

Joy Osofsky

- B.A. (1966) Syracuse University, M.A. (1967) Syracuse University, Ph.D. (1969) Syracuse University

Major Employment:

- Louisiana State University Health Sciences – 1986-Present, Professor of Pediatrics, Psychiatry, and Public Health
- Louisiana State University Health Sciences – 2009-Present, Barbara Lemann Professor

Major Areas of Work:

- Violence, Trauma, and Effects on Children
- Infant Mental Health
- Parent-Infant/Child Interaction; Adolescent Mothers and Infants

SRCD Affiliation:

- Publications Committee (1974-1991), Governing Council (1985-1991), and Chair of the Interdisciplinary Committee (1995-1997)



SRCD ORAL HISTORY INTERVIEW

Joy D. Osofsky

Louisiana State University and University of New Orleans

Interviewed by Robert N. Emde
University of Colorado School of Medicine
Part I – July 1, 1994
Part II - August 1, 1995

Emde: Joy, I know you and I have read the outline at some time in the past and I've actually conducted one previous oral history interview, even though we don't have it with us today, I think we can proceed with the general framework that will really conform to the spirit of the outline if not the outline itself. Let me begin by asking you to reflect on the thoughts of your background in terms of whatever you might interpret that to be: childhood education, influences of other people, that led you into the field of child development and clinical child development, and then perhaps we can lead up to some of the background of your graduate education and the beginnings of your research and academic career. Joy --?

Osofsky: It's an interesting question as to how one proceeds into a field—a professional field, an academic field. Growing up in the 1950s essentially, and finishing high school in the early sixties, the idea of a woman going into a professional field was not one that was very common. And if a woman was to choose a profession, it more often was more traditional or a profession considered more traditionally female at that time, like nursing or social work or teaching. My family background was not one that encouraged me to pursue higher education or a professional field. It was one that encouraged women in general to follow a more traditional view of getting married and having a family and orienting them--orienting their life around family and community.

When I was growing up I was in a relatively small family. I have one older brother and an older half-brother. And one of the things that probably motivated me from my early life to go into child development had to do with, well first of all psychology in general and then child development, the fact that I perceived myself as somewhat different from other people. I was always very people-oriented, interested in people, interested in why they behaved the way they did and acted the way they did. And I was not one to accept

things always just the way they were, but seemed to want to look for different ways to do things and to understand people. With that came, I think, a desire to learn more about people through learning more about behavior in a sense. When I was in high school, though, I was oriented primarily toward going into college and at that point hadn't made a decision about a professional career. As I said before, it wasn't something that most women thought that much about. Actually, there were some formative influences after high school going into college that probably played a major role in my decision-making at that time. First of all, my father died when I was sixteen years old and still in high school. My father and mother, while they were close to me and loved me, at that time, at least for them, perceived their role as parents as prescribed in a certain way. So my father used to be very devoted to his work and devoted to his family too, but not involved in the way that we see many fathers today. And, I think that was fairly typical. My mother also was very oriented toward doing things to support my father and his work and, again make sure my family was taken care of, but it was a different orientation to the family. Well, when my father died when I was sixteen, that probably influenced me a great deal, in terms of going into--into psychology and to understanding more about why people act the way they do. He died very suddenly. There was no preparation. He died of a heart attack, and it was very disruptive on the family. It made me oriented though very strongly toward going to college and moving along with my life. And my mother, I have to give her credit, that it must have been difficult for her, but she encouraged me in that direction.

When I went to college my freshmen year actually at Simmons College in Boston, I was introduced to the person who then became my husband on a blind date and got married after I finished my freshmen year at college. I married into a family that valued education a great deal. And though my--my mother-in-law was very bright, she had not proceeded beyond high school, because they couldn't afford it at the time; but very much valued education. Her two older sons, my husband was a doctor then and her older son was a doctor and the younger son was in college and headed toward being a doctor. And so I started to think of the possibility of more education for myself at that point and was very much headed into psychology. I was always intrigued with children and, I think, at that time, probably adolescents to some extent -- maybe because I was just getting through that myself. I went to Syracuse University, took actually a course in child development that wasn't particularly interesting (or the teacher wasn't particularly interesting), but the course intrigued me and I thought I would like to learn more, perhaps with a better teacher. And, I was very strongly motivated to proceed with my education at that point.

Emde: So, Joy, you were in Syracuse right in the middle of the sixties, the 1960s, a very troubled time. And, as I recall from conversations with you, I think you became quite an activist student; and, if I am not wrong, a student leader. And, earlier you alluded to the fact that being a--on a track as a woman was something that was particularly significant for you and something you struggled with. I wondered if you could talk a little bit about the time of sixties at Syracuse and your role in some of the activism, including as a woman, heading toward a professional career.

Osofsky: I realize when you asked that question that I, for somebody reading this, left out a transition that after I was married, after my freshmen year at Simmons, I transferred to Syracuse University, because my husband was on the faculty. He was then a doctor on the faculty at Upstate Medical Center. I completed my undergraduate education at Syracuse and then went on to graduate school there. The sixties was a very interesting time and Syracuse was an interesting place to be. It's a conservative--relatively conservative--upstate New York community, at the same time is an area where many strong liberals in the civil rights movement and anti-war movement and women's movement emerged. And, as I was looking for a direction in my professional life, I also found myself very much oriented toward individual rights. I became involved in the women's movement, as well as, the civil rights movement and the anti-war movement. There were emerging quite radical groups then, I was less involved with the groups that were very strongly radical and more an equal opportunity kind of issue and individual rights kind of issue. The National Organization for Women was formed in the 1960s, and I knew some of the early leaders in the movement, in fact, was one of the first people on the executive committee. Actually, my husband was one of the first men on the executive committee very early on and was influenced by people like Betty Ferdan and others at that time when not that many people were involved with the women's movement; and when the issues were, what would be considered at this point, very conservative. Actually being involved in those types of issues, for example, equal pay for equal work; public accommodations--a woman having the

right to go into a hotel or a bar; and things that we would consider at this point to be, first of all, given but fairly conservative types of issues at that time were quite serious issues in the movement. And to me, there was a sense of--a real sense of equal rights and equal opportunity. This was very much related to my own personal quest in terms of education, because there weren't that many women in graduate school, at least at Syracuse, there may have been other places where there were more women, but there weren't at Syracuse. And so, I often found myself as the lone woman and was more likely to conform in those ways than to, in fact, express some of the feminist kinds of things, but it became very clear that one's own identity was important to move forward. In terms of other kinds of influences in that way---I also started to consider, as I moved from undergraduate to graduate school, new ways of looking at things that I think were influenced by the perspectives that had been opened for me, in terms of some of the individual, individual rights types of movements. For example, at that time in psychology in child development---and I chose to go into psychology and I chose child because it seemed like a field that was very interesting at the time---however, I had some difficulty with some of the conservatism in the field, as well in terms of methodology, for example there were a great number of studies in at that on cognitive developmental issues such as conservation, laboratory studies that were very strictly defined, and while I can understand the importance of them, somehow, to me, one needed to take a somewhat broader perspective. And I started to look at some other ways of looking at things. Did you want to orient me?

Emde: How were you involved in the civil rights in those days? Cause that's interesting as an undergraduate you were involved also in the civil rights and I know that you have been deeply concerned with the plight of the poor and disadvantaged and more recently other environmental conditions of minorities and African Americans in particular in your career. So it's interesting to note how were involved as an undergraduate in the sixties?

Osofsky: There were some leaders of the civil rights movement who had a strong impact in Syracuse: George Wiley, the Berrigan--well the Berrigans were more anti-war type of people. But a lot of the kind of struggles that were going on in the south---that's very interesting for me, by the way, living in the south now and seeing some of those cities where these major struggles took place---but many of the struggles were taking place in the middle of the sixties. And there were a group of us overlapping between the women's movement and the civil rights movement and the anti-war movement, which came a little later--a group of us who were concerned about how to forward, forward the concerns of the civil rights movement, to create equal opportunity. There were doctors as well as students who were going to the south. The freedom movement in the south, the sit-ins, other types of things, I was I guess a little more hesitant and did not end up myself going south, but was very supportive of people who did and helped to build a strong contingent for them. But I think it was the very much related to the idea of equal rights, of equal opportunity. Interestingly enough, it reminded me of an experience of my earlier childhood. I remember I had a friend when I was in high school who lived in a town called Chester Town, Maryland. And I went down to visit with her one weekend. And I lived, you know, outside of New York City. I was absolutely appalled and shocked when I went down to Maryland that there were separate drinking fountains and separate bathrooms and separate entrances for Blacks --then called Negroes --and Whites; and that it was very much accepted as part of that culture that people were treated differently. So that had an impact on early and I think this was just very much tied in with this idea of equal opportunity and equal rights.

Emde: That's, really quite interesting. Let's move forward a little bit and get some anchor points. When did you graduate from Syracuse and when did you begin graduate school and, by the way did you major in psychology--it sounds like you might, but let's anchor that, and when you begin graduate school and a little bit about that and we'll move along?

