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As you will see in the newsletter, we have a fantastic program planned for this year’s APA meeting in Denver. We continue to be well represented in the interdivisional sessions thanks to our great program chair this year, Jennifer Fredricks. I encourage everyone to come. Denver is lovely in the summer.

It has been a troubled year for APA and many members continue to be concerned about the future direction of our association. The fallout from the Hoffman Report is still a major concern. Our APA Council Reps, Suniya Luthar and Sarah Friedman, have gone well beyond the call of duty to do whatever they can to work for positive outcomes. I want to give them a very special thank you this year for their many efforts on our behalf and on behalf of the integrity of the APA. I know how stressful the year has been for them. We are fortunate to have such dedicated council reps.

I also want to take this opportunity to thank Gail Goodman for her many contributions to Division 7 over the last 6 years, as President-elect, President, and Past-President. This will be her last APA meeting as one of the “presidents.” It has been a real honor to work with her for the past 4 years. She has done so much for our Division that it is hard to fully acknowledge her influence. But perhaps one of her most long lasting influences will result from the many new committee chairs and leaders she has recruited onto our team, including Sonja Brubacher as Membership Chair and Lindsay Malloy as the new editor for our newsletter. Gail was also able to recruit Sue Hobbs to update our APA website. It has been quite amazing this year to watch these new team members take over their respective committees this year and go well beyond what we might have expected of them. Thank you Gail for recruiting such great team members and thank you to each of the new team members and volunteers for your amazing contributions this year.

I am not a very political person and am usually reluctant to comment on the national and international political scenes. But this past year has been terrifying, and I feel compelled to express my concern over the rise in fascist, racist, xenophobic, and extreme right wing rhetoric in the Western political world. I am particularly distressed by the ways in which this rhetoric is aimed at immigrants who are striving to find safe and healthy places to raise their children and protect their families. I live in a part of the world where extreme wealth surrounds me while nearby schools serving immigrant families from Mexico, Central American, and South East Asia can’t get enough money to provide high quality educational experiences for all of the children they serve. I watch drowning children being pulled from the waters of the Mediterranean Sea. I read about Islamic children being bullied in American schools just because they are Muslim. And I listen to Donald Trump fan hatred and xenophobia as a way to win the election. What is going on? How will exposure to this level of hatred influence the developing generations of young people all over the world? How can we best respond to these frightening challenges to the development of our children? I have never been this frightened for the future of our children. If you share my concerns, please do all you can to try to bring sanity, humility, and humanity back to our political discourse so that we can help to foster positive human development.

Hoping to see you in Denver in August, Jacque Eccles
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EARLY CAREER AWARDS

DISSELTATION AWARD
The recipient of the 2016 Dissertation Award is Maria Laura Filippetti. Dr. Filippetti is a post-doctoral researcher at University College London. Read more about her award winning dissertation on pp. 18-19.

RESEARCH GRANTS

Cecilia Cheung, Assistant Professor at the University of California, Riverside, is the recipient of the 2016 Early Career Research Grant. Read more about her work on pp. 12-13.

Jonni L. Johnson, doctoral student at the University of California, Davis, is the recipient of the 2016 Dissertation Research Grant. Read more about her work in the upcoming Winter 2017 Division 7 Newsletter.

EARLY CAREER OUTSTANDING PAPER
The 2016 winners for the Early Career Outstanding Paper Award are Arya Ansari (University of Texas, Austin), Sarah Moore (Cornell University), and Marije Verhage (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam). Read more about these papers on pp. 14-17.

MENTOR AWARD IN DEVELOPMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY

Nathan A. Fox, Ph.D.
Distinguished University Professor & Chair
Human Development and Quantitative Methodology
University of Maryland
Check out the exciting Division 7 Program at APA 2016 in Denver, CO Aug 4-7!
In FULL on p. 34!

http://infoaboutkids.org/

Division 7 is part of an ongoing collaboration—the *Consortium for Science-Based Information on Children, Youth, and Families*, a group of seven APA divisions who share the goal of enhancing public access to scientific information concerning children, youth, and families. At the website, parents, other caregivers, and professionals can find research and evidence-based guidance and links to other trustworthy sites. Monthly blogs will summarize the science on various timely topics.

Are you interested in writing a BLOG for the infoaboutkids.org website?

*Click on the “suggest a blog topic” link here http://infoaboutkids.org/*

*Now soliciting blog topics for 2017!*
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Early Career Outstanding Paper Award Committee
Kimberly Cuevas
Miranda Goodman-Wilson
Natalie Wilkens
David Scott Yeager
Gail Goodman, Chair

Mentor Award Committee
Susan Carey
Henry Wellman
Jacquelynne Eccles
Paul Harris, Chair

Early Career and Dissertation Research Grant Awards Committee
Natalie Hiromi Brito
Kathleen Corriuveau
Loren Marulis
Gary Glick
Lindsay Cameron
Wendy Rote
Maria Laura Filippetti
Christin Ogle and Michael Lamb, Co-Chairs

Boyd McCandless Award Committee
Jacquelynne Eccles
Adriana Galvan
Jennifer Jenkins
Jennifer Saffran
Felix Warneken, Chair

Eleanor Maccoby Book Award Committee
Willis Overton
Elliot Turiel
Kali Trzesniewski
Geoffrey Saxe, Chair

G. Stanley Hall and Urie Bronfenbrenner Awards Committee
Michael Cole
Adele Diamond
Jacquelynne Eccles
Gail Goodman
Ann Masten
Elizabeth Spelke
Carolyn Zahn-Waxler
Michael Lamb, Chair

Congrats to Division 7 Member, Rich Lerner!
The 2015 recipient of the Ernest R. Hilgard Lifetime Achievement Award for Distinguished Career Contributions to General Psychology—awarded by Division 1.

He will give an invited address at APA 2016
Saturday August 6th from 11 –11:50am
Convention Center/Room 506 Level 2-Meeting Room Level
Selecting the Next Director of the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH):
Letter Sent to the Search Committee Endorsed by Division 7

February 24, 2016

Dear Members of the Search Committee:

As you undertake your important mission of selecting the next Director of the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH), we know you will be considering a variety of criteria as you evaluate the candidates. We strongly encourage you to include among those criteria the need for a Director who recognizes the central role of psychosocial, cultural, and behavioral research in addressing the mental health needs of our nation.

NIMH has an ambitious mission: to define the mechanisms of complex behaviors, chart mental illness trajectories, strive for prevention and cures, and strengthen the public health impact of NIMH-supported research (NIMH 2015 Strategic Plan). We believe that achieving this mission requires a leader who recognizes the necessity of examining psychosocial, cultural, and behavioral mechanisms. This kind of leadership will help ensure progress in research on environmental causes of mental illness, as well as on the development, refinement, and dissemination of evidence-based psychosocial (e.g., cognitive, emotional, and behavioral) diagnostic tools and preventive interventions and treatments applicable across diverse populations and ages. These are crucial issues because research has shown that for most individuals with diagnosable mental disorders, the most effective treatments are those that target cognitive, behavioral, emotional, or interpersonal change, as opposed to those that act more directly on cellular processes or brain structures (though of course any changes in mental processes will affect neural circuits as well). For example, psychological treatments for individuals with anxiety disorders, eating disorders, suicidality, and insomnia are equally -if not more- effective than the most effective somatic treatments, such as psychotropic medications and brain stimulation methods, especially when longer-term effects are considered. Similarly, as NIMH-funded research has shown, psychological therapies for depression, the most common mental disorder, are the most effective treatments in the long run. Further, psychosocial preventive interventions have been found to prevent substance abuse, mental disorders and violence. Yet, we have much to learn: to improve both prevention and treatment of mental disorders, we need to further our understanding of psychosocial and behavioral mechanisms underlying these disorders and interventions to prevent or treat them. Moreover, given the increased national diversity, we still have a limited understanding of societal/cultural, familial, and interpersonal inputs to mental illness and health across childhood, adolescence, and adulthood. Without the resources to investigate these mechanisms, characterizations of the processes by which maladaptive behaviors arise and persist will be woefully incomplete, slowing down the search for prevention and cures.

