participate in a 2-day conference in Washington, DC. The conference will provide unique professional development experiences for grantees, including highly qualified speakers on topics of education policy and career development, presentations of dissertation research by former grantees, and interaction with the Governing Board and federal agency staff. This conference is specifically for AERA grantees, and travel expenses will be paid by AERA.

Grantees will present their research at a poster session during the AERA Annual Meeting and will participate in a one-day capstone workshop. Grantees must include travel funds (up to $1,000) in their grant budget to attend the AERA Annual Meeting held in Spring.

Application Requirements

All applications for Dissertation Grants must include:

- Information on the applicant (contact and background information)
- Abstract of the proposed research project
- Statement of how this research advances the current state of knowledge in the field, substantively or methodologically
- Research proposal (limited to 4 single-spaced pages) that addresses the following:
  - Problem statement/policy issue and its importance
  - Theoretical or conceptual framework for the research
  - Brief review of relevant research/policy literature
  - Research questions, including justification for the use of the data set(s) to analyze the research question(s) of interest; hypotheses to be tested
  - Description of methodology including proposed data set and criteria for selecting data file, sample (e.g., groups used, exclusions to sample, and estimated sample sizes), selection of variables and rationale for using them, analytic techniques, and feasibility of the study
  - Connections between the potential findings and the policy issue
  - Brief dissemination plan for this research, including ways in which to make the research known to influence policy
  - Conceptual or figural model depicting the design of the study
  - Statistical model or formulas, appropriately defined, that are connected to the conceptual model, including justification for inclusion of variables into the model(s)
  - Categorized list of variables from the NSF, NCES, or other federal data set(s) to be used
  - References cited in the proposal narrative and models
  - Proposed budget
    - Applicant’s curriculum vitae, no longer than two pages, to include the following:
    - Research and academic employment history
    - Relevant graduate courses in statistics and methodology
    - Relevant publications and presentations
    - Relevant professional affiliations and/or memberships
    - Substantive letter of support from applicant’s faculty dissertation advisor that includes an indication of the student’s current progress toward the degree and expected date of completion, and of the student’s potential for success in his or her anticipated career path. If the applicant is from a discipline other than education, a second letter of support from a faculty sponsor with an education research background is also required. Note that letters may be sent electronically to the AERA Grants Program Manager or in hard copy but must be received by the deadline. Applicants are encouraged to ask their advisors early for letters of recommendation.

Application Submission

Proposals must be submitted electronically. Applicants should read carefully the entire Call for Proposals and the Submission Instructions prior to starting the online submission process. Applicants will be asked to enter specific information in text boxes and upload doc-
The deadline for submission is 11:59pm Pacific Time. Applicants are encouraged to submit proposals in advance of the deadline. Submission must be made electronically on the AERA Dissertation Grant submission web page. Contact grantspro-gram@aera.net if you have questions regarding the application or submission process. NOTE: all awards are contingent upon AERA’s receiving continued federal funding.

For more information about these grants, go to AERA’s Call for Proposals.

Next Application Deadline: Thursday, September 5, 2013 at 11:59pm Pacific Time

Call for Papers

An International Journal of Theory & Research

Special Issue: Problematic Identity Processes

This special issue invites manuscripts that investigate the anxiety, distress, and difficulties that are sometimes encountered in the identity development process. For some identity development is a relatively smooth and rewarding process of exploring and committing to the roles, goals, and values that have the potential to give one’s life direction and purpose. For others, it can be a tumultuous time of existential anxiety and depression, fraught with fears and uncertainty leading to a condition that has been labeled as Identity Disorder (DSM III-R) or Identity Problem (DSM IV). We invite the submission of manuscripts that explore how and why identity development can sometimes involve and/or lead to psychopathology and maladjustment, as well as how this distressing condition might be prevented or ameliorated.

Submissions should be made through the journal’s website on ScholarOne: http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/hidn

When submitting a manuscript, indicate that it is intended for this Special Issue.