Osofsky: I did major in psychology as an undergraduate. Interestingly enough, I was making a decision after my sophomore year. I transferred from Simmons after I finished a year of college and then went to Syracuse and went winters and summers and ended up finishing right on time, 1966. But I was also quite interested in religion. I think it's a time of often for people of personal struggle and I found that there were several ways to deal with this personal struggle intellectually: one was through psychology and one was through religion. Turned out that I did fairly well in my religion courses and my professor thought that I should be majoring in religion and it was actually a very important decision point when I decided to go into

psychology and decided to deal with, learn more about individual behavior and direction, that way. But I graduated in 1966 and went on to graduate school at Syracuse. My husband was on the faculty at Upstate Medical Center and Syracuse was the university that was there, and I decided to go into--- Well I went into developmental psychology, but actually started out with a kind of a joint program between developmental, social and clinical or developmental, social-personality and clinical. We had some interesting instructors who kind of bridged fields at that point. And I, though I knew I was interested in child development, I was also interested in clinical and I was also interested in personality theory and personality, and so was trying to get a broader base. I started working in graduate school with Dave Hunt, who was then at Syracuse who you may be familiar with the conceptual systems model that he co-, the book he co-authored and the theory he developed with O. J Harvey and Schroeder. And he was oriented toward developmental but would, I think, be considered more of a personality theorist. I was interested in pursuing work with children and he was very supportive of that, and gave me a lot of very interesting opportunities as I started graduate school. He was one of the advisors to the Upward Bound program at that time. And it's interesting that you had me talk a little bit about my involvement with the civil rights movement, I worked as an assistant for him and actually visited---I remember very vividly an Upward Bound program in Ann Arbor, I believe at the, or not in Ann Arbor, outside of Detroit at the Cranbrook school. And that was really my first exposure to dealing with students who came from poor, quite disadvantaged backgrounds. And, it was something that, as a fairly young female at that time, was a bit of a challenge. But I saw it as a very-- that experience impacted on me a great deal in terms of efforts to communicate and get in tuned with these kids. And I also recognized how very important these opportunities were for young people who weren't, didn't have the same opportunities and exposure in that way. I had a broad base of training early on in graduate school. My, I actually proceeded through graduate school rather quickly. I went summers and winters. I, it's interesting, I was very much aware of the fact that, I kind of called it "running scared". It really was difficult for as a female at that point being in graduate school, and on top of it I was a married female, and I was in a community--my husband was a doctor. And very few of the women--they all had college educations and if they had any graduate education it was most often nursing or teaching or social work. And doing a Ph.D. was quite unusual at that point. I also didn't get much encouragement from my, my family, though my mother-in-law was very proud and encouraging of me. So people kept asking me why I wasn't having children and you know, why I was doing all this education, and so. I felt it was important for me to get through my education if I could, before I started having children, 'cause I somehow felt that I would not have the opportunity to complete it otherwise. So what I did was take a very heavy schedule and go summers and winters and just move along and not let anything interfere at that time. My husband was also very supportive. I was ambitious and motivated and really very interested in research. I was quite interested in the work that Dave Hunt did. But one of the things he did beyond that, he had, I believe he had a student that was like a year or two ahead of me who also, who went from Syracuse actually--Chuck Halverson--to work with Dick Bell who was then at NIMH with Howard Moss. And they had, to my mind, a much broader view of both developmental theory and methodology than I was exposed to at Syracuse that tended to more experimental child in orientation. And I found that kind of intriguing and Chuck introduced me to some of it when he would come back and visit and actually, Dave Hunt also introduced me to some of Dick Bell's work at that time that was quite intriguing. Do you want me to continue that or do you want to redirect me?

Emde: Yes, in your work, I know your dissertation work on reciprocity probably grew out of that interest and your strong attention to what Dick Bell called infant effects on the caregiving relationship and was this influential in terms of your interest in reciprocity in your research in that area?

Osofsky: Well actually, Dick Bell's work was more on child affects, I moved it down to infancy.

Emde: Oh, I see.

Osofsky: But that's nice to see it credited in that way. Interestingly enough, I'd say that the orientation at Syracuse was more experimental child in some ways. So actually for my Master's thesis that you may be less familiar with, I kind of created a compromise between the more experimental approach and my interest

in, first of all, interest in observation that was becoming clear. Although, as you're well aware or people are well aware, in the late sixties observational methods were used very little. And it was not a methodology, I think, that was considered would be one that one would incorporate in training in developmental psychology. And in addition to the technique, that method, it required different types of statistical analyses than were, again, usually considered to be traditional for Ph.D. training. But what I did actually for my Masters' thesis before —

Emde: Excuse me. You observational as oppose to experimental or what?

Osofsky: Yeah, observational methods as oppose to experimental. Experimental laboratory methods were those that were seen as more expectable and the kind of thing that a person should in their Ph.D. research training at that time, at least that was the message that I was getting. Part of that relates to where one trains and who one's expose to. But it was a much more common way to proceed. Dave Hunt actually, and he was probably had influence with me, was a bit of a maverick in the field. He would consider, I think, different ways of doing research, but again, he bridged developmental and personality. In any case, I became increasingly interested in observational methods. And my compromise for my Masters' thesis, I recall that I published it as a paper "The shaping of mothers behaviors by children" or something--I think that that was the title. And you can tell that there is an experimental twist to that. And what I did was train confederates to act in a certain way, confederate children. Interestingly enough, those children I have sometimes, have tracked--they are obviously grownups at this point--and they remembered this experience. But I trained these confederate children who were latency age children to act a certain way with mothers and then observe the mothers' responses to the children with the behavior obviously controlled and did a kind of a modification of combined experimental observational study.

I found that interesting, but to my mind it didn't go far enough. I was very excited that the method worked--that one could train the children and one could control the experiment that way. But, I wanted my dissertation to be a bit less contrived than that. And had the opportunity--that was introduced to me at Syracuse--to apply for a NIMH predoctoral fellowship. Dave Hunt was still there and it was under his direction that I applied for this fellowship and proposed a dissertation study that was going to be an observational study pursuing the idea of the child's effect on the parent, but doing it in a more naturalistic way so that I would have certain things influencing the child's behavior to maintain some kind of control--putting through a paradigm to maintain some kind of control--but not training them, as I did previously to be confederates.

Now if you think about developmental theory at that time, theory in child development, we had much more of unidirectional model. That's why Bell's work was so intriguing to me. The model was that the parent affected the child, usually the mother. We didn't even--very few studies on the fathers

Emde: As well.

Osofsky: As well?

Emde: In other words, as I understand it Bell's was a point of emphasis. You had to look at that direction as well as the other direction. He was---isn't that the point?

Osofsky: Right, yes, right. You had to look at that direction as well as the other direction. But that was, actually, I would say fairly revolutionary at that time. It's very interesting now, I'm thinking now about a workshop I just participated in where people were talking about the infant's, you know, contribution, so we seem to go back and forth in some ways. But I think that it was very important to recognize theoretically that it was a much more of a unidirectional mother to child; not even father to child; not parent to child view at that point. And so the idea of the child influencing the parent's behavior was quite significant at that point.

Emde: And your dissertation?

Osofsky: And my dissertation showed clearly that the child had a very strong influence on the parent's behavior. And one couldn't see it as a unidirectional approach. It was at time that theory was beginning to be expanded in that area. You know, we started to, then, talk about interaction. We hadn't talked about ---

Emde: Wasn't there a reciprocity program?

Osofsky: Well, the interaction first. Interaction first and then reciprocity.

Emde: But that was part of your conceptualization.

Osofsky: Part of my conceptualization, yeah, was rec--

Emde: Cause I remember some of it.

Osofsky: Yeah, the, well I think reciprocity, using the term reciprocity, is a more complex way to understand the interaction, because we moved actually much into transactional work at that point, where it was very much a back and forth type approach. The kind of thing that ---

Emde: The transaction's the next.

Osofsky: The transaction's the next level--the, Sameroff and Chandler model that was talked about after that--but yeah there was very much reciprocity in there. But at that time you had to make a point. You had to make a point that the child was playing a major role in the relationship that, you know--I mean we're talking about twenty-five years ago and our conceptualization of, first of all, our observational methods; second of all, that there was really this interactional/reciprocal relationship going on. And also, ways to consider it through our statistical techniques were considered.

Emde: Oh so do you think that in those days, not only was child development field, strongly under the sway of experimental approaches, but also behavioral approaches which essentially use the word shaping, were emphasizing the direction of coming from parenting and socialization experiences in the environment shaping the child as oppose to the child going the other way? Is that

Osofsky: Yeah.

Emde: Is that the context you're eluding to?

Osofsky: Right, that's the context. And I also think that it's a really important one to recognize, because I think that our field has gone---has progressed so far since then that we forget how narrow our conceptualize-, in my opinion, how narrow our conceptualization were.

Emde: Yeah, that's really a good context specification I think for those times and your career. I wonder if you could continue to tell us about the launching of your academic career itself. Incidentally, I may have made an error earlier when I referred to your undergraduate at Syracuse. Obviously that was your graduate--

Osofsky: No, my undergraduate was at Syracuse too.

Emde: Oh, because you transferred.

Osofsky: I transferred to Syracuse.

Emde: I see, I got a little confused there.

Osofsky: I clarified that on the tape.

Emde: Okay, thanks. So if you could talk about the launching of your academic career and some of your research and academic interests.

Osofsky: Okay. I'm going to follow a theme that I brought up earlier that you brought me back to related to the issue of being a woman.

Emde: Okay.

Osofsky: I finished my Ph.D. in 1969. I did very well, in that--I mentioned I got the NIMH award for my predoctoral, for, predoctoral award to do my dissertation and then also was awarded a university fellowship based on some of the work that I had done. I only mention that because you sort of need it, as a woman, whatever advantages anyway you can get at that point. I don't know that the job market was less open for women; however, I was limited in terms of geographic mobility at that point. It may be now that we have dual career families with people living in different cities. I didn't have children yet but, at the same time, the idea of, you know, living further than commuting distance was not something that my husband and I were probably going to consider at that point. So I looked at the opportunities that were available in the Syracuse area and, fortunately, there were a number of opportunities including the one that I ended up taking. My first academic position was in the Department of Human Development and Family Studies at Cornell University. Not only was that obviously a very good job and a good match in many ways--as I mentioned my orientation was much more toward broader perspective and that was one of those departments, you know, that had a very broad perspective in terms of the different kinds of interdisciplinary people who were in it and the areas they were covering, and that kind of thing. But there were some people there who were wonderful mentors for me. I came in as junior faculty at the time that Henry Ricciuti was chair of the department. And he was doing some of the very first work in infancy. I increasingly was becoming interested in infancy and I'll tell you why. But he was doing, he had started one of the first infant daycare programs. And I remembered at the time, you had to find mothers that would put their child in daycare half a day and be available the rest of the day. We didn't have that much of the working mother type of thing at this point. And we were very critical of working mothers that was the prevailing...