We strongly value the importance of the biological level of analysis in the etiology, treatment, and prevention of mental disorders. At the same time, it will be crucial for the next Director not to privilege one level of analysis (whether it be the biochemical, systems neuroscience, motivational, or sociocultural level) above all others, but to encourage vigorous scientific inquiry at all levels in the explanatory hierarchy. Psychopathology is far too complex a phenomenon to be understood at only one or two levels, and one of the key tasks of the next Director will be to encourage research that respects – and when relevant, bridges across – multiple levels. To be sure, some levels of analysis will ultimately prove to be more fruitful than others for certain mental disorders. But decisions about which levels to prioritize must be guided by data.

In addition, it is vital that the new Director of NIMH appreciate the value of investigator-initiated research programs, vetted by peer review, as a crucial engine of scientific progress and as a critical element in promoting innovation and independent thought in the leading mental health and brain scientists, as well as in the young investigators who will replace them. We are concerned that NIMH’s support for investigator-initiated research has diminished significantly, and we ask that the new Director be explicitly committed to reversing this trend. As described by Thomas Insel in his Director’s White Paper, the percentage of the NIMH budget that has supported NIMH-initiated research has nearly quadrupled, from 6% in 2004 to 23% in 2014, and this has come at the expense of investigator-initiated research. Even the allocation of the remaining funds has come under much greater central control. An example is that proposals for an essential type of research – the investigator-initiated randomized clinical trial – are no longer accepted for review at NIMH. This makes it markedly harder for new, innovative treatments to be developed. While we support a focus on identifying “experimental therapeutics,” it is also essential that NIMH provide a home for developing and testing interventions that can be highly efficacious even though their underlying mechanisms may not yet be specified. Indeed, researchers have only recently made
progress in identifying the mechanisms behind the efficacy of, for example, cognitive-behavioral therapy for anxiety disorders and PTSD, even though these treatments have been reducing the suffering of patients for several decades. Similarly, although psychosocial interventions exist that target some specific mechanisms in schizophrenia, such as cognitive deficits, there is a need to develop and test interventions to target additional domains, such as motivation and social cognition. Mechanism research has best been conducted by planfully including it in the context of large-scale clinical trials that offer the necessary power for tests of mediation. Without renewed support for investigator-initiated RCTs, we believe that the great strides in the understanding, prevention, and treatment of mental disorders that have been made with support from the NIMH for investigator-initiated research will be compromised.

We understand that you have a challenging task ahead of you and appreciate your consideration of our views. We would be pleased to provide additional information and assistance to you during your deliberations.

Originating Signatories (in alphabetical order)
Association for Behavioral and Cognitive Therapies
Association for Psychological Science
Society for a Science of Clinical Psychology

Endorsing Organizations (in alphabetical order)
Academy of Psychological Clinical Science
American Academy of Psychoanalysis and Dynamic Psychiatry
American Psychological Association (APA)
APA Division 5--Quantitative and Qualitative Methods
APA Division 7--Developmental Psychology
APA Division 12--Society of Clinical Psychology
APA Division 12 Section II--Society of Clinical Geropsychology
APA Division 22--Division of Rehabilitation Psychology
APA Division 37--Society for Child and Family Policy and Practice
APA Division 38--Society for Health Psychology
APA Division 39--Psychoanalysis
APA Division 53--Society of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology
APA Division 56--Trauma Psychology
Association for Behavior Analysis International
Behavioral Genetics Association
Cognitive Science Society
College on Problems of Drug Dependence
Consortium of Social Science Associations
Federation of Associations in Behavioral and Brain Sciences
International Society for Developmental Psychobiology
International Society for Interpersonal Psychotherapy
International Society for Research on Internet Interventions
International Society for Traumatic Stress Studies
Society for Computers in Psychology
Society for the Exploration of Psychotherapy Integration
Society for Judgment and Decision Making
Society for Mathematical Psychology
Society for Prevention Research
Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues
Society for Psychophysiological Research
Society for Psychotherapy Research
Society for Research in Child Development
Society for Research in Psychopathology
Society for Research on Adolescence
Society of Behavioral Medicine

ANNOUNCEMENT:
Penn State’s 24th annual Symposium on Family Issues
Sleep Across the Lifecourse: Family Influences and Impacts
October 24-25, 2016.
Decades of clinical and epidemiological research have established the role of sleep in human health. Sleep has implications for physiological processes ranging from immune and endocrine to brain functioning, and has been linked to obesity, heart disease, mood and cognition. Sleep researchers have documented the scope of problematic sleep patterns (e.g. most adults and children in the U.S. get less sleep than they need). Such findings direct attention to the social/environmental factors that may promote healthful sleep— including characteristics and dynamics of families. The 2016 National Symposium on Family Issues aims to stimulate research by family scholars on the roles families can play in fostering healthful sleep patterns among members. At this interdisciplinary symposium, scholars will consider children’s sleep, sleep patterns in adulthood, and influences from socioeconomic contexts in which families are embedded. For more information and to register visit http://www.srri.psu.edu/24th-family-symposia
JOINT TASK FORCE ON PHYSICAL PUNISHMENT OF CHILDREN

Committee on Division/APA Relations (CODAPAR)

Interdivisional Grant

Cindy Miller-Perrin, Co-Chair Joint Task Force on Physical Punishment of Children

Divisions 7 and 37 (Child and Family Policy and Practice) are leading a Joint Task Force on Physical Punishment of Children in an effort to review research on spanking and factors that influence attitudes and beliefs about its use. One significant influence on parents’ use of spanking is the recommendation of psychologists. Schenck et al. (2000) found no clear consensus among clinical psychologists regarding the advisability of corporal punishment. In the 15 years since this research, however, cultural attitudes have shifted away from spanking and a growing body of scientific research addresses spanking’s impact. To assess psychologists’ current views concerning parental use of spanking, members of the task force received a CODAPAR grant to replicate and extend the survey by Schenck et al.

Leaders from 10 divisions of APA (3, 7, 8, 9, 37, 41, 43, 45, 53, 56), representing both a child and family practice focus as well as a science and policy focus, are collaborating on the survey project, which assesses division members’ current ethical beliefs, attitudes, and practices related to parental use of spanking.

Each division invited a random sample of 300 of its members to complete the online survey. To date, approximately 850 division members have responded.

“Knowledge gained from the survey will inform the work of the Task Force on Physical Punishment of Children as well as many APA constituents who seek to understand the effects of spanking.”

The results of the survey will be presented at this year’s APA Convention as part of the Division 37 Presidential Address entitled, “A Survey of Ethical Beliefs, Attitudes, and Professional Practices of Psychologists Regarding Parental Use of Spanking,” scheduled for Saturday, August 8 from 1:00 – 1:50 pm in Convention Center Room 704. The address will focus on the survey results, particularly findings related to current professional standards and practices surrounding parental use of physical punishment and how these findings inform policy and practice recommendations that will promote positive parenting and family relationships.

The findings will eventually be disseminated in the form of a report to the Joint Task Force on Physical Punishment of Children and a journal article to an APA journal such as the American Psychologist.