Due Date:
August 15, 2013

Questions and inquiries should be directed to the Special Issue Guest Editors: Steven L. Berman: sberman@ucf.edu or Marilyn J. Montgomery: montgomm@fiu.edu

You are welcome and encouraged to email an abstract in advance of submitting a full manuscript to the website, for feedback and guidance.

Frontiers

A Research Topic of Frontiers in Psychology, co-edited by Yusuke Moriguchi (Joetsu University of Education, Japan), Philip D. Zelazo (University of Minnesota, USA) and Nicolas Chevalier (University of Colorado Boulder, USA), will be devoted to research investigating the development of executive function during childhood.

Executive function refers to the goal-oriented regulation of one’s own thoughts, actions, and emotions. Its importance is attested by its contribution to the development of other cognitive skills (e.g., theory of mind), social abilities (e.g., peer interactions), and academic achievement (e.g., mathematics), and by the consequences of deficits in executive function (which are observed in wide range of developmental disorders, such as attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder and autism). Over the last decade, there have been growing interest in the development of executive function, and an expanding body of research has shown that executive function develops rapidly during the preschool years, with adult-level performance being achieved during adolescence or later. This recent work, together with experimental research showing the effects of interventions targeting executive function, has yielded important insights into the neurocognitive processes underlying executive function. Given the complexity of the construct of executive function, however, and the multiplicity of underlying processes, there are often inconsistencies in the way that executive function is defined and studied. This inconsistency has hampered communication among researchers from various fields.

This Research Topic is intended to bridge this gap and provide an opportunity for researchers from different perspectives to discuss recent advances in understanding childhood executive function. Researchers using various methods, including, behavioral experiments, neuroimaging, eye-tracking, computer simulation, observational methods, and question-
niares, are encouraged to contribute original empirical research. In addition to original empirical articles, theoretical reviews and opinions/ perspective articles on promising future directions are welcome. We hope that researchers from different areas, such as developmental psychology, educational psychology, experimental psychology, neuropsychology, neuroscience, psychiatry, computational science, etc., will be represented in the special issue.

The deadline for abstract submission is September 30th, 2013.
The deadline for manuscript submission is November 30th, 2013.

CALL FOR PAPERS: THE MEASUREMENT OF VIOLENCE & VICTIMIZATION

A Special Issue for Psychology of Violence

Edited by John Grych and Sherry Hamby

Psychology of Violence invites manuscripts for a special issue on the measurement of violence and victimization, including self-report, observational, and experimental techniques for assessing violence and mechanisms proposed to cause violence. It is our hope that this special issue will help propel the study of violence forward and become a resource for anyone looking for guidance on conducting state-of-the-art research on violence.

Violence research was launched in part by the realization that people would disclose involvement in violence on confidential self-report surveys, whether this involvement involved victimization, perpetration, or both. Many surveys have now been developed to measure violence and related constructs. The field has also seen advances in experimental approaches to the study of violence, from Milgram’s obedience experiment to modern techniques such as the Hot Sauce paradigm. Our success in measuring violence has transformed research, intervention, and policy. However, existing measurement strategies have also produced unresolved controversies, such as questions about gender patterns in intimate partner violence and the impact of exposure to media violence. No field of science can rest on its laurels and the need for innovation is ever present.

This issue is intended to address the primary methodological limitations getting in the way of better understanding the causes, rates, and consequences of violence, especially those pertaining to measurement, and to offer potential solutions to these problems. It will focus on all facets of the measurement of violence, including but not limited to those suggested below. We conceptualize violence broadly, including child maltreatment, intimate partner violence, bullying, community violence, teen dating violence, elder abuse, sexual aggression, conventional crime, psychological aggression, suicidal behavior, and stalking, and papers addressing any form of violence are welcome.

Topics may include but are not limited to:

- New approaches to the measurement of any form of violence or victimization and the mechanisms hypothesized to cause violence
- Assessment of aggression and violence in laboratory settings
- Innovative methods for studying mechanisms hypothesized to cause violence (e.g., implicit cognitive processes, biological/genetic factors)
- Measuring violence equally validly across groups that vary by gender, ethnicity, race, culture, sexual orientation or other groups who may experience different rates, risks, and consequences for violence
- Developmental considerations in assessing violence
- Papers focusing on conceptual or definitional issues
- Challenges and approaches for obtaining accurate disclosure of violence & victimization
- Diagnostic accuracy (such as estimates of sensitivity and specificity)
- Ethical issues in violence measurement
- Reviews of the state of violence measurement within or across sub-disciplines

Manuscripts can be submitted through the journal’s submission portal. Please note in your cover letter that you are submitting for the special issue.