Emde: Ethos?

Osofsky: Ethos, at that time. And, he was doing, what seemed to me to be, very important pioneering work. And also, Urie Bronfenbrenner was there. And Urie was always intrigued with new younger faculty with their--he's always been open to new ideas and very encouraging; and Ed Devereux, who was in family sociology, was there and then became chairman after Henry. It was very much of an interdisciplinary department. So for me, it was a wonderful place to go because there was an openness to the areas that I wanted to expand in that I hadn't really experienced at Syracuse. Syracuse was a wonderful academic place, but didn't have that broad perspective. Plus, these people who really became very significant mentors to me, interestingly enough, Henry and I and Urie and Ed--to less of an extent, Harold Feldman was there too, at that time was a family sociologist. We continued a very close relationship over the years. And it opened up all kinds of opportunities as well as, as I say, people who you could turn to for advice and guidance.

Emde: Certainly, once again, underscores the importance of early faculty development of mentoring and also continuing networking and support. That's very nice.

Osofsky: Yeah, I agree. I think it's very, very important. And it's a very important--you know you talk a lot about transitional periods and that's a very important transitional period, it seems to me, in professional growth.

Emde: Yeah, that's a good point. And also, when we get to SRCD, I imagine that's an important aspect of SRCD. It certainly was for me and I think perhaps for you too--continuing that networking and mentoring opportunity

Osofsky: Yeah, very much though. I have to add an anecdote at this point, hopefully, if there are some females or young females who are reading this, they'll appreciate it and it may help them at various times. But I was just thinking with the job at Cornell, it was fairly unusually for people to be married and working so far apart and a lot of the people--some of the people, I don't remember that of Urie and Henry, but some other people--wondering how I was going to do this. So I agreed to take an apartment in Ithaca and we did a lot of commuting. But interestingly enough, I remember one of the female faculty came up to me--I don't know if it was in Human Development or in the College of Human Ecology--said, you know, 'is your marriage still together?' about six months after I had been there. And I said 'yeah, why? everything's fine'. Then she said 'well you're here all the time'. And I said 'well that's my job to be here all the time'. That there was really, still a conception of woman that made it harder. You felt like you were in a uphill struggle some of the time. There are some very interesting things that happened in that area at Cornell as well in decision making that I made in terms of my professional career that's important. When I was there, actually the second year I was there, they decided they wanted to start a woman's study course. This was one of the first woman's studies courses that was taught anywhere in the country. And Human Development, as I say, was a very open kind of a department. And at the same time I was junior and I had a lot of support from Henry and Urie, you know, the senior faculty, but I thought I really am sticking my neck out as junior faculty if I would offer a course like this alone. So, Harold Feldman, who was senior faculty, agreed to co-sponsor it with me--and that was interesting in and of itself to have it co-sponsored in that way. So we started one of the first women's studies courses that was very popular at that time. And I also started some other new seminars, actually, in observational methods and early development and that kind of thing at the same time.

Emde: Just out of curiosity, what do you remember to be the main kinds of curriculum in that early women's studies course?

Osofsky: Well actually it was a large lecture course and, as I say, we didn't have a women's studies program yet. Cornell started one of the first women's studies programs. But one of the reasons that the course was quite palatable to people who were more conservative in terms of having courses like that was --as you may know Cornell has both an endowed college and state college and our department was part of the state college and when people from endowed went to state, they had to pay that tuition and our course was very popular--so, that helped it a little bit, I think, politically.

But I felt it was very important in the first women's studies is to, first of all, have a strong section on history. So we went back to some of the early major women who had played an important role in terms of medicine and other areas. So we had a strong historical section.

Emde: Was there , did you use biography or what kind of literature did you have to use?

Osofsky: Well there wasn't a lot of literature then. There's a lot of literature now. There wasn't a lot then. We used biography of various women: Elizabeth Blackwell, who actually had tradition from that part of the country; and a number of the very early women feminists. There were a number of people who were doing some writing in that area from a variety of disciplines, even though some of it hadn't been published. So we got in touch with some of them. And then I recall in the early course, also, I had gotten some statistics, some books from Sweden--countries that were more progressive in terms of the roles of women. And we gave some of that

Emde: Cross cultural.

Osofsky: Cross cultural perspective as well.

Emde: And did you use autobiographies that you would collect from, not only individuals, but students?

Osofsky: We didn't do that.

Emde: No?

Osofsky: At that time.

Emde: Interesting.

Osofsky: But, the early literature didn't, the curriculum didn't depend as much on books because they weren't available then, but we managed to pull together papers.

Emde: One of the things that occurs to me, just thinking about it now, is that right from the start would you say that women's studies took a life-span approach?

Osofsky: Women's--

Emde: Life, it was a really a life-span, developmental approach?

Osofsky: Yes, absolutely.

Emde: Yeah.

Osofsky: It was a life-span, developmental approach and also an interdisciplinary approach.

Emde: Yeah, that's fascinating.

Osofsky: From the very beginning, now actually I made a personal decision--this course was very popular. And as

Emde: What made it very popular? Was it popular with men as well as women?

Osofsky: We had a fair number of men who came to take the course. I think first of all it was popular because, well it was quite well-taught, I have to say, and the curriculum was interesting

Emde: Well it must have been exciting to teach?

Osofsky: It was exciting.

Emde: It was new.

Osofsky: It was new. It was exciting to teach. We did make a--I insisted that it be academic. I didn't want this to just be a sensitivity group.

Emde: Right

Osofsky: Or a sharing--I mean, some of that's important.

Emde: There were pressures that way?

Osofsky: Oh yeah. Many people wanted it to be more of that kind of a group. But we were going to do something new. We were going to make this an academic course in that area.

Emde: Was this some that your mentors: Henry Ricciuti, Urie Bronfenbrenner, encouraged?

Osofsky: Yeah, they encouraged us doing the course.

Emde: Did they participate?

Osofsky: I don't recall--I don't think that Urie and Henry participated, but as I say Harold Feldman who was a family sociologist did it jointly with me. And then I brought in various lecturers from around Cornell and then if I could get some people to come in from out of town. For example, one of the women that I worked with in Syracuse in the women's movement, was one of the first female lawyers in the civil rights movement and in the women's rights movement, and she came down and lectured in the course. And --

Emde: That's interesting. It sounds in your beginnings and networking early women's movement if not feminism movement, but really the women's movement, women's academic, women's studies, etc. had, had multiple roots, the people were also tended to be activists in other social action areas; civil rights, anti-war, perhaps governmental activism in general. Is that a, is that a correct impression?

Osofsky: It seems to me that that would be a correct impression. And I can say for me personally, and I think quite a few other women at the time had played a very important supportive role in being able to launch new directions, professional directions and other kinds of things.

Emde: How is it supportive?

Osofsky: Well, for me personally, I didn't get a lot of support with what I was doing from my extended family

Emde: But the network?

Osofsky: The network played important role that you could do it, that they had confidence in you, that there other women you could talk to.

Emde: So this is a, an example of a strong, academic support network there at that time.

Osofsky: Right.

Emde: With your mentors and other people that were recruited, it sounded like you must have generated a considerable student excitement?

Osofsky: Oh yes, absolutely. And people were intrigued with the fact that with this first women's studies course we made it as academic as we did. You know, I think some people thought that it would not be a serious academic course.

Emde: That you would be politicized.

Osofsky: Right. Interestingly enough--I guess it was about a year or so maybe two years after this course started, I think it may be a year--yeah they were going to start a women's program at Cornell. And I think because this course had been so successful and I had shown a leadership role in this area, they asked me if I would become the head of the women's studies program. And that was a very serious decision point for me.

Emde: How, when did that occur? How far along were you in your career?

Osofsky: I would say I was about one year beyond my Ph.D.

Emde: Wow!

Osofsky: Right!

Emde: Wow! Okay.

Osofsky: Maybe a year, a year and a half.

Emde: So why did you decide not?

Osofsky: Well it was very tempting obviously in many ways for people to think that highly of me to consider, you know, me launching a program of that sort. However, I'd struggled very hard to become a psychologist. You know, it isn't that I had a hard, that hard of a time in school, I did well in school, I think particularly after I gained confidence that I could do it. But I felt it was very important to have women proceed within the more traditional disciplines and be models and mentors in that way. And, I talked at great length with the different people and I said I felt that I could do more for women and the kinds of efforts that we were trying to accomplish by staying within my discipline and continuing to teach women's studies or other kinds of courses but proceed in a more traditional way.

Emde: That's fascinating to me. That certainly was a noble decision. You must have been really tempted, not just flattered, but it was a major. But I sense from what you say that you were, you had a strong sense that you were just getting your professional identity together and you needed more to consolidated it in your own terms. You weren't quite sure where it was taking you. Is that the sense of that's correct?

Osofsky: Yes, I think that would be an accurate way to portray it. But other thing that was happening is there were parallel things that were happening to me professionally that relate very much to child development. I mentioned when I left Syracuse that I was developing this strong interest in infancy and I can tell why. Moving from the direction effects and socialization, which was Bell's original paper written in the sixties, that influenced me a great deal. And then a book by Harper--you know the book...

Emde: By Bell and Harper.

Osofsky: Bell and Harper.