Knowledge gained from the survey will inform the work of the Task Force on Physical Punishment of Children as well as many APA constituents who seek to understand the effects of spanking. We hope this work, as well as that of the task force, will contribute an important link between science, policy, and practice and thereby improve the quality of children’s lives.

Survey results will be presented at APA!
Saturday, August 8th
1:00—1:50pm
Convention Center Room 704
Div 37 Presidential Address
I have been totally “out of the loop” since September 2014—and I didn’t miss it at all. So why come back? Well I never lost my love for APA and its mission, and much to the dismay of my family and friends, I came to the conclusion that I really wanted to help, if I could.

What I would like to do this morning is share some reflections on APA that I have had since leaving, noting their implications for the future. In my 14 plus years at APA I have only addressed Council a couple of times, and then very briefly. This is probably my last chance. And I want to speak from my heart, with my hat as the interim CEO firmly in place for the governing group of APA.

The Independent Report (IR) has obviously been a catalytic event. When the IR was released, I was completely on the outside, seeing only what was in the public media and the APA website. Like many others I was dismayed, hurt, shamed and angry at various times. When it came out I was confined due to a foot problem, so I read, and read. I have actually read the report about 5 times from cover to cover and reviewed nearly every document in the Binders at least once. Each time I learned something new.

But I did become especially dis-trauaght at the level of discourse I was seeing in public. I believe that Mr. Hoffman reported to you at your last meeting that the newspapers were not getting the story right. I didn’t know of his comments then, but I saw that psychologists across the nation were making public statements that were inconsistent with the factual findings of the report. Many seemed not to have read the full report itself. Many others did not distinguish the facts from the opinions expressed therein.

On the inside now, I see signs of the same problems in discourse — as well as the efforts to self-correct. I implore us to practice what we preach—to engage in critical thinking, to distinguish fact from opinion, and to respect that opinions may differ given the same facts. Ascribing motivations to others is unverifiable at best, and defamatory at worst.

An additional problem I’ve noted is the reliance on knowledge from secondary versus primary sources (remember your professor’s admonition to read the primary source?). Although hearing others’ perspectives is critically important in the decision-making process, we also know that this can lead to GroupThink. It was so very re-freshing that a recent survey related to the IR reported openly on the percent of respondents who had actually read the report. Although it was disappointingly low (less than 9% had read the whole report, and only 36% had read the Executive Summary)—the public acknowledgement of what data had been considered by respondents in making their recommendations was an important step in transparency. Within Central Office, I hope to provide for more training in GroupThink for our staff liaisons so they can work with their groups to facilitate its disruption in our policy making processes.

“I implore us to practice what we preach — to engage in critical thinking, to distinguish fact from opinion, and to respect that opinions may differ given the same facts.”

Another issue we need to address is mechanisms for fact checking in our policy-making process. The IR states that “APA simply took the word of DoD officials with whom it was trying to curry favor that no such abuse was occurring, and that future DoD policies and training would ensure that no such abuse would occur” (p.1). APA is subsequently roundly criticized for remaining, “deliberately ignorant” of facts.
How do we translate this criticism into better practices? At the staff level we will need to wrestle with under what conditions third party verification of an expert task force member’s report should be undertaken. But it relates to Council as well; as we know there have been misstatements of fact on the floor of Council over the years. How much second guessing will we need to do in the future, and what are our mechanisms for correction? I love the Washington Post’s Fact Checker column that informs the electorate regarding recent public pronouncements. I am not sure that kind of mechanism could be useful here, but I am certain that everyone in this room is committed to an accurately informed process.

I am so pleased to see that Council is taking the issue of discourse seriously by establishing a work group on civility principles and procedures. Staff have long been aware of this problem; aggressive and disrespectful discourse has had a demoralizing and intimidating effect within the APA family. When there is no response to outright nastiness, ad hominem attacks or racist comments, we lose confidence in the ability of the organization to manage itself. But obviously I view the problems in discourse as larger than those of civility, and I worry what they mean for our ability to develop good policy, to lead in the national and global contexts, and to be good role models for students.

Despite the pain from the IR, I do believe that one of the biggest favors Mr. Hoffman has done for us has been his stark characterization of us as an organization. After studying us intensely over six months, his opinion is that we are driven primarily by self-interest—at least around the matters that were the subject of the IR—and sees us as motivated primarily to get more jobs and more money for psychologists. How did he miss the fact that that is not the APA mission? We are a charitable scientific and educational organization whose purpose is to advance psychological science and its application to the promotion of health, education and human welfare. And in fact, that is what we actually do—just look at the 60 page report you recently received regarding Central Office activities and all the work done in collaboration with our governance groups that serves the public good. And on what do we spend most of our money? The integration and dissemination of psychological knowledge through our publications program. Some could actually say that we are primarily a publisher of scientific knowledge.

But Mr. Hoffman is not the only one that seems to have missed what is our mission. For example, I was shocked to be called a representative of a trade association at a federal policy meeting years ago; indeed the Boston Globe recently used that description of us in print. Moreover, I have heard members of our own governance use the term “guild” to describe APA, and to propose specific guild-type activities for the association. Staff often feel that pressure from our members and are not always sure how to respond.

And I am sure the APA elected officers have felt the same pressures during the campaign cycles. I have also heard many individual members say “What is APA doing for me?” and express desire for more help with pocketbook issues—as if our mission were to benefit them individually versus promote human welfare. You don’t hear that kind of statement about the Red Cross, the Sierra Club, the American Cancer Society, AERA....

Most recently I was surprised by an article shared with Council written by some prominent psychologists that had a good deal of useful information in it regarding APA membership and related issues. Unfortunately, the authors proposed resolutions that reflected a gross misunderstanding of the APA mission—and it got through what I assume was a rigorous peer review process by its publisher. Nor did it elicit a peep on the listservs that I saw.

So how come our publics, our consultants, many of our members and even some in governance seem to think APA is a guild? How have we unwittingly contributed to that perception? And what must we do to clarify our mission to ourselves and to others—to keep our direction due North, not the magnetic
North that can lead us astray.

This is not a new concern for me, I wrote about it in my last column before retirement. But the IR and the recent settlement of the lawsuit regarding the practice assessment have crystallized the urgency I have felt for the organization to address this issue. So I bring that agenda to the Interim CEO position with a passion. The reaffirmation of the APA mission as a charitable scientific and educational organization designed to advance the creation, communication and application of psychological knowledge to benefit society and improve people’s lives. It is a great and important mission and we have the talent in this organization to pursue it. But we need a sharper focus on this mission, and a brighter line between the mission of APA and our companion organization, the APapo.

It is a bit intimidating to talk about these issues, as a knee jerk reaction could interpret my comments as advocating a science practice split. That is not the case; this is not about science, nor is it about practice. It is about mission and its related culture.

I believe all of psychology needs a guild; there are professional issues in all career paths that need our attention. In hindsight, I wish the APAPo had remained with its own name of American Psychological Association Professional Organization (versus Practice Organization). But I do not believe that our guild will be successful if our discipline and profession is not valued as a public APAs. What kind of internal conflict might they feel when asked to vote on something that serves the APA public mission, but not necessarily the business interests of their home organization? How does that affect agenda setting? Even those elected by a C3 organization may feel pressure, especially if asked by their group to vote in a certain manner which could violate their fiduciary responsibility to APA. Many of us believe we have seen these issues play out repeatedly in Council deliberations. Are there other structures that could foster more clarity of purpose? Are we having a fundamental culture clash regarding mission that must be resolved? This issue may play out around specific agenda items, but it is really much bigger than that. How do we forge a culture focused on the APA mission? Given our diversity of interests, it can truly be the tie that binds.