Deadline for submitting manuscripts is August 25, 2013.

Inquiries regarding topic or scope for the special issue or for other manuscripts can be sent to:
John Grych, john.grych@marquette.edu< or Sherry Hamby, sherry.hamby@sewanee.edu
The goal of the Division 7 Mentoring Program is to provide informal mentoring by mid-career or senior scholars to interested early-career individuals, typically from outside their working unit. Potential mentors are APA Division 7 members who are at the Associate Professor level or above (or the equivalent for mentors who are in applied fields, private industry, etc.). Potential mentees may be post-docs or Assistant Professors and individuals at this level working in applied jobs. Every effort will be made to match mentors and mentees on research or professional area, interests, and availability. The nature of this mentoring would be negotiated between the two individuals, but could include advice on job opportunities/hunting, setting up a laboratory, publishing, obtaining grants, the tenure process, negotiating work-career issues, and/or other career-related issues. Mentors and mentees might meet at a conference (e.g., APA, SRCD), or discuss issues by phone, Skype, email, or any other method that is convenient for them. Visit the web-site for more information and to sign up.
CONGRATULATIONS TO OUR MEMBERS

Charles M. Super, professor of human development and family studies in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and professor of pediatrics at the UConn Health Center was recently elected to the U.S. National Committee for Psychology, an organization supported by the National Academy of Sciences. As one of 12 members on the committee, Super will represent the United States' psychological science community with the International Union of Psychological Science (IUPsyS), a worldwide organization charged with the development, representation, and advancement of psychology as a basic and applied science.

Celia B. Fisher, Marie Ward Doty Endowed Chair and Professor of Psychology, was named a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science http://www.aaas.org/

Kathleen McCartney is president-elect of Smith College and become a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.


Barbara Rogoff received the 2013 Distinguished Contributions to Cultural and Contextual Factors in Child Development Award, from the Society for Research in Child Development.

Joyce Benenson’s research was highlighted in Slate.

Doctoral Candidate Rachel Manes was awarded the 2013 American Psychological Foundation Ungerleider/Zimbardo Travel Scholarship and she has joined DASH-NY, New York’s Obesity Prevention Coalition and Policy Center, as a Junior Policy Associate at the New York Academy of Medicine.

Susan Gelman was inducted into the National Academy of Sciences.

Nancy Eisenberg is president elect of APS.

Jacquelynne S. Eccles is moving to the University of California at Irvine in the fall as a Distinguished University Professor. She is also receiving the 2013 APF Gold Medal for Life Achievement in Psychology in the Public Interest at the APA meeting in Hawaii.

Carol Dweck was inducted into the National Academy of Sciences.

David Uttal and Catherine Haden presented on Developing Early Interest and Skill in STEM: Hands-On Activities and Parent-Child Conversations to lawmakers and their staff at a co-sponsored NSF-SRC event on Capitol Hill.

WE’RE ON FACEBOOK

We want to be “Liked.” Please visit our Facebook page and “like” us. We are building our Facebook presence to provide opportunities to share ideas about developmental psychology and exciting findings from your lab as well as to discuss current developmental psychology studies. However, we can only grow and become a valuable resource if you join our page and participate!
Dr. Sarah Mangelsdorf’s research investigates the social and emotional development of infant young children. She has published over 50 articles and chapters, which have appeared in the top developmental outlets (e.g., Developmental Psychology; Child Development). Dr. Mangelsdorf’s work provides theoretically and empirically rich and thoughtful investigations of the interactions of child temperament and parenting variables on attachment and child outcomes, in both typical and atypical circumstances. Her work on coparenting is particularly unique and has showed how temperament of the child can impact the nature of the coparenting relationship. Her novel approaches to the study of attachment and temperament have now become the norm for research in the area.