Emde: They put it together in a book, Bell and Harper. I remember it very well.

Osofsky: Right. Well at that time I had the notion that if we really wanted to look at directional effects and socialization, that what we wanted to do was eliminate as much of the variance, as much of the environmental influences and other influences we could. It was sort of a naive approach at that point if you moved earlier and earlier in infancy or in childhood toward infancy you would eliminate some of the environmental input in the kind of the noise that you can't always control. So I became intrigued with, it isn't that I had the Watson view of the blank, you know the blank screen type of child/baby. But at the same I thought well you wouldn't have had all those years of all those other things happening with a child. So I became intrigued with learning more about infants. I hadn't learned much about infants in graduate school except, you know, just a little bit. There wasn't anybody focusing on it.

Emde: Well you may have, it sounds to me, been intrigued with the idea that a lot of socialization experiences. Osofsky for the history. This is Side 2 and we're doing this in July, the end of July 1994. And I believe that I was just commenting, Joy, that you may have thought that if you move prior to language and all of the, many of the studies had been concentrating on socialization in terms of language experiences on the child, that there might have been some simplifications.

Osofsky: Well to some extent, I would say prior to language, but for me it was even broader than that. I was looking at the environment and trying to control the environment. That's what I tried to do to some extent in my Master's and my dissertation through experimental methods.

Emde: Um-hm

Osofsky: And there's less environmental influence the earlier you go with a child in a sense. Again, you have to remember that these conceptualizations are coming from the late sixties and early seventies.

Emde: So what-what did you mean in your thinking, "less environment"? That does puzzle me.

Osofsky: Less, less environmental influence than a baby comes into the world with

Emde: That there's more balance of biological factors or something?

Osofsky: There is more balance of biological factors and you have to remember it's 1994 and take yourself back to 1969 or 1970 where it isn't that we thought of the baby as a blank screen, but we didn't have all this emphasis on early prenatal factors, during pregnancy--that's been a very recent development. We knew much, much less about the infant than we know now. The Brazelton Scale was just in the process of being developed at that time. I actually worked with Berry on some of the early development. So we had this very naive sense, I think, that, you know, we had, we knew a lot more about the little baby.

Emde: I see, sure.

Osofsky: And actually,

Emde: That things were simpler.

Osofsky: And that things were simpler. Now, there may be, and certainly was and we know a lot of naiveté to that, I also needed to learn something about infancy. There weren't that many people focusing in the area of infancy then. And actually, the first year out of graduate school, I spent some time traveling to visit people who I considered to be experts in the area to learn more about what was going on. I went to visit Jerry Kagan and Marion Radke-Yarrow at NIMH and I also went to visit Sally Provence at Yale Child Study Center, because these were people I respected a great deal in terms of knowing something about infancy. At the same time obviously, Henry was playing a very important mentor role.

Emde: Again networking and the idea that you had that it was important to visit other laboratories sounds like it was an important feature of really sustaining the beginning of your research career, is that correct?

Osofsky: It was a very important feature. At the same time as I was doing that, as I say I was very motivated in undergraduate and graduate school. I was also very motivated to move ahead in my profession as quickly as I could. So I actually did a study, a new study my first year at Cornell, where I expanded my conceptualization of the effects of children on parents beyond mothers to fathers.

Emde: Um-hm

Osofsky: And also had preschoolers at various ages. And so I continued to do that work, learn more about infancy and tried to move ahead in a very serious way with my professional career early on.

Emde: Um-hm. Actually, I'm going to suggest something, we're going to move on to your SRCD activities, your leadership activities, and, coordinating activities for our organization in a few moments. But before doing that I wanted to continue this theme with you that we've started and move ahead in time, even though we're going to go back in a little bit. I think of Arthur Miller's phrase "time bends" in which you can bend time to continue themes and they weave back and forth. And I wanted to go forward a little bit to ask you on this theme about some of your career, early career developments. You mentioned that you were, you wanted to move ahead--I guess I was going to say you were ambitious. You really, it seems to me, early in your career edited a major volume which is now also gone through a second edition--and I guess the time might come for a third edition--with respect to research in infancy and I wonder if you could talk a little bit about that,

because that was really relatively early in your career that you had the vision and energy and the commitment, some might even say the “Chutzpah.”

Osofsky: I know.

Emde: --to network leaders in the field to edit a major volume that, I must say, has been so useful to most of us--just about all of us I think and certainly students--in the field of infancy research and, particularly, from a multi-disciplinary perspective, such as SRCD certainly represents, in my view. So how did you, how did you get that vision, and a little bit of reflection on that experience early in your career, to contact the leaders and then badger them and all the things that you had to do as an editor?

Osofsky: It's an interesting question. I think you used the word “chutzpah” and I think I probably felt that too. Because I was very early in my, it was early in my career and I was also young. I might mention in addressing that, that when I started to work on that volume, I was in Philadelphia. Things were going very well at Cornell for me, however, Howard and I had the thought of wanting to continue to pursue work in an urban center. And that's very interesting, because I was thinking you traced me back to the civil rights movement and I do work now related to issues of poverty and other kinds of work related to groups that are disadvantaged in individual rights and that type of things. While I was at Cornell I had the opportunity to work in Syracuse with a program with teenage mothers and their infants. And, I recall very---
[interruption in recording]

--And as we talk about mentorship I recall very vividly that I went in to talk to Henry Ricciuti, then the chair of the department, about this opportunity to work in this program. And he was very encouraging and said it was fine to spend a day a week in developing research in this area. This was one of the very first observational studies that had been done--certainly with teenage mothers and babies. I think Tiffany Field may have started to do some work around then, but there were very few studies early on and Henry was very encouraging. This is related also to the question about the handbook, because I mentioned that I went to visit Kagan and Provence and Radke-Yarrow around issues of infancy and these people were very open and welcoming to a young person in their laboratories and wanted to help and nurture in many ways in terms of learning about this field. And, in the process of developing my research study with teenage mothers and their babies, my observational study again, I went to people to get advice in terms of observational techniques. Although, my--you know, Henry played a big role in helping with this and I found a real openness. Well, Howard and I made a move to Philadelphia, I went to Temple University in Philadelphia in 1971--left Cornell, not because I wasn't happy there. I was very happy there. But we had an opportunity to go working in an urban center which provided, again, a chance to deal with some issues of poverty and diversity and risk and intervention in ways that one couldn't in a rural area, as well as an opportunity to be in a different type of department--in this case a psychology, and develop new directions in that area. And on top of it, I guess, there was a personal kind of issue that it would be nice to be living in the same city and not have to commute. At that point, we were thinking of having children and it would be very difficult to be living in two different cities and try to raise a family, that just didn't seem to be that feasible.

So we moved to Temple University and one of the areas that I was focusing on was, in developmental psychology in the Department of Psychology at Temple, was teaching in the area of infancy; both, mainly at the graduate level, the undergraduate level was more basic developmental courses. And there weren't that many materials out there to use. We would pull together articles and there weren't very many books then and there certainly wasn't a resource kind of book. And I found myself calling around to get materials and looking up materials and actually building more and more of a network of people who were working in the area of infancy and, I guess, as they say, I was ambitious and I was highly motivated and I wondered if there would be some usefulness to have a reference volume in infancy. And I called some of the senior people in the area. Again, perhaps a bit of chutzpah, and I said, you know, I'm doing this teaching and I would find it useful to have some kind of a reference volume and what do think? And I got a lot of encouragement from people thinking that it would be a good idea. And then I went a step further and

Emde: Like who?

Osofsky: Well, Jerry Kagan

Emde: Really, great.

Osofsky: Yeah and Henry Ricciuti.

Emde: Hum,

Osofsky: And um--

Emde: So naturally they would contribute.

Osofsky: Oh, right. Naturally they would contribute. Not only were they encouraging, but people gave me advice in terms of the areas that would be important to cover--I had some of my own ideas. I did a lot of research in the area, I don't mean a lot --I mean a lot research into what might the most important areas to cover. And I asked people their advice and I would ask around different people so that I would get some consensual validation. At the same time, Bill Overton was at Temple. He's not an infancy person, he's more of a cognitive developmental person that, interestingly enough, has gone into clinical work after I did and combined it. And, he knew the field a great deal and was very encouraging; we were good colleagues who were trying to move ahead. And, so it was, I got encouragement and I just felt like this was something that I could undertake as well as a lot of encouragement from a publisher.

Emde: I remember two of the leading people at the time facilitating that--that person I admired very much, Frances Graham, contacted me and said that she thought that this was going to be a terrific volume and that she had recommended that Joe Campos and myself do a chapter on psycho-physiology, psycho physiological development. And Joe and I were very flattered, even though we were in the midst of a very busy time. And my first introduction to you was one in which I let you down because Joe and I just couldn't pull off getting this chapter together in our busy lives and we had to pull out. And I remember how badly I felt and how badly he felt and we did. We agonized over contacting you. You were quite gracious but we--that was, that was my introduction. But the point of that is that , Frances Graham said this is going to be a first rate volume and this would be a great opportunity to represent a good in a major review. So, apparently you just sun--you commanded enormous respect from leaders in the field who got behind and rallied and really gave the support to that volume which turned out to be so successful. In fact, later I remember it was so successful I was with you at an SRCD meeting when it first came out and somebody stole it from the publisher's desk.

Osofsky: Yeah, actually, I wasn't going to bring that personal interchange about the chapter that you and Joe didn't do. I think that the two of you felt more that you let me down than--I put it more in perspective that it was a developmental transition for you. It wasn't just a matter of obligations and a lot of other commitments which I know was part of the issue but you and Joe were changing the direction of your work at that

Emde: Yes I was changing [Speaking simultaneously], yeah--

Osofsky: --at that point and that had something to do with it. But for me--from the point of an editor and I've obviously done a lot--that was the first attempt to do a lot of editing. It was just a matter of--that was a very important chapter and I had to find somebody else. Some people were helpful.