I am not implying here that a change in the APA mission or structure would be the solution. Proposals for such change have been studied numerous times in the past with consistent conclusions that in addition to significant financial consequences, there would likely be significant damage to APAs public credibility if it were to change from its focus on the public good. I also believe APAPO—psychologists’ guild organization—needs a strong APA with its human welfare focus for it to achieve its own potential.

I am here with you for only a limited time, and may not even see you again this year. I hope I have made the case that our current crisis also presents us with a great opportunity to address some fundamental, festering problems that have been with us for a while. I hope you will stay the course and not prematurely cease the process of self-examination as the dust from recent events settles.
EARLY CAREER RESEARCH GRANT WINNER

Cecilia Cheung, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor, University of California, Riverside

Where is the Pygmalion?
The Role of Parents’ Expectation in Children’s Learning

A plethora of research indicates that parents play a key role in children’s educational success (for a recent review, see Grolnick, Friendly, & Bellas, 2009). Much attention, hence, has been devoted to understanding what parents do (i.e., their practices) that makes a difference in children's school experience. However, less is known with regard to how parents think (i.e., their cognition) and how that can shape children’s learning. Building on prior theory and research on teachers’ expectation (i.e., the classic Pygmalion effect), the proposed research will tackle two important questions in the domain of parental cognition. First, extending prior research on teachers’ expectation (see Rosenthal, 1994) the proposed research will examine the effects of parents’ expectation on children’s learning. Second, the proposed research will investigate a potential mechanism that underlies the role of parents’ expectation in children’s achievement.

Two studies will be conducted to address the questions outlined. In the first study, the effects of induced expectation will be examined. Parents will be induced to hold distinct levels of expectation about their children’s performance in the laboratory setting. We will examine the quality of parents’ involvement and children’s performance as a consequence of their expectation. In the second study, parents' naturally occurring expectation about children's achievement in school will be examined in a 1-year longitudinal study. Parents and children will be asked to complete surveys at three time points over the course of one year. The surveys will assess parents’ expectation, their involvement in children's learning, as well as children's adjustment in school.

“The proposed research is anticipated to yield important insights on whether parents’ expectation can influence children's academic achievement.”

Study 1: Induced Expectation
Families with children attending 6th through 7th grades will be included in the study. Dyads will be invited to visit the laboratory and randomly assigned into the high expectation, low expectation, and control groups. In all groups, children will first complete a pre-test, which assesses their performance on a novel cognitive task. In the high expectation group, parents will receive information privately about children’s pre-test score, which will be presented as highly favorable, regardless of children’s actual performance. In the low expectation group, which is identical to the high expectation group otherwise, parents will be told that their children's performance is beyond the normed average. In the control condition, parents will be given an opportunity to read a magazine and will not be presented with any information about their children’s performance.

After parents received information about their children’s performance, or no information, for that matter, children will join their parents to work on additional problems. At this time, the interaction between parents and children will be videotaped. The quality of parents’ involvement – specifically on the parenting dimensions of control and autonomy-support – will be coded. Before leaving the laboratory, parents and children will fully debriefed, such that they understand the information they received about their child’s performance is in no way reflective of their child’s ability.

Study 2: Naturally Occurring Expectation
Parents and children will be recruited to participate in a 1-year longitudinal study focusing on the role of parents’ naturally occurring expectation in children’s school academic performance. Children in 6th through 7th grades and their
parents will be included in the study. At the beginning of the academic year in the fall semester (wave 1), children and parents will receive a survey (delivered online or through postal mail) about parents’ expectation, their involvement in children’s learning, and children’s school adjustment. Children and parents will complete the survey again at the end of the fall semester (wave 2), and one last time at the end of the spring semester (wave 3). Children’s engagement in school and the value they place on school will also be assessed. School grades in four core subjects (i.e., language arts, math, social studies, and science) will be obtained from official school records.

**Anticipated Findings**

It is expected that children will show highest performance when their parents are induced to hold a positive view about their academic prowess. Furthermore, the quantity and quality of parents’ involvement are anticipated to underlie the effects of parental expectation on children’s achievement. Specifically, we predict that parents are more likely to become constructively involved in their children’s learning (e.g., provide verbal and non-verbal affirmation to enhance children’s confidence) when they expect their children to succeed academically.

**Significance of the Research**

The proposed research is anticipated to yield important insights on whether parents’ expectation can influence children’s academic achievement. While research has documented the power of teachers’ expectation in children’s learning trajectories and outcomes, the proposed research will fill a major gap in the socialization literature on parents’ cognition. Furthermore, the proposed research represents one of the first efforts in testing a possible mechanism underlying expectation and children’s achievement. As such, the proposed research will complement the broader literature on the Pygmalion effect. If parents’ expectation about children’s achievement can indeed make a difference in children’s academic performance, education programs may be devised to help parents understand the role of their expectation in children’s learning.

**References**


*The Winter 2017 newsletter will feature our Division 7 Dissertation Grant Award Winner:*

**Jonni. L. Johnson**

**University of California, Davis**
EARLY CAREER OUTSTANDING PAPER AWARD WINNER:
Arya Ansari, Graduate Student
Human Development and Family Sciences, University of Texas at Austin
Classroom Age Composition and the School Readiness of 3- and 4-year-olds in the Head Start Program

There has been growing interest in publicly funded early care and education programs as a means of reducing socioeconomic and racial-ethnic disparities in children’s early learning before the start of formal schooling. Part of this effort has included the expansion of preschool education to not only include 4-year-olds, but 3-year-olds as well. Despite the fact that mixed-age classrooms represent one of the most common models of education in early childhood programs across the country, their efficacy in facilitating the early learning and development of young children has long been debated, with limited and dated empirical support. In fact, until our study, there had not been a national analysis of classroom age composition in the Head Start program, which is the nation’s largest federally funded preschool program and which often serves both 3- and 4-year-olds in the same classrooms.

In this article (Ansari, Purtell, & Ger shoff, 2016), which was published in Psychological Science, my colleagues and I examined the implications of classroom age composition in the Head Start program for low-income children’s early academic and socio-emotional development. To this end, we addressed the following two research questions. First, we examined whether classroom age composition was associated with 3- and 4-year-olds’ early academic and social-behavioral development over the course of one preschool year. Then, we examined whether there were specific thresholds at which the associations between classroom age composition and children’s early learning were either stronger or weaker.

We used a nationally representative sample from the Family and Child Experiences Survey (FACES) 2009 Co-
hort to examine the experiences of newly enrolled 3- (n = 1,644) and 4-year-old (n = 1,185) Head Start children from all 50 states and the District of Columbia during the 2009-2010 school year. Roughly three out of every four Head Start children (77%) were enrolled in a mixed-age classroom that served both 3- and 4-year-olds.

Results from our investigation revealed that 4-year-old children in the Head Start program demonstrated fewer gains in mathematics and language and literacy skills during the preschool year when they were enrolled in classrooms with a greater number of 3-year-olds. When only 20% of their classmates were 3 year of age, 4-year-olds demonstrated significantly smaller academic skill gains, equivalent to one month of learning. When as many as 45% of their peers were aged 3, these lost opportunities amounted to roughly four-to-five months of academic learning. In contrast to the experiences of 4-year-olds, classroom age composition was not consistently associated with the early academic or socio-emotional development of 3-year-olds.