In addition to her outstanding and highly regarded published scholarship, Dr. Mangelsdorf has contributed to the field of psychology in her outstanding teaching and mentoring of students, her active role of service to the profession (e.g., member of APA Division 7’s executive committee at a time of significant transition and growth for this division; much reviewing and editorial work), and most notably as Dean, Weinberg College of Arts and Sciences, Northwestern University (since 2008).

Dr. Glenn Roisman has an exceptional program of research focused on two aspects of attachment relationships: the impact of early relationship experiences on psychological adjustment in adulthood and the appropriate assessment of attachment in adulthood. His research on the enduring impact of early experiences has the richness of being multi-method and multi-informant. His work has used methodology not typically used in attachment research (neuroimaging, autonomic processing, behavioral genetics) to model family influences on personality and other psychological outcomes. Dr. Roisman also is one of the Co-PIs on the Study of Early Child Care and Youth Development. From this program of research Dr. Roisman has made sustained contributions to the research literature by consistently publishing in the top developmental research journals. Because of his work on developmental transitions in relationships, he has become one of the most prolific and influential researchers examining attachment relationships. Two prestigious international awards highlight the important impact of Dr. Roisman’s research on the field of developmental psychology. In 2007, he received the Society for Research in Child Development Award of Early Research Contributions. In 2010, he received the APA Division 7 Boyd McCandless Young Scientist Award. These awards from two different developmental psychology groups demonstrate the critical nature of his research contributions to our field.

Dr. Roisman has conducted ground-breaking research on adult attachment. He demonstrated that the traditional adult attachment categories have limited validity. Instead, his pioneering research demonstrated that dimensional assessments of the core attachment constructs yield critical information about adult attachment. This new method for assessment adult attachment is now state of the art in adult attachment research. Thus, his work on adult attachment has already had an impact on our field and that impact will be felt for years to come.

Dr. Roisman has made sustained contributions to the science of developmental psychology since receiving his PhD in 2002. He has published 53 peer-reviewed journal articles, most in top tier developmental journals. He has published 11 invited chapters, with two others currently in process. His work is funded by NICHD. Finally, Dr. Roisman’s impact on the field of developmental psychology is highlighted by the receipt of two of the most prestigious awards for early career developmental psychologists: the Society for Research in Child Development Award for Early Research Contributions and the APA Division 7 Boyd McCandless Young Scientist Award.
## Upcoming Conferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NeuroDevNet’s Annual Brain Development Conference</td>
<td>September 29 - October 1, 2013</td>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td><a href="http://www.neurodevnet.ca/events">http://www.neurodevnet.ca/events</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State’s 21st Annual Symposium on Family Issues</td>
<td>October 7-8, 2013</td>
<td>University Park, PA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.pop.psu.edu/events/2013/nsfi">http://www.pop.psu.edu/events/2013/nsfi</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Society for the Study of Emerging**
**Upcoming Conferences**

**Adulthood: 6th Biennial Conference**  
October 9-11, 2013  
Chicago, Illinois  
http://www.ssea.org/

**24th Annual Conference for the Alliance of Universities for Democracy**  
October 13-15, 2013  
Sarajevo, Bosnia, Herzegovina  
http://www.audem.org/

**The 2013 Cognitive Development Society’s Biennial Meeting**  
October 18-19, 2013  
Memphis, TN  
http://www.cogdevsoc.org/

**39th Annual Conference of the Association for Moral Education**  
October 24-27, 2013  
Montreal, Canada  
http://www.amenetwork.org

**The 38th Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development**  
November 1-3, 2013  
Boston, MA  
http://www.bu.edu/bucld/

**The Society for the Study of Human Development: 8th Biennial Meeting**  
November 3-5, 2013  
Fort Lauderdale, FL  
http://www.sshdonline.org/

November 7-8, 2013  
College Park, MD  
http://www.marces.org/conference/commoncore/index.htm

**The 3rd Annual International Conference on Stigma**  
November 30, 2013  
Washington, D.C.  
http://www.whocanyoutell.org/