Emde: Um-hm

Osofsky: In finding somebody else to do it, but

Emde: That's terrific.

Osofsky: I think it's very important to recognize in our field that we have a lot of people who nurture other people. And I think that that's how this volume was done. I was also at that time doing consulting with Berry Brazelton on the Brazelton scale. He also contributed a chapter. And, you know, when I called major people in the field, they were willing to work with me on it. They all felt there was a need and were willing to come together.

Emde: For the record, let's note the title of the book and the publisher and also the two editions; and then let me ask you if you think there will be a third edition? They came about ten or twelve years apart--the two editions.

Osofsky: The first that's called, *The Handbook of Infant Development*. And the first volume was published in 1979.

Emde: Wiley?

Osofsky: By Wiley. The second volume was again called, *The Handbook of Infant Development*, Volume 2, Second Edition.

Osofsky: Second ed--sorry, Second Edition of *Handbook of Infant Development*, published in 1987. There were different chapters in the

Emde: Totally different reviews, there were major reviews and perspectives.

Osofsky: Major reviews and perspectives. I tried to work with my authors so that they would give a perspective on their particular area rather than just review their work. In terms of a third volume

Emde: I have--I would add that Joe Campos and I each gave separate contributions to your second edition.

Osofsky: Yes, that's true, that's true. In the second edition, emotional development had proceeded to such extent that we ended up having two different perspectives on emotional development--one done by Joe Campos and Karen Barrett and the other one done by Cal Izard. And Bob Emde did a chapter related to perspectives in infant mental health for volume two. Yeah the two of them really came through very strongly for volume two. Actually you know, certainly the field of infancy changes and there's new work and new perspectives, but I think it's fortunate to have these kind of important review classic chapters at two different periods of time--eight years apart. Whether there will be a third volume, the two volumes did well in terms of sale and you know, I'm less concerned with sales than the contribution to the field. In talking around with colleagues--which is how I ended up doing the first two volumes--the feeling is that the time is not right now to do another volume. So I'm not planning to do that at this point. You know we have seen such growth in the field of infancy; it continues to grow with major journals in the field and other means of publication that I think it's quite a different situation than it was when we started on the handbook volumes.

Emde: Um-hm. I think now we could maybe skip an extra line in the text and make a major transition to talking about your activities in SRCD and move to your experiences and perspectives and wisdom with respect to SRCD and the participation of yourself and others. So let's get a beginning on that, Joy and could you tell us your beginnings with SRCD and how you moved into a leadership role? Again, my knowledge of your activities is such that it seems to me you became centrally involved in the organization and workings and work of the SRCD fairly in your career.

Osofsky: It was early in my career. I joined SRCD as a graduate student, as many of us do, and went to meetings and gave--we didn't have posters then--but gave a paper. I saw this as a very important group where one had the opportunity to meet, you know, the leaders in the field. Well, there was sort of a

serendipitous opportunity that came up for me when I was in Philadelphia. The SRCD meeting was planned for Philadelphia, I believe that's the 1973 meeting—right, it would be the 1973 meeting. And, as I mentioned, I was motivated, worked hard, was ambitious, and Kuno Beller was then the chair of the Division of, or the head of, the Division of Developmental and had taken on responsibilities of arrangements for the SRCD meeting in Philadelphia. And I was still junior faculty, although, I had was --I believe I was just about at the associate professor level; that I'd have to check. It was around that time that I was promoted to Associate Professor. Kuno came to me and asked me if I would help him with the arrangements for SRCD. And I said I'd be glad to-- I was one who didn't turn down any opportunity and I was a hard worker and well organized and committed--you know I thought SRCD was terrific, so to me it was a wonderful opportunity. And what happened over a period was that Kuno and I worked together and sort of divided responsibilities and as some of you may recall the Philadelphia meeting turned out to be much, much larger than we had anticipated. I think it was anticipated to have what, five or six hundred something like that, and it emerged at about 1,000 or somewhat double the s--

Emde: Was that one of the first transitions to a big meeting?

Osofsky: That was THE first transition to a big meeting--it was really much bigger than we had anticipated. It was fortunate that the hotel that we had booked had expandable space. But we had no idea it was going to be as big as it was. Interestingly how history repeats itself, that I was Program Chair for the meeting in New Orleans, the last meeting that also was

Emde: Give a year

Osofsky: 1993, that also well, that to date was the largest SRCD meeting.

Emde: How was--what was that?

Osofsky: I believe that forty-- I believe that was forty-five hundred? Something like that--4500, 4700 it was very large.

Emde: Yes. That was a fabulous meeting I might add. From the point of view of diversity, social activity, and just general success of the meeting.

Osofsky: And you, of course, might have a personal perspective on it being President of SRCD during the New Orleans meeting. In any case, going back to Philadelphia twenty years earlier, it turned out to be a much larger meeting and

Emde: According to our time bends perspective--

Osofsky: And Kuno and I rose to the occasion together to try to accommodate the larger meeting. And I, you know, gave my all to it and worked very closely with Dot Eichorn and others who were very involved with the planning of the SRCD meeting at that point. And it was quite a success. I think there was some organizational problems as happens by necessity when a meeting gets much bigger than we anticipate. But one of the things that happened is I got to know people quite well. We had to work closely together and it was the beginning of a, a new relationship with SRCD for me. It actually turned out to be a very important beginning of a new relationship because it was within the next year that SRCD made a decision that they might want to go in a different direction with the newsletter than they had previously. Did you want to hear about this?

Emde: Yeah. Yes, Joy, this introduces what to me is a fascinating topic and very important for our Historical Archives of SRCD. Because you were the founding editor of the SRCD newsletter that became under your leadership a regular publication, and of increasingly vital importance as well as high quality for the organization. It seems to me that it was your vision that got it going and certainly your leadership. Because as I recall from your CV, I think you were editor for something like eleven years. You were founding editor and editor for eleven years. And so, in many respects,

you assumed responsibility for a communications center, surely, the executive officer, Dot Eichorn was a communication center. But this was a special thing--a newsletter for Society--and I'd love to hear your reflections on the beginnings and the course of your guidance of the SRCD Newsletter, why you did it and sort of the changes in the form of it during more than a decade in which you guided it.

Osofsky: While you were formulating your question--since this is an archival document--trying to, without having my CV in front of me, put together the years. I was thinking that I don't recall--I think it was Barbara Kahn who called me, but I'm not exactly sure. But it was 1974. So it was the year after the SRCD meeting in Philadelphia or I may have been six months after that I got a call from someone from SRCD -- that's the reason that I think it may have been Barbara Kahn. She had been publishing the newsletter and had primarily been reporting on the minutes from the business meeting and the financial status of the organization and then the new members and that kind of thing; and was just a publication that reported on the business of the Society. And I got a very flattering call where they said that they were very impressed with the role that I had played with the success of the Philadelphia meeting and were thinking of possibly changing the direction of the newsletter or bringing in an editor for the newsletter, a professional editor, a psychologist--child development person, perhaps create something different from what they had before. And they wondered, you know, what I thought about it and if I would possibly be interested in taking this on. It was a very open invitation, as I say, it was flattering. I was still very young and flattered to be called by SRCD. But also you know, there wasn't really, there weren't any guidelines as to how this newsletter would evolve and what would be in it. They said we have confidence in you to be able to create something that would be very helpful in terms of communicating a broader perspective and other perspectives and additional perspectives to the membership. Well, it was such a flattering offer that I couldn't say no. I've never really been very good at saying no even when it means taking on work. But I also, it was a wonderful challenge and I loved it. You know, I already loved SRCD and I thought well this is nice exciting opportunity. Plus, you know, in a way I was sticking my neck out because they might not like what I did, but they weren't telling me a particular direction that I needed to go.

Emde: Can I interject something here, you said, you knew you loved SRCD. What was it about SRCD, at this phase in your career, that you loved?

Osofsky: Well, my first real involvement, you know, beyond a more passive participant at the meeting was at the Philadelphia meeting. And there was such incredible excitement. We have to remember that, even though a thousand--which I think is about what it was--is a large group. It's much smaller than what it is today. And, you know, I was in the field of child development I was still a young person--I actually, you know, got my Ph.D. at the age of twenty-four--and so, in 1973, you know I actually was twenty-nine at that time and still young in my career. And got to go to this meeting and meet all these people who were very nice to me, who were hear this exciting work and I thought, you know that this was just a wonderful opportunity. I loved SRCD, you know. I think people were very open and warm and bright and sharing and it was an opportunity to grow.

Emde: So you continued to get this encouragement that we heard earlier from Cornell: mentoring, excitement, networking, and you said openness which is another theme about the organization and about your commitment to it. Here you are in a communications center, and it sounds to me like you wanted to contribute to that openness. Is that right?

Osofsky: Well, I think that, yeah. I would agree that that's right. Plus the fact that nobody was really telling me how I had to communicate or there had to be one particular way. What they were saying was that you know, that they had confidence in me to create something for the Society that would be meaningful. The other thing that I think is important to recognize, and it may sound a little bit naive, but I can remember back and you know that it's really mind boggling to meet some of these people whose work you'd read, who you can talk to, who you listen and, you know I think--I see that now, by the way with young people who I introduce to people in SRCD--that is just it's a very exciting organization and will always will be I'm sure.

Emde: Yes. Yes, and also now in our international work we're doing together. When we see people who come out from regions that had been formally isolated, like, we both experienced the former Soviet Union, the repressed countries who come out and they just are so excited to, to meet and have interchanges with people they'd only known about through publications and writings and reputation.