When taken together, the results from our study provided insight into the potential ramifications of classroom age composition in the Head Start program. Our findings that 4-year-old children made fewer academic skill gains, and 3-year-old children were no better off, in mixed-age classrooms indicate that we need to pay closer attention to the implementation of mixed-age classrooms in preschool settings.

Full References to the Award Winning Early Career Papers!

Arya Ansari

Sarah Moore

Marije Verhage
In this review article, I propose a framework for understanding the neurobiological processes that guide how individuals navigate and internalize environments. Previous work brought to attention the empirical evidence that some individuals with particular temperaments, physiological characteristics, and more recently, genetic polymorphisms, demonstrate heightened effects of social environments on development (Belsky & Pluess, 2009). My review article, published in *Psychological Bulletin*, steps beyond this question of whether individuals vary in responses to social environments, which is now well established, to why individuals differ in their responses. In other words, I set out to address: what underlies this variation in sensitivity to experience, and how does it develop?

Since the publication of seminal work on gene-environment interactions (Caspi et al., 2002, 2003), gene-environment interaction has become quite common in investigations of individual differences in responsiveness to environmental factors. Collectively, the work suggests that particular genes encoding neurochemicals relate to the degree that social contexts have enduring consequences on developmental outcomes. What was missing in this area was an explanation as to how variation of these neurobiological systems shapes individual differences in the enduring consequences of environmental factors. The first part of my review article thus addresses the neurobiological functions of genes commonly implicated in gene-environment interaction studies of sensitivity. These functions bridge genetic variation affecting neural systems to actual differences in neuroplasticity processes to environmental inputs, explaining mechanistically why particular genotypes might be linked to larger effects of the environment on development.

Inherent to the notion of plasticity is the critical role of experience. Plasticity means that environments are interacting with biology in the development of traits. Despite this accepted view of development as plastic, and thus involving an ongoing interplay of biology and experience, there still exists a heavy emphasis on genetics, in and of itself, wherever one or more genes might be implicated. In the second part of my review, a development framework is proposed that accounts for the dynamic nature of the biological processes that are affected by genes. Simply put, if a genetic factor shapes plasticity to the environment, then the history of environmental effects on the biology of the brain is as important to understanding outcomes as the genetic susceptibility factor: any long-term consequences of such a factor is intrinsically dependent on the surrounding environmental context.

Taken together, the importance of this article lies in its novel insights into the mechanisms that may account for individual variations in sensitivity at a point where the field is in need of such an analysis. For the increasing number of developmentalists turning to research on genetic and biological markers of sensitivity, this article serves to inform the biological role of the prominently studied genes in human development. It also highlights other biological systems relevant to how experiences are registered and internalized. The article advances the current literature’s myopic focus on identifying genetic ‘plasticity’ markers to understanding the plasticity processes at play. The plasticity of neurobiological systems directly accounts for who responds and adapts, and to what in the environment. This is essential for understanding developmental change, and for identifying targetable mechanisms of risk. After all, changing genes is not an option!

Ultimately, this article is intended to jumpstart more in-depth research aimed at understanding the nuanced developmental trajectories of individuals with different susceptibilities and unique histories. Understanding how biological tendencies are modified by experience will pave the way for tailored interventions that target the specific needs of individuals, and ultimately improve psychological and physical health outcomes. I will be continuing this work as a Scholar at the Child and Family Research Institute at the University of British Columbia. In this next phase, I will investigate the epigenetic mediators bridging the interplay of genetic variation and experience to neurodevelopment.

**References**


EARLY CAREER OUTSTANDING PAPER AWARD WINNER:

Marije Verhage, Ph.D.
Faculty of Behavioural and Movement Sciences, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam
Narrowing the Transmission Gap: A Synthesis of Three Decades of Research on Intergenerational Transmission of Attachment

The article
Continuities across generations have intrigued researchers in multiple domains of human functioning, among which the attachment relationship between caregivers and children. Decades of research inspired by the attachment theory (Bowlby, 1969/1982) has provided many insights into the emergence of the attachment relationship, among which the finding that mental representations that caregivers have built up based on their own attachment experiences with their parents predict the quality of the attachment relationship with their own children (Main, Kaplan, & Cassidy, 1985). This ‘intergenerational transmission of attachment’ has been studied extensively over the last three decades.

Our article (Verhage et al., 2016), which was recently published in Psychological Bulletin, aimed to thoroughly evaluate the status of the intergenerational transmission of attachment by synthesizing these 30 years of research in a series of meta-analyses. Research questions were aimed at examining the robustness of intergenerational transmission of attachment and at testing the generalizability of the effect across normative and clinical populations, methodological variation, and time. Also, the mediating role of caregiver sensitivity was carefully scrutinized, which only partly explained the transmission of attachment in a meta-analysis of the first wave of studies on attachment transmission (van Ijzendoorn, 1995).

The search for eligible studies was a large undertaking, as it included a massive hunt for unpublished studies. In the end, 97 samples were identified, over half of which were previously unpublished. The results of the study supplemented attachment theory in several ways. First, a robust effect for attachment transmission was found, confirming it as a universal phenomenon. However, the study also showed that attachment transmission was not equally strong in all scenarios: the effect size varied by characteristics of the caregiver-child dyads. For example, transmission rates were lower in samples with an ‘at-risk background’, such as teenage parents and parents with psychopathology. Also, a gradual decline in effect size over the years was discovered, which could not be explained by the fact that more studies were performed in at-risk populations in later years. Attachment transmission was also lower for unpublished studies, which suggests a publication bias towards significant results. Finally, the mediating effect of caregiver sensitivity was equally limited in the current study as it was twenty years ago, which underlines the need for alternative explanations of attachment transmission.

The implications
This study has substantial implications for attachment theory and research. We systematically integrated the novel findings of the study into the existing theoretical model, building towards an augmented theoretical model of intergenerational transmission of attachment that opens up new avenues for research, particularly research into the conditions that determine whether transmission occurs or not. Furthermore, as the effect size of attachment transmission has decreased, this leaves room to generate ideas on new predictors of caregiver-child attachment besides caregiver attachment representations. In a broader sense, the findings of this meta-analysis underscore the importance of considering decreases in effect size and publication bias for evaluating the status of theories in psychological science.

The future
By synthesizing 30 years of research on attachment transmission, we took the first steps towards more definite answers to long-standing questions in the field of attachment. However, many fine-grained questions on the mechanisms behind attachment transmission remain yet to be answered and we feel that the key to answering these questions lies in collaborative science. Due to the labor-intensive methods used to measure attachment, large samples are very rare in this field. However, to examine these fine-grained questions and extensive theoretical models, large samples are a necessity. Therefore, we
came up with the idea of pooling the existing data of all researchers to perform Individual Participant Data meta-analysis (Riley, Lambert, & Abo-Zaid, 2010), which is a more fine-grained technique for meta-analysis that allows us to study the data at the level of the individual participant. With this idea of collaborative science in mind, we initiated an international consortium of researchers who studied attachment transmission to try to combine their existing study data into a large database. The responses to this endeavor were very positive and the consortium currently consists of over 60 researchers who work together to take the next steps in attachment transmission research. The enthusiasm and commitment of these study authors in the consortium is not only evident from the high response rate, but also from their participation in the Collaborators Meeting we had last summer.

As we are currently still in the process of data collection and preliminary analyses, it is still possible to join the consortium. Together with the traditional meta-analysis that was awarded the Early Career Outstanding Paper award, this project has the potential to broadly impact the field of developmental psychology.