**Budapest CEU Conference on Cognitive Development**  
January 9 - 11, 2014  
Budapest, Hungary  
http://www.asszisztencia.hu/bcccd/

**Early Years Conference 2014**  
January 30 - February 1, 2014  
Vancouver, BC  
http://www.interprofessional.ubc.ca/EarlyYears2014/

**3rd Annual International Conference on Cognitive and Behavioral Psychology**  
February 24-25, 2014  
Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia  
http://www.cognitive-behavior.org

**International Conference on Shaken Baby Syndrome/Abusive Head Trauma**  
May 4 - 6, 2014  
Paris, France  
http://www.dontshake.org
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121st Annual APA Convention Program
Developmental Psychology
(Division 7)

Honolulu Hawai’i
July 31-August 4, 2013
Earn Continuing Education Credits with Division 7

Preconvention Workshop: Children and the Law
(4 Continuing Education Credits)

Tuesday, July 30th, 2013
8:00AM – 11:50AM

Description: This intermediate workshop presents the latest research and theory on children's disclosure, deception, memory, and suggestibility as relevant to child forensic interviewing. Recent innovations designed to facilitate children’s testimony in forensic interviews and court, and research examining the effects on children’s stress, accuracy, and perceived credibility will be described. Controversies, points of agreement, legal issues, and application to practice will be addressed from legal and clinical perspectives. Participants will learn developmentally sensitive methods for questioning child witnesses and best practices.

ENROLLMENT IS NOW OPEN!
Visit: http://www.apa.org/convention/ce-workshops
or call the CEP Office at 800-374-2721, ext. 5991.

Continuing Education Convention Sessions:
During the APA Convention Division 7 along with the APA Office of Continuing Education in Psychology and the Continuing Education Committee are offering three sessions to earn Continuing Education credits.

- Spanking and Its Consequences for Children
  Wednesday, July 31st, 2013 9:00AM Convention Center RM 309

- Influence of Caregiver Factors on Early Child Development
  Wednesday, July 31st, 2013 11:00AM Convention Center RM 309

- Trauma, Stress, and Cortisol Across the Life Span
  Friday, August 2nd, 2013 12:00PM Convention Centre RM 302A

For more information on CE credits please visit: http://www.apa.org/convention/
You are cordially invited to attend the
APA Division 7
Developmental Psychology
Social Hour

APA Convention 2013, Honolulu, Hawaii
Saturday, August 3, 2013, 5:00-6:00 p.m.
Hilton Hawaiian Village Beach Resort – Honolulu Suite III

All are welcome to attend!!

Honoring the 2013 & 2014 Award Recipients:

2013
Boyd McCandless Early Career Scientist Award: Nicole McNeil
G. Stanley Hall Award for Distinguished Contribution to Developmental Psychology: Rand Conger
Urie Bronfenbrenner Award for Lifetime Contribution to Developmental Psychology: Richard Lerner
Mentor Award in Developmental Psychology: Alan Sroufe
Eleanor Maccoby Book Award in Developmental Psychology: Robert LeVine
Dissertation Award in Developmental Psychology: David Yeager

2014
Boyd McCandless Early Career Scientist Award: Adriana Galvan
G. Stanley Hall Award for Distinguished Contribution to Developmental Psychology: Michael Lamb
Urie Bronfenbrenner Award for Lifetime Contribution to Developmental Psych.: Ann Masten & Adele Diamond
Mentor Award in Developmental Psychology: Susan Carey
Eleanor Maccoby Book Award in Developmental Psychology: Paul Harris & Barbara Rogoff
Dissertation Award in Developmental Psychology: Hyowon Gweon

Time and Locations of Award Addresses:
Boyd McCandless (8/3 3:00pm Hilton Honolulu SuiteIII);
G. Stanley Hall Award (8/2 9:00am Convention Center Room 326B);
Bronfenbrenner Award 8/3 4:00pm (Hilton Honolulu Suite III).
If you would like further information, please contact Angela Evans (aevans@brocku.ca) or Leslie Carver (lcarver@ucsd.edu)
Join Division 7: Developmental Psychology!