Osofsky: Well, actually, I had that experience too in terms of the way people would react to me after I did the first volume of the *Handbook*--I'll get back to the *Newsletter*--but I would meet people--and you know, this was a big volume, about a thousand pages and all of that--they'd come up to me and they said 'Oh I thought you had to be much older', you know, to have done something like that. And it, you know, gives you a different perspective on yourself too. Related to the *Newsletter*, I think it's really important for people to recognize first of all that SRCD as an organization may, you know, our process at times is I think democratic in terms of having a broad group of people who we approach to development certain areas. But in other ways, sometimes we'll identify someone who we have confidence in and that's sort of what they did with me for the *Newsletter*. So what I did was I called around people who had done newsletters--I looked at the various newsletters that were available and I called around--and tried to find a format and some approaches that I thought would be useful for SRCD. And I you know called up, of course, the president and others and said, you know, 'what do you

Emde: Who was the president then?

Osofsky: Well, I believe it may have been Arthur Parmelee at that, at that point. I'm trying to, I was trying to realize--

Emde: Was it Mary Ainsworth?

Osofsky: Or it may have been Mary Ainsworth at that time.

Emde: Mary Ainsworth.

Osofsky: Yeah, 'cause Arthur then followed Mary.

Emde: Mary Ainsworth was, I think, so crucial in opening up the Society, again, to more interdisciplinary and other efforts. So that's, that's an interesting juncture there.

Osofsky: Right. Well, in any case, I mean even calling the president of the organization at that point you know was an exciting thing for me. But I had an idea that in the newsletter, we would be able to communicate in a very different way. We would have freedom of different of format. And I decided that I would choose various topics that I thought were important for the field and find the best person I could to write on them and see if I could get some commitments and at the same time keep it scholarly but without the constraints that the journal had. *Child Development* has always been a very fine journal, but with a lot constraints and the newsletter wouldn't have to do that. Then I also thought that it would be a good to communicate activities that were going on the Society. I think early on the Interdisciplinary Affairs Committee--we kept trying to communicate what was going on with Interdisciplinary Affairs through the newsletter, as the Public Policy Committee, it now has a different name, but at that point Public Policy and the Washington Office and--

Emde: Yeah.

Osofsky: --other kinds of activities: what was going on in NIMH, and NIH and Washington activities. It seemed like, again, these were important things for people to know that could be communicated through the newsletter. So what I did was consult with, you know, the leadership of SRCD and say these were my ideas and this is what I wanted and what did they think? And they said terrific. And so, I really had free reign, in fact, nobody even said you know this topic is important and this one isn't.

Emde: In the early years of the newsletter, as you think back on it, what were some important communications that you think of, in the early years?

Osofsky: Well, I chose people who I thought had important messages to communicate. And I tried not to focus on the areas that were those that I had more expertise or particular interest, but a broad range. It's hard for me to think of some of the exact areas.

Emde: So who did a good, who did a--do you remember any particular ones that were salient?

Osofsky: Well one thing that I remember that I did way back--that you know I did the newsletter four times a year I had a lot of different articles and it's a number of years ago, so I really can't remember the specifics that well. I remember that we introduced things like the effects of television on children that a lot of people didn't know about at that point.

Emde: Was that John Wright? Or--

Osofsky: John Wright and Aletha Huston and their work.

Emde: Uh-hm

Osofsky: I believe, let's see oh, but Bob McCall wrote on some of his work and what he was trying to do in communicating in various ways--

Emde: Yes.

Osofsky: --- With, with the organization and I'm trying to think of some of the other people who had contributed early on--

Emde: We did a special communications program at Boys Town and I think you did a feature on that.

Osofsky: I did a feature on that at that time, yeah.

Emde: Um-hm, Um-hm

Osofsky: Yeah. I think, what's really important to recognize is the flexibility within the Society to be able to say, you know, previously you know, we had *Monographs* and *Child Development* with a certain way of communicating, but now we want to broaden that perspective. The other thing that was very nice for me and involved me directly and in a much more intensive way with SRCD, was that the *Newsletter* editor was also appointed to the Publications Committee. So that when I started to edit the *Newsletter* in 1974, I also became a member of the Publication Committee so when you're on a committee, particularly Publications or Council, some of the other committees as well, but those committees in particular, you learn a great deal about the workings of the organization.

Emde: Yeah, so how long were you on the Publications Committee, Joy?

Osofsky: Well, I was on the Publications Committee from 1974 to 1985, during the time that I edited the *Newsletter*.

Emde: So eleven years.

Osofsky: Yes, however, I continued on the Publications Committee for six more years when I was Secretary for the Society from 1985 to 1991.

Emde: Well one of the things we want, one of the things we want in an historical archives is a perspective over time. A perspective is IN time, but you have a special contribution to offer the archives because you have a perspective over time. And so one of the questions I'd like to ask you now to reflect upon, first of all from the point of view of the *Newsletter*, is what do you think of over your eleven years of the first eleven years of the *Newsletter* of SRCDC, what do you think of as changes over those eleven years? And then I will ask you the same question; and we'll get to the Publications Committee. But if I could, the *Newsletter*, let's just focus on that. What do you think of as changes over those eleven years in the *Newsletter*?

Osofsky: I think there were definite changes that occurred in direction that have reflected changes in the Society. At first, the articles that I would solicit--it was always the lead article--were those that were more strictly tied to the literature in the field. So even though you could write in a way without the constraints of a journal publication, at the same time, it was very closely linked to the science in the field in a more traditional, it seems to me, of child development. It seems to me over time with the *Newsletter*, as well as some changes that we started to see in the Society, we included material from the--we set up a Washington office--and included material from the Washington office. Public Policy Committee, committee on--it has a different name now, but at that time it was mainly Public Policy, they had a major section in the *Newsletter*. And what we saw over time was a move from just considering traditional kinds of research in child development to moving first to intervention work--I did have a number of articles on intervention at that time you know that might not have made into the jour--I mean not that we had it with all the rigor that was in the journal, but even the topic might not have made it into the journal. We moved to intervention work and then moved very strongly into public policy work. Plus, we actually had a negotiation that we had to take place probably in the last four years or so of my editing the *Newsletter*, because public policy always wanted so much space in the *Newsletter* that I just couldn't give them all that space, and I said you could only have so much space. Because they always had so much to report in the Washington office as well that it was important for the membership, but you know, it shouldn't dominate all of it. But we certainly saw a very strong shift in that area.

Emde: And you're describing the tension that built up so what happened?

Osofsky: We had to negotiate and

Emde: Okay--

Osofsky: -- we limited the space

Emde: Okay, okay--

Osofsky: I mean they were always given space--

Emde: So was in this first course you were already seeing an increasing need for public policy information, but the public policy reports that we know today had not yet developed.

Osofsky: Oh no, the public policy reports had not yet developed, and it may be that it's a reflection, public policy reports, it's certainly a reflection of changing directions in the Society and the field. But we did see that pressure along the way you know, toward finding different ways to communicate information that many more people in the membership were feeling was important but could not be done through the traditional means.

Emde: Um-hm, yeah, and did you have a multi-disciplinary participation in the *Newsletter*? Was that a feature?

Osofsky: Well you know I'm a multi-disciplinary person, and I've always been a multi-disciplinary person with a number of different ideas and perspectives. So yes, I had. I felt that it was very important to reflect

a variety of different disciplines. And, you know, we still have this tension in *Child Development* in terms of represen--

Emde: You mean the journal or the field?

Osofsky: In the journal *Child Development*, there's still a tension related to representation of different disciplines. We didn't have to have that tension in the *Newsletter*, so I had, I had sociologists and anthropologists and child psychiatrists and clinicians of various types, pediatricians, historians.

Emde: Um-hm, so, so there's a freedom you're expressing in the *Newsletter*, which I think is very prominent today. A freedom of expression--it's just for the membership. And you begin over the eleven years, as I hear it, to sense that it had a role not only in communication of everyday matters for the Society and business matters, but also--and announcements, but also would represent an opportunity for freedom of informal expression of the many diversity interests of the Society: Multi-disciplinary, ethnic, cultural, etc. Is that right?

Osofsky: Yeah, but I think what you're reflecting is something that is much more going on much more in the Society now than it was when I started to edit the *Newsletter* and you're, perhaps, reflecting some of the very important changes that occurred under your leadership as president as well. I have to, though, inject a caution. I was editing a newsletter, so you know a newsletter is a newsletter, it's not a journal. But I have to say that I often worried, you know, is one still considered respected in one's field and discipline if one introduces all of these diverse perspectives. And I think that's a very important issue as well. I never received any feedback from the *Newsletter* that wasn't positive. Well, you know, you shouldn't make absolute statements like that, but I can't recall people being particularly critical of the *Newsletter*.

Emde: Well I can see why you're worried about that.

Osofsky: What?

Emde: Well, if you don't receive criticism, are you stirring the waters enough? Or maybe you're just, just being a communication for? It seems to me that your vision was to be a good communications for and you moved beyond that increasingly and were representing multiple voices. It's hard to imagine you'd have multiple voices without some controversy, that's all.

Osofsky: Oh, yeah, I agree. But I think people accepted it as a newsletter

Emde: Sure.

Osofsky: --publication and, you know, it was the direction that the Society wanted to go.

Emde: Sure, but I think you may have sown the seeds for a newsletter we see today which has much more cross currents and, and, and it has more controversy in it; and I think it's your foresight which set that framework in motion.

Osofsky: It's really interesting, by the way, in terms of getting feedback from people related to a newsletter, as I say, you know, the comments--well, it may be that I forgot the others, but the comments, I remember were primarily positive. But I think people don't tend to write in that much. We always tried to get a column of this type-- letters to the editor-- and it's just like people don't always respond that much to nominations and that kind of thing.