References


If you have any questions or would like to participate in her research, please contact Dr. Verhage at ml.verhage@vu.nl

The Early Career Outstanding Paper Award deadline is March 15 annually!
In our daily encounters, as we sense and act in the surrounding environment, we perceive our movements in a unique manner, we are able to recognize that the facial features we see in front of a mirror belong to our own face, and we are self-conscious and aware of ourselves. Nevertheless, how and when these aspects that uniquely define the self originate and develop is still a matter of debate. Historically, much attention has been given to the developmental trajectories of conceptual aspects of the self, such as the construction of self-consciousness, however the role of perceptual and implicit aspects of body perception remains controversial.

In the last two decades, adult research has provided behavioural and neuroscientific evidence on the crucial role of multisensory processing in influencing body awareness, suggesting that our mental representation of the bodily-self is flexible and can be updated by multisensory signals. A classic example comes from the Rubber Hand Illusion (Botvinick and Cohen, 1998). In this illusion, participants are tricked to perceive a rubber hand as belonging to their own body, through the synchronous stroking between their own real hand and the fake hand (Botvinick & Cohen, 1998). Evidence that this interaction between visual, proprioceptive and tactile signals can produce such a powerful change in one’s own mental body representation suggests that processing of sensory information may represent a valuable precursor of body perception from the earliest stages of development. A number of studies have shown that multisensory processing becomes functional quite early in life (e.g. Bahrick and Watson, 1985; Morgan and Rochat, 1997), though there remains some uncertainty concerning the age of onset and the specific contribution of different sensory modalities (Reddy et al., 2007; Zmyj et al. 2011). Based on this research, the overarching goal of this dissertation was to investigate how body perception originates and evolves, both from a developmental and neuroscientific perspective.

This dissertation has illuminated hitherto undocumented behavioral and neural mechanisms involved in body perception from the first stages of development, which may be precursors of later body representation. In a series of studies, this research work presented evidence of the ability of human newborns and 5-month-old infants to detect multisensory information in the context of body-related cues. Specifically, I have shown that newborns can detect the temporal and spatial invariants of visual-tactile signals, and that this preference only exists when the sensory stimulations provided are relevant for the infant’s own body (Filippetti et al., 2013; 2015). Furthermore, I revealed the presence of a similar pattern of visual preference in older infants, suggesting a developmental trajectory from birth to 5 months where infants seek redundant multisensory cues to specify the bodily-self (Filippetti et al., 2016). Continuing from these novel findings, I have explored the neural underpinnings of body perception, with the aim of providing more direct converging evidence on the role of multisensory processing for the development of body perception in the first stages of life. Through the use of functional Near Infrared Spectroscopy (fNIRS) with 5-month-old infants, I revealed the presence of specialised cortical activation in response to multisensory information related to the body (Filippetti et al., 2015).

While the present findings represent a pioneering starting point for the investigation of the ontogeny and developmental trajectories of mechanisms responsible for body
perception, more research is needed in order to understand the specific role of multisensory processing and its relation with visual appearance for the development of a mental representation of ourselves. In fact, while this work demonstrates that soon after birth infants have the propensity to orient their attention towards self-specifying information, the ability to process multisensory cues doesn’t necessarily imply that the infant is able to recognise this information as belonging to the self. For example, when encountering our own reflection in front of a mirror, we must be familiar with our own facial features in order to recognise that face as standing for ourselves. Crucially, we must also be able to associate these unique features to ourselves every time we see our reflection in a mirror, meaning that we must eventually build an off-line mental representation of how we look like. The key role of both visual appearance and multisensory processing in self-recognition, and their relation in the developmental process of learning to recognise ourselves remains poorly understood, and more research is needed in order to tackle this important issue.
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Award Addresses at APA 2016

Dissertation Award in Developmental Psychology

Maria Laura Filippetti


Friday, August 5th, 5pm–5:50pm
Colorado Convention Center, Room 502
Division 7 Business Meeting

Urie Bronfenbrenner Award for Lifetime Contribution to Developmental Psychology

Mark Greenberg

“Understanding and Watering the Seeds of Compassion: A Developmental Perspective”

Saturday, August 6th, 9–9:50am
Colorado Convention Center, Room 403
Boyd McCandless Award

Cristine Legare

“The Ontogeny of Cultural Learning”

Saturday, August 6th, 10–10:50am

Colorado Convention Center, Room 405

G. Stanley Hall Award for Distinguished Contribution to Developmental Psychology

Susan Gelman

“The Nonobvious Foundations of Childhood Thought”

Saturday, August 6th, 11–11:50am

Colorado Convention Center, Room 111
Invited Symposia at APA

Thursday, August 4th in Denver, CO

Empowering Youth to Improve Health

♦ Lori Crane
♦ Sheana Bull
♦ Elaine Belansky
  ♦ Colorado School of Public Health

Thursday, August 4th
1pm–1:50pm
Colorado Convention Center,
Room 102

Child Abuse and Neglect:
From Basic Research to Foster Care and Mental Health

♦ Desmond Runyan
  ♦ University of Colorado, Medical Center
♦ Jodi Quas
  ♦ University of California, Irvine
♦ Gail Goodman
  ♦ University of California, Davis
♦ Sue Hobbs
  ♦ University of California, Davis
♦ Dante Cicchetti
  ♦ University of Minnesota
♦ Omar Gudino
  ♦ University of Denver
♦ Richard Krugman
  ♦ University of Colorado, Medical Center

Thursday, August 4th
2pm–3:50pm
Colorado Convention Center,
Room 103

Congrats to Division 7 Members,
Dr. Roberta Michnick Golinkoff and Dr. Kathy Hirsh-Pasek!
Their recently published book hit #4 on Amazon’s bestseller list (July 5, 2016)!
Special Session at APA 2016

Forty-five Years of Influence of the Lifespan Developmental Approach: Past, Present, Future

Thursday, August 4th, 10am—4pm

Colorado Convention Center, Mile High Ballroom 1E

A collaboration between Adult Development & Aging (Division 20); Developmental Psychology (Division 7); and Experimental Psychology (Division 3) and supported by a grant from the Committee on Divisional APA Relations.

The Lifespan Developmental Approach has provided an overarching and vital framework for understanding human development from conception to death. This special set of sessions will provide a review, examination, and discussion of the influence of the Lifespan Developmental Approach across the past 45 years. A 6 hour series of presentations and discussions will be hosted at the 2016 APA convention featuring speakers and a reaction panel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical and Conceptual Approaches</th>
<th>Thursday, August 4th, 10am—11:50am, Mile High Ballroom 1E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willis (Bill) F. Overton</td>
<td>Life-Span Developmental Paradigms and Meta-models: 1968-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manfred Diehl</td>
<td>Modifiability of Middle Age and Older Adult Views of Aging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursula M. Staudinger</td>
<td>Plasticity of Human Aging</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodological Issues</th>
<th>Thursday, August 4th, 12pm—1:50pm, Mile High Ballroom 1E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sara Czaja</td>
<td>Methodological Challenges in Psychosocial Interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner Schaie</td>
<td>Methodological Issues in the Psychology of Lifespan Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Smith</td>
<td>Methodological Issues in Intervention with Grandparents Raising Grandchildren</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention, Modifiability, and Plasticity</th>
<th>Thursday, August 4th, 2pm—2:50pm, Mile High Ballroom 1E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cameron J. Camp (Keynote)</td>
<td>Applied Lifespan Developmental Psychology:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherry Willis</td>
<td>Plasticity in Old Age: Influence of Lifespan Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boris Baltes</td>
<td>Motivation for Working across the Lifespan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie Lerner</td>
<td>Character Development in the Second Decade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Collaborative Proposals Submitted by Division 7

Rethinking Sex: The Future of Gender and Psychology

- Daphna Joel, Tel Aviv University
- Sari van Anders, University of Michigan
- Rebecca Bigler, University of Texas
- Charlotte Tate, San Francisco State University
- Janet Hyde, University of Wisconsin

Saturday, August 6th
12pm–1:50pm
Colorado Convention Center, Room 203

Building Bridges Among Research, Policy, and Practice

- Jennifer Fredricks, Connecticut College
- Elizabeth McKenney, Southern University of Edwardsville
- Susan McMahon, DePaul University
- Wendy Middlemiss, University of North Texas
- Carmen Valdez, University of Wisconsin

Sunday, August 7th
8am–9:50am
Colorado Convention Center, Room 203

Full Program Available on page 34 of this newsletter!