- Always free for undergraduate and graduate student affiliates
- Free for members for the first year
- $24 per year for members after the first year (Membership in APA Not Required)

For more information on Division 7’s activities or to join, visit: http://www.apa.org/divisions/div7/

---

121st American Psychological Association Annual Convention  
Honolulu, HI

Division 7 Program Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Tues | 07/30 8:00 AM-11:50 AM | Sheraton Waikiki Hotel     | Preconvention Workshop: Children and the Law  
*Pre-registration Required | Gail Goodman  
Jodi Quas  
Bradley McAuliff |
|      |               |                           |                                             |                                   |
| Wed  | 07/31 8:00 AM-8:50 AM | Convention Center Kamehameha Exhibit Hall | Poster Session: Infancy and Childhood |                                   |
|      | 9:00AM-10:50 AM | Convention Center Room 309 | Symposium: Spanking and Its Consequences for Children  
*Earn CE Credits* | George Holden  
Shawna J. Lee  
Inna Altschul  
Elizabeth Gershoff |
|      | 11:00 AM-12:50 PM | Convention Center Room 309 | Symposium: Influence of Caregiver Factors on Early Child Development  
*Earn CE Credits* | Yvonne H. Roberts  
Christina A. Campbell  
Cindy Y. Huang |
<p>| Thurs | 08/01 8:00 AM-8:50 AM | Convention Center Kamehameha Exhibit Hall | Poster Session: Adolescence |                                   |
|      | 9:00 AM-9:50 AM | Convention Center Kamehameha Exhibit Hall | Poster Session: Emerging Adulthood and Parenting |                                   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thurs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/01</td>
<td>10:00 AM-</td>
<td>Convention Center</td>
<td>Symposium: Young Researchers in Developmental Psychology – Selected Paper Symposium</td>
<td>Elizabeth C. Penela, Rebecca H. Post, Meredith A. Henry, Melissa N. Richards, Su Yeon Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:50 AM</td>
<td>Room 315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>08/02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 AM-</td>
<td>Convention Center</td>
<td>Invited Address: G. Stanley Gall Award for Distinguished Contribution to Developmental Psychology</td>
<td>Rand Conger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:50 AM</td>
<td>Room 326B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 PM-</td>
<td>Convention Center</td>
<td>Invited Symposium: Trauma, Stress, and Cortisol Across the Life Span <em>Earn CE Credits</em></td>
<td>Jodi A. Quas, Robert S. Stawski, Douglas A. Granger, Avron Spiro III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:50 PM</td>
<td>Room 302A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 PM-</td>
<td>Hilton Hawaiian Village Beach Resort</td>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting (Executive Committee Only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:50 PM</td>
<td>Kahili Suite I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 PM-</td>
<td>Hilton Hawaiian Village Beach Resort</td>
<td>Business Meeting (Division 7 Members Only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:50 PM</td>
<td>Nautilus Suite I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>08/03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 AM-</td>
<td>Convention Center</td>
<td>Invited Symposium: Neurological and Physiological Implications of Maltreatment</td>
<td>Layla Banihashemi, Victor G. Carrion, Martin H. Teicher, Sharon G. Portwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:50 AM</td>
<td>Room 318B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 AM-</td>
<td>Convention Center</td>
<td>Presidential Invited Address</td>
<td>Paul Harris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:50 AM</td>
<td>Room 318B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 PM-</td>
<td>Hilton Hawaiian Village Beach Resort</td>
<td>Invited Address: Boyd McCandless Young Scientist Award</td>
<td>Nicole McNeil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:50 PM</td>
<td>Honolulu Suite III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 PM-</td>
<td>Hilton Hawaiian Village Beach Resort</td>
<td>Invited Address: Urie Bronfenbrenner Award for Lifetime Contribution to Developmental Psychology</td>
<td>Richard Lerner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:50 PM</td>
<td>Honolulu Suite III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 PM-</td>
<td>Hilton Hawaiian Village Beach Resort</td>
<td>Social Hour</td>
<td>All are welcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:50 PM</td>
<td>Honolulu Suite III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>