Emde: Yeah, it took your energy, not just your visions, but your energy to pull this off I think; and that's been true of the wisdom of subsequent newsletter editors. It takes a lot of energy, doesn't it?

Osofsky: Takes a lot of energy. I also moved again, you know so I--[brief interruption]

Emde: Yes, you moved again, Joy, and I think that transition offers us a stopping point for this first interview. And we'll pick up next time and, perhaps, we can talk about the Publications Committee and your perspective on that over the long period of your tenure. And also, your experience as SRCD secretary and then, in addition, I will ask you to reflect upon comparing your experiences, with another kind of time bend or perhaps a time warp, as you compare your experience as an arrangements--was it arrangements and program for the Philadelphia meeting?

Osofsky: Well-- For the Philadelphia meeting? Philadelphia? or--

Emde: No the Philadelphia meeting.

Osofsky: No, arrangements for Philadelphia.

Emde: Arrangements Chair, for the Philadelphia meeting. But in those days, as is true today, the arrangements and program require integration and knowledge of each other. So if you could reflect on the situation and perspectives of arrangements and program in Philadelphia in, and that was, what did we figure out the year?

Osofsky: It was 1973.

Emde: 1973

Osofsky: It really wasn't [speaking simultaneously] program. I was in local arrangements; it was more separate then.

Emde: It was more separate then?

Osofsky: Yes

Emde: 1973, the Philadelphia meeting, and compare it with the New Orleans meeting of 1993, I think that would be an interesting perspective to go---[tape ends]

Okay, this is on the first of August 1995--testing--for part two of the oral history SRCD interview of Joy Osofsky. This interview is being conducted in Part 2, actually one year after we began Part 1; and due to technical difficulties, for which I apologize, we lost the concluding part of the interview a year ago. And so, we're taking this opportunity to update our perspectives and conclude the interview. And I really appreciate, Joy, your being available to do this under these circumstances.

Where we left off was in your telling about the times on the Publication Committee and what I'd like to have us do is to--you may want to add anything about that--but I'd like have you just give us the mechanics of when you were Secretary of SRCD. And then, perhaps, we could move to some of your perspectives, which I'll ask you about, on the different kinds of issues and changes that took place in terms of SRCD and the interactions among people over the course of that time. And I think for the record of interest, historically, in the archives, it would be good if we can be as concrete as possible with names and particular issues--and I'll try and provide anchors for that in the flow of the narrative. So, let's begin--I'm not sure--should we say anything more about your tenure on the Publications Committee at this point or your perspectives on it? Or do you want to move to the Secretarial time; and then we'll come back to issues and perspectives?

Osofsky: Let's turn it off a minute.

Emde: Okay.

Osofsky: If it's helpful--is this, is this working?

Emde: Yep, it's working. Um-hm.

Osofsky: Okay. If this is helpful in terms of archival information, I will share of the date of my major participation in SRCD. In 1973, as reviewed on the last tape, I participated in, as a co-chair of the arrangements for the 1973 meeting in Philadelphia, which was one first larger SRCD meetings. And then in 1993, twenty years later, was Program Co-Chair for the very large meeting in New Orleans, also handled a lot of the arrangements for that meeting. In the interim, from 1974 to 1985, I served as a member of the Publications Committee as the editor of the *Newsletter*, and I reviewed much of the material of that activity on the last tape. And then from 1985 to 1991, was Secretary of the Society. In terms of what might be interesting for people on the Publications Committee, in the seventies, when I served on the committee and I would say into even the early eighties, some of the tension that has been experienced with the Committee in the later eighties into the n--and I think even growing much stronger--into the nineties was not experienced early on. I think people were quite pleased with *Child Development* and *Abstracts*. The major issues that went on had to do with the content that would be covered in getting a good editor--I believe Bob Emde, editor of *Monographs* during that time period, I think we shared time together on the Publications Committee when you were editor of *Monographs*. And major concerns were to keep the publication level, or the publication style and level, at a very high scholarly level and to make sure that our circulation continued at the rate that it was. But I don't recall it being particularly issue-oriented in terms of material to be included in the journal. Until discussion of those kinds of issues started, I would say in the mid-eighties and then continued with some vigor into the late-eighties and then into the nineties, under your tenure as President, I know there was a lot of discussion. And actually, now in 1995, with the new editor coming in 1996--Mark Bornstein becomes editor--the journal is

Emde: He became editor June first, 1995.

Osofsky: 1995. And he started accepting papers as of then? There is very different emphasis going on at this point in the journal. But I'd like to trace a little of that. One of the issues that came up repeatedly in the Publications Committee, not particularly a very exciting issue, but one that's important for the Society's publications was whether we should continue with the University of Chicago Press as the publisher. And this was reviewed by the Committee about every three to four years. And when Lew Lipsitt was chair of the Committee I remember that there was an extensive review of the relationship of the University of Chicago Press coming out with the conclusion that the Press was doing an excellent job. I think one of the things that did happen that was very helpful to the publications at that point was more involvement of the University of Chicago Press-- in the meetings and working with council and working with Pub Committee which, I think, also made people, reassured people in terms of the commitment that University of Chicago Press had to the publications. It was always interesting, lively, discussions, although, as I said -- not that issue-oriented.

Emde: Isn't it true, Joy, that at that time that you're describing on the Pub Committee, *Child Development* had a number of special roles that in addition to being a premier journal of peer review with high standards, must have brought in a substantial amount of money for the organization, and in fact, I think you might say, which went toward, in effect, subsidizing international mailings, to worry so much about the financial consi--[tape interrupted]

Osofsky: ...accurate, and indeed, people saw it as the--have always seen the Journal as the major mainstay of the organization both, in terms of scholarship and in terms of finances.

Emde: Um-hm

Osofsky: Actually, bringing that up, I think it's important in light of some of the changes that people-- [mechanical problems causing speakers to be cut off in mid-sentence]

Emde: Uh, you saw a lot of changes and issues with the respect to the journal...secretary of the organization and really, in many ways, the overall administration.

Osofsky: There are a number of issues that are really important for the time period that I was Secretary, important for the Society, important changes and transitions that were taking place. Let me first deal with some of the issues related to the Executive Committee. When I was Secretary for the first two years, Mavis Hetherington was President and Dorothy Eichorn was still Executive Director of the Society and Dorothy played a very active role.

So, as I was saying during my time as Secretary, the three presidents were Mavis Hetherington for the first two years, Berry Brazelton for the second two years, and Sandra Scarr for the last two years. Dorothy Eichorn was Executive Director during the first two years, however, her retirement was imminent and she let people know that she would do it in a gradual way, but that she did want to retire as the Executive Director of the Society. This was a time that, or this was a situation actually that created, I think, a fair amount of anxiety, in terms of my experiencing it as a member of the Executive Council at the time. Because Dorothy had been Executive Director for so long. I think it was, what was it, twenty-five years, a long time anyhow. That that was what essentially the Society knew in terms of the kind of administrative base, operating out of her Berkeley office and home. And people always knew that the history of the Society, if nowhere else, was in Dorothy Eichorn's head. Now the history of the Society was in other places as well, but everybody always had a feeling, the officers, when came--if I don't know something or if I don't remember something or if I need to remember how something was dealt with--we could always call Dot and she would know. And, you know, that offered a lot of security for incoming Executives who had had less experience in the Society. Fortunately, because I'd been a member of the Publications Committee for such a long time coming in as the Secretary of the Society at that point, I knew more about the operation of SRCD than some people. And yet, secretarial role is a very, at least at that time, was one that carried a lot of responsibility--still does carry a lot of responsibility. And you tended to work very closely with the Executive Director and share information back and forth to keep things working smoothly, because in essence the secretary's in for six years - the presidents are in for six years but essentially their term as president is two--they're president-elect and they're past-president. But the secretary really has to continue activities during that six year period.

Well, with Dorothy's imminent retirement, we had to--the Executive, the Council in a sense--had to figure out how we were going to deal with finding a new Executive Director and the search went on during my time as Secretary. One of the things, actually, that I recommended at that time that was instituted, I believe, under Brazelton when Brazelton was president--yeah, I'm sure it was when Brazelton was president--was a way to make decisions and recommendations to Council in a more efficient way than waiting. Either waiting until we met yearly or trying to do it just through mail at that time--I don't think we used fax very much either. So I recommended that we form an executive committee, a smaller executive committee composed of president, past-president, president-elect, secretary and Executive Director, Ex-officio... in order to be able to make those decisions. That process that took place changed the establishment of the executive committee at that time, which was approved by council, was one that eased the transition a great deal in terms of going through this process of having to search for a new executive director and recommend it to Council and have the decision made for the Society. We interviewed a number of people; John Hagen, as everybody knows is our Executive Director. When I first approached him about it, whether he would be considered, he actually was ambivalent, as many people are, but grew in enthusiasm as he, you know, learned more details. And you know we were very pleased with, obviously, the decisions that have been made. It's been very good for the Society. But during that period of time there was a lot of anxiety and concerns in terms of directions and how we would go and, you know, what type of person should be brought in and the--the changes, you know, from a situation that had been in existence for a very long time for the Society.

Emde: Yes, the secretary is, in many ways, the vital communications center of so many different kinds of communications and issues to keep things going and I remember you were an incredible person in terms of calling and writing and communicating always finding people day or night and able to get communications at all times. You had a well-deserved reputation for being an arch communicator. That really forms a background for a another kind of question that I think the archives would be interested in and that is, if you could tell us a little bit about the styles of the different presidents that you served with and some of the different issues that came up with them. I

know the archivist would like it to be as open as possible and everyone has things that they excel at as well as things that, possibly, they don't excel at as much and they get involved in different kinds of issues and turmoil. And so, how would you, could you be--characterize the presidencies and the styles of Mavis, Berry and Sandra?