Click here: www.facebook.com/groups/218878051489647/
Or search Facebook for: "APA Division 7 - Developmental Psychology"
Division 7
Special Events at APA 2016

Social Hour
Networking Together to Advance Children’s Mental Health & Well-Being
In Conjunction with Committee of Children, Youth, and Families, Division 37, Division 16
Thursday, August 4th, 6pm-8pm in the Agate Room, Hyatt Regency Hotel

Young Investigators Symposium
Friday August 5th 10am-11:50am
Colorado Convention Center, Room 210/212

Business Meeting
Open to all Members—Join Us!
Friday August 5th, 5pm-5:50pm
Colorado Convention Center, Room 502

Presidential Address
Jacquelynne Eccles, Ph.D.
Friday, August 5th, 4pm—4:50pm
Colorado Convention Center, Room 502
APA Dissertation Research Award
Deadline is September 15, 2016

APA Early Graduate Student Researcher Award
Deadline is September 15, 2016
http://www.apa.org/about/awards/scistucoun-earlyre.aspx

The Science Directorate of the American Psychological Association is managing two award programs for graduate student research in 2014. For both awards, applications are welcome from graduate students of psychology in any research specialty area. The application deadline for both awards is Sept. 15, 2016. If you have questions, please contact the Science Directorate via email (science@apa.org) or telephone at (202) 336-6000. A description of the two awards follows:

APA Dissertation Research Awards

The Science Directorate of the American Psychological Association sponsors an annual competition for dissertation research funding. The purpose of the Dissertation Research Award program is to assist science-oriented doctoral students of psychology with research costs. The current program includes 30-40 grants of $1,000 each, along with several larger grants of up to $5,000 to students whose dissertation research reflects excellence in scientific psychology. For more details about the award, including eligibility requirements and application materials, visit: http://www.apa.org/about/awards/scidir-dissertation.aspx

Early Graduate Student Researcher Awards

The purpose of the Early Graduate Student Researcher Awards program is to recognize students for conducting outstanding research early in their graduate training (i.e., research conducted within the first two years of doctoral study). The award focuses on both the student’s general research experience and specific completed research projects. The research independence of the applicant as well as the novelty and implications of research performed as a graduate student will be used for evaluation purposes. Therefore preference may be given to students who have completed their second year of doctoral studies.

The funds may be used for direct research expenses (e.g., computer time, animal care, equipment, participant fees and incentives), software, and/or conference travel; it may not be used for tuition, fees, or personal expenses.

Each recipient receives an award 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
Child Psychology Graduate Student Fellowship
Deadline is November 15, 2016
http://www.apa.org/afp/funding/koppitz.aspx

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

❖ Nurtures excellent young scholars for careers in areas of psychology, such as child-clinical, pediatric, school, educational, and developmental psychopathology
❖ 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 program 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, 2016

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.

Lizette Peterson-Homer Injury Prevention Grant Award
Deadline is October 1, 2016

The Lizette Peterson Homer Memorial Injury Research Grant supports research into psychological and behavioral aspects of the prevention of injuries in children and adolescents as reflected in the activities and interests within pediatric psychology of the late Lizette Peterson-Homer and her commitment to improving the status of children in the face of the most significant threats to their health and development. This grant is open to students and faculty to support research related to the prevention of injuries in children and adolescents. Funding is available up to $5,000 and is sponsored jointly by the American Psychological Foundation and APA Div. 54.

Amount: Up to $5,000
APF does not allow institutional indirect costs or overhead costs, principal investigator stipends, travel, or publication-related expenses. 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
- 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
- References
A current curriculum vitae
Supporting faculty supervisor letter (if the applicant is a student)
Proof of IRB approval or statement that IRB approval is pending.


Deadline: October 1, 2016.
For more information see: http://www.apa.org/apf/funding/peterson-homer.aspx

Dissertation Grants from the AERA/NSF
Deadline is August 25, 2016
http://www.apa.org/about/awards/scistucoun-earlyre.aspx

With support from the National Science Foundation (NSF), the American Educational Research Association (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 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

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 2 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 documents that have been saved in PDF. 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 grantsprogram@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.

Click here to apply for an AERA Dissertation Grant or visit the AERA Grants Program Website at http://www.aera.net/grantsprogram

Next Application Deadline: August 25, 2016
UPCOMING CONFERENCES

American Psychological Association Annual Convention
Aug 4-7, 2016
Denver, Co
http://apa.org/convention/

European Early Childhood Education Research Association Annual Conference
Aug 31-Sep 3 2016
Dublin, Ireland
http://www.eecera.org/conferences/

The Flux Congress
Sep 8-10, 2016
St Louis, MO
http://www.fluxconference.com/

Penn State’s 24th annual Symposium on Family Issues
Sleep Across the Lifecourse: Family Influences and Impacts
Oct 24-25, 2016
http://www.ssrri.psu.edu/24th-family-symposia

The Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development
Nov 4-6, 2016
Boston, MA
http://www.bu.edu/bucll/

The Annual International Conference on Stigma
Aug 3-6, 2017
Washington, D.C.

American Psychological Association Annual Convention
Nov 18, 2016
Washington, D.C.
http://www.whocanyoutell.org/

Annual Conference of the Association for Moral Education
Dec 8-11, 2016
Cambridge, MA
http://www.cogdevsoc.org/

Budapest CEU Conference on Cognitive Development
Jan 5-7, 2017
Budapest, Hungary
http://www.bcccd.org/

Annual International Conference on Cognitive and Behavioral Psychology
Feb 27-28, 2017
Singapore
http://www.cognitive-behavior.org/

Society for Research in Child Development Biennial Meeting
April 6-8, 2017
Austin, TX
http://srcd.org/meetings/biennial-meeting

Society for the Study of Emerging Adulthood: 6th Biennial Conference
Nov 2-4, 2017
Washington, D.C.
http://www.ssea.org/

Society for Research on Adolescence
Apr 12-14, 2018
Minneapolis, MN
http://s-r-a.org/

Meeting of the European Society for Cognitive Psychology (ESCoP)
Sep 3-6 2017
Potsdam, Germany
http://escop.eu/events/future/

The Cognitive Development Society’s Biennial Meeting
Oct 12-14, 2017
Portland, OR
http://www.cogdevsoc.org/
APA Division 7 Young Scholars Fund

APA Division 7 (Developmental) is seeking donations for the Young Scholars Research Fund. The Division 7 Young Scholar's Research Fund supports research projects for graduate students and early career scholars in developmental psychology. Grants of $500 to $1000 will be awarded to a designated number of deserving scholars each year. These awards will include a dissertation research grant and a small grant for early career, untenured faculty members. Donations to the fund are tax-deductible.

To donate, please complete the form below (make checks out to American Psychological Association, Division 7; PLEASE put “for the Young Scholar Fund” somewhere on the check):

Name: ____________________________________________

Address: __________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Donation Amount: ___________ Check Enclosed or Charge Credit Card (circle)

If using credit card, cardholder name and address (if different from above):
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Credit Card Type: Visa Mastercard Amex (circle)

Credit Card Number: _________________________________________________________

Signature: _________________________________________________________________

Expiration Date: ___________________________________________________________

Please mail to the Treasurer of Division 7: Kristen Alexander
Department of Child Development
California State University, Sacramento
Brighton Hall 213
6000 J Street
Sacramento, CA 95819-6139

***Some Division 7 Award winners and executive committee members have opted to donate their convention travel reimbursement funds to the Young Scholars Fund. If you would also like to donate your Division 7 reimbursement funds, and receive documentation of your donation for tax purposes, please notify the Division 7 treasurer. You may then send your travel receipts to the treasurer along with a memo indicating that you would like your reimbursement funds transferred into the Young Scholar Fund. You will receive a donor letter documenting the donation amount.
Not a Member of Division 7 Yet?

Join Division 7: Developmental Psychology

Membership in APA Not Required

Division 7 is the official developmental psychology section of the American Psychological Association (APA). It is comprised of psychological scientists and others from a variety of disciplines who study or work on human development.

Join:

* Always free for undergraduate and graduate student affiliates
* Free for members for the first year
* $24 per year for members after the first year

Benefits:

* 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
* Influence psychological science, grant priorities, and social policy at the national level
* Network with other developmental psychologists and individuals interested in development
* Eligibility for dissertation and early career grants to fund your research
  
  o Serve on important Division 7 committees, including the Executive Committee

  o Membership in APA is encouraged but not required. If you join APA or are already a member of it, there are additional advantages and opportunities, but you can now join Division 7 either way!
Executive Committee

President (2-year term): .................................................. Jacquelynne Eccles (Jan 15 – Dec 16)
Past President (2-year term): ........................................... Gail Goodman (Jan 15 – Dec 16)
President-Elect (2-year term): ......................................... Michael Lamb (Jan 15 – Dec 16)
Secretary (3-year term): .................................................. Kali Trzesniewski (Jan 14 – Dec 16)
Treasurer (3-year term): ................................................... Kristen Alexander (Jan 16 – Dec 18)
Members-at-Large (3-year terms): .................................... Elizabeth Gershoff (Jan 15 – Dec 17)
........................................................................................................... Susan Rivera (Jan 14 – Dec 16)
........................................................................................................... Kathryn Lemery-Chalfant (Jan 14 – Dec 16)
Reps. to APA Council (3-year terms): ......................... Sarah Friedman (Jan 16 – Dec 18)
........................................................................................................... Suniya Luthar (Jan 14—Dec 16)
Rep. to APA Committee on Children, Youth, and Families...... Sarah Friedman (2010—present)
Newsletter Editor (3-year term): ........................................ Lindsay Malloy (Jan 16 – Dec 18)
Fellows Committee Chair (1-year term): ......................... Ross Thompson (Jan 16 – Dec 16)
Program Committee Chair (1-year term): ...................... Jennifer Fredricks (Jan 16 – Dec 16)
Program Committee Co-Chair (1-year term): ................... Kristina Callina (Jan 16– Dec 16)
Membership Chair (3-year term): ...................................... Sonja Brubacher (Jan 16 – Dec 18)
Education & Training Chair (DOTDEP) (3-year term): ......... Judith Becker Bryant (Jan 13 – Dec 15)
Historian (3-year term): .................................................. John Hagen (Jan 14 – Dec 16)
Web Master (3-year term): ............................................... Louis Manfra (Jan 14 – Dec 16)
Early Career Psychologists Network Representative (2-yr): .... Lindsay Malloy (Jan 15 – Dec 16)
........................................................................................................... Thanujeni Pathman (Jan 16 – Dec 17)
Graduate Student Representative (2-year term): ............... Sue Hobbs (Jan 15 – Dec 16)
Listserv Administrator.................................................... Adam Winsler

Addresses, telephone numbers, and e-mails are listed on the Division 7 web site:
http://ecp.fiu.edu/apa/div7/

NEWSLETTER EDITOR:
Lindsay C. Malloy
Department of Psychology
Florida International University
lmalloy@fiu.edu
124th Annual APA Convention

Program Booklet

Colorado Convention Center,

Denver, CO

August 4th - 7th, 2016

Registration Information

The American Psychological Association handles registration for the convention. Registration materials can be obtained through the APA website www.apa.org/convention where registration and hotel reservations can be completed online.

Division Reception

Thurs, Aug 4, 6pm – 8pm. In Conjunction with Committee of Children, Youth, and Families at APA, Division 37, Division 16
**ALL rooms are in the Colorado Convention Center**, and all sessions are open to all attendees, unless otherwise stated. Some titles in this program have been truncated for brevity.

### THURSDAY AUGUST 4, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session ID</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 - 8:50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 10:50</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>Symposium: The West Point cadet study - Developing leaders of character. Div: 1, 7, 15, 19, 27, 37, 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 12:50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 1:50</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Invited Symposium: Empowering youth to improve health. Div: 7, 9, 12, 18, 27, 29, 32, 37, 42, 43, 46, 47, 53, 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 3:50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 5:50</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>Hyatt</td>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting ---- CLOSED Capitol Ballroom 5, Hyatt Regency Hotel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please note the additional session on Thursday*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Sess. ID</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 2:50</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>Symposium: Theatre as an identify construction vehicle. Div: 7, 10, 44, 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Session ID</td>
<td>Room</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 – 8:50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 – 9:50</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Symposium: Relational developmental systems and child flourishing. Div: 6, 15, 27, 29, 39, 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 11:50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 – 12:50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 1:50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – 2:50</td>
<td></td>
<td>Exhibit Hall</td>
<td>Membership Chair (Sonja Brubacher) at the Division Services booth to meet Division members/ &amp; answer questions about Division membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – 3:50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SATURDAY AUGUST 6, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session ID</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 – 8:50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - 9:50</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>Invited Address: Urie Bronfenbrenner Award (Greenberg). Div: 7, 15, 28, 32, 42, 53, APAGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 10:50</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>Invited Address: Boyd McCandless Award (Legare). Div: 1, 7, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 11:50</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>Invited Address: G. Stanley Hall Award (Gelman). Div: 7, 15, 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 12:50</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>Symposium: Rethinking sex - Future of sex and gender in psychology. Collaborative Program Div: 7, 8, 35, 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 1:50</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Paper Session: Socioemotional Development. Div: 7 (12 – 1:50)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SUNDAY AUGUST 7, 2016
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session ID</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 - 8:50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>Symposium: Building bridges among research, practice, &amp; policy. Collaborative Program. Div: 7, 15, 16, 27, 33, 37, 43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**See our Division 7 Award Winners present their research!**

- 2016 Boyd McCandless Award: **Cristine Legare** (Sat Aug 6, 10am)
- 2016 G. Stanley Hall Award: **Susan Gelman** (Sat Aug 6, 11am)
- 2016 Urie Bronfenbrenner Award: **Mark Greenberg** (Sat Aug 6, 9am)
- 2015 Dissertation Award: **Maria Laura Filippetti** (Thurs Aug 4, 9am Poster Session F)

**Other 2016 Division 7 Awardees:**

- Dissertation Research Grant Award: **Jonni Johnson**
- Early Career Research Grant: **Cecilia Cheung**
- Early Career Outstanding Paper Award: **Arya Ansari, Sarah Moore, Marije Verhage**
- Eleanor Maccoby Book Award in Developmental Psychology: **David S. Moore**
- Mentor Award: **Nathan Fox**