Osofsky: As people know, most people know--maybe not everybody reading this, these people have very different personality styles. I was actually picking up a theme. I listened to the first tape again before doing this tape, a theme that you brought up twice actually on this tape, I'm going to diverge for one minute before I answer your question.

When I was asked in 1974 to do the--to sort of change the way the *Newsletter* was formatted and the material in it and how it was used by the Society, you commented at that point that it became then a major source of communication for the Society, the *Newsletter*, because we could include so much different material that hadn't been there before and communicate in different ways. Now you're bringing up again with the Secretary's role in terms of being a major place of communication for the Society. So I guess, one of my roles in all the time that I spent actively with SRCD has been a major communication source actually that continued after I retired as Secretary and then took on my next duty as Program Co-Chair for the 1993 meeting, which again is a different type of communication, but you know, another important outlet for the Society; and I guess that's been one of the things that I've done a lot with the, with the Society and hope to continue with in the future.

In terms of the presidents, not only are their personalities different, but the role of secretary was different for the two years that Dot Eichorn was still there, because Dot took a lot of responsibility and, you know, I could really lean on her as secretary. I didn't really have to find out all this stuff myself 'cause you could always call Dot and she knew and that moved it forward. I found it to be very advantageous that I'd been Secretary for two years at the point that the change in the Executive Director was made, because what happened then was I could no longer lean on the Executive Director. I still called Dot, I have to say, probably for a year to two after she retired, but then I became a major source of--my office or me--became a major source of communication, not really decision making, because decision was never made by one person, but you know, sort of a place to gather information about how to move forward with various things. When the continuity that had been there for twenty-five years was really no longer there in the same way.

And Berry Brazelton was a very different president from Mavis or Sandra, very different personalities. First of all, well I'm an interdisciplinary, multi-disciplinary person myself even though my primary discipline is psychology, so that I was very used to and enjoyed working with people who came from a variety of disciplines and was used to doing it well. And it's interesting when you said I get people night and day, I'm thinking of all the people I disturbed probably in the evening. Berry Brazelton who, you know, obviously was then a very busy person--has always been a very busy person, some people would say is really hard to reach. I never had any difficulty getting in touch with Berry, and actually, to this day. If I call Berry, it's rare that I don't get a call back within 24 hours. And Berry calls himself, you don't have to go through all kinds of ten people to get to Berry. He's an excellent communicator and many people may not experience that way, but I, I always have. And under, when he was president, I actually enjoyed that a great deal, because we really worked very, very closely together. Berry's the kind of person who kind of--he has a lot of his own ideas--but he also likes to lean on other people. So he'd give me a call and he said, 'Joy, what should we put together for Governing Council at this point [you know], what do you think?' And we'd go back and forth and put together some of the issues that needed, or I would actually tell him some of the issues that needed to be on the agenda and then ask what else he had; and he was just real easy to work with. The other thing is that the meetings were fun with Berry. Berry had a certain style and a certain flair; not, you know, the other people did too. He had--maybe because he was a multi-disciplinary person or cause he's Berry or pediatrician or whatever--but it was during that period of time when he kept coining the phrase and repeated at a Council, and I think it was eventually in the journal, about "throwing out the baby with the bath water". I see you're laughing, you remember that. That--Berry would harp on the fact that very often because of our focus on either minute details or forgetting about some of the important issues or also not paying any attention to results that don't come out that we might be "throwing

out the baby with the bath water?”. And he would continually bring this theme up at Council and at Pub Committee which was very useful.

Emde: In fact he, he turned that phrase a couple of times paradox [tape malfunction] of publication in *Child Development* which [tape malfunction]

Osofsky: If we want to look at actually where some of the changes may have started or the impetus for some of the changes that may have started, you know, that was ‘87 to ‘89 when he was president when we would hear this message over and over and over. And there were a number of other people there including myself; interdisciplinary/multi-disciplinary people who would continually bring up some of these issues that should we be considering, broader perspectives and topics. And I’m not sure whether it was during that period of time, but it may have been, that we saw an increase in, for example, special sections or special issues, but more often special sections of *Child Development* where there would be a sort of affirmative action outreach to bring in additional material that would not usually be submitted to *Child Development*. One of the things though that continued, that I think is changing in some ways now, is that even without reaching for articles in areas where you might want to do a special issue or cover a special topic, the very, very stringent review process still eliminated some papers that probably could make an important contribution in terms of ideas. I know now under Mark Bornstein’s editorship, quite a number of years later, and that impetus maybe was started and continuing during that period of time there is a consideration of different types of review panels and a different process and even different sections so that there would be opportunities to include papers that are more oriented toward public policy, that are more oriented toward intervention, that are more oriented toward issues that need to be covered in our field in a scholarly way but might not make it through the--the traditional review process. I need to talk about Mavis Hetherington, but you can interject.

Emde: You’ve , you’ve provided, in a sense, the style of Berry [tape malfunction]

Osofsky: Mavis, yeah, and Sandra. Mavis, as I mentioned, it was a more traditional style. Mavis is very firm in her ideas; knows where she’s going, knows what she’s doing and you know, she had clear ideas about you know, directions we should go. We would talk about agenda, we would consult with Dot Eichorn and she was a very good leader--provided very good leadership for the organization; was extremely easy to work with, was very well organized and also, a good communicator.

Sandra and I had had a previous history of working together when she was Editor of Developmental Psychology and I was an associate editor under her. So I was looking forward to working with Sandra, having had a past relationship and knowing, you know, that we had a style where it was easy to work together. At that time John Hagen, you know, was Executive Director and had been, I believe for two years maybe one year, but anyhow he was getting quite familiar with the position and taking more of a leadership role. So Sandra worked very easily together, and I think she provided also good leadership for the Society, and was easy to work with for me. There were sometimes some heated discussions at Council. There were a lot of strong personalities and sometimes they would clash. There were times, actually, those three presidents would clash on Council in terms of the way things were stated or the way issues were brought up and I think, you know, it made for some lively-lively discussions. The bottom line though, I think people in general--my experience on Council is, though there are controversies--in general people are very compatible and, you know, concerned about each other and issues for SRCD

I actually think that 1991 was when I retired as Secretary of the Society and then worked with the Society for the next two years in planning the program for the New Orleans meeting. I think things were starting to get stirred up at the time that I retired. I believe that was when you came in as president--and I think, well, there’d been a lot of earlier concern particularly about the journal and directions for the journal and interdisciplinary focus of the Society; you’d been involved with it, I’d been involved with it, a lot of others had been involved with it. And I think it was an opportunity to see whether you know, it’s going to happen probably more under an interdisciplinary president ‘til we elect some of those interdisciplinary psychologists presidents. But, you know, in terms of whether indeed we can do affirmative action outreach even more than we have to people in other [abrupt silence]

Emde: We just completed side three of the oral history interview with Joy Osofsky. The first side of August 1st 1995 and we're on the side four or the second side of the '95 interview. Joy, in the period that you just covered I think I would bring up some major, major issues that were heating up and that had been heating over a four-year period as I recall, that maybe culminated at the end of the time you were Secretary and Sandra was president. And, I would say they were heating up at least over four years and probably longer. The way--and I want to get your comments on this--the one issue was the perfectionism of *Child Development* that across several editors, so it was not the responsibility of a single editor certainly. The Society and the Editorial Boards had become more and more perfectionist about *Child Development* as a publication so that the acceptance rate was so small that the reputation of people from outside psychology and from even disciplines within psychology that were not experimental cognitive or traditional was such that they wouldn't submit, because they felt they would have endless reviews and be rejected; and the perfectionism was not just in the rejection rates, but the continual rounds of reviews. And another issue that may have even overlapped with that one was then I think called the Minority Affairs Committee initially and subsequently changed its name became increasingly disgruntled and unhappy with the fact that--and began to vocalize that they were not being heard in terms of their concerns particularly with respect to *Child Development* but in other aspects of participation. They would participate in the program increasingly, but less in the publications and in other aspects of the Society. Similar concerns from the Interdisciplinary Affairs Committee were building up during that time; that repeated requests for more of a voice in *Child Development*--associate editors whatever and other suggestions that they were making, they felt--the perception was that they were being heard, didn't have a role. And I wondered if you would comment on that, 'cause my perception is that those things were heating up during the time of your secretarialship.

Osofsky: Yeah, they very much were and now that you've brought that up it brings back some other experiences that I remembered. During the Kansas City meeting, during the Council or right after the Council meeting, there was a lot of concern from the Minority Affairs Committee in terms of whether these--whether their concerns and issues were being considered adequately by the Society and by the Council. And it was during that time period that this group started to organize a pre-conference on minority issues, Black issues. I believe, it was during that time period, it's now been a regular kind of thing, but I remember it vividly in Kansas City and I think it probably occurred before that. That may have been the first occasion for the one day pre-conference. But I remember also, I believe, it was Harriett McAdoo, who came to talk to Berry and me and to Council--I may be wrong in terms of who it was, but it seems to me it was Harriett--about some of these issues to bring them out in the open more and yes, I think it was heating up very much during that period of time. The interdisciplinary issues as well, the public policy issues and, you know, SRCD was finding their solution it seems to me, both in terms of publication and other activities, to some of these problems without really making the changes in the journal--more of which were being made at this particular time--and the way they dealt with it... more of which have the potential of being made at this point. The way they dealt with it was to have special sections, to have special issues, we also have a *Social Policy Report* that came out starting in the early 1990s...as a separate publication. The *Newsletter*, could--you know, as we said before--you could publish whatever you wanted in the *Newsletter*. But, I always felt like it was a bit of a compromise position in some ways, you know, that, yes, we'll include these issues but they're not going to be included as part of the regular mainstream, they're going to include as additional things or special sections or special issues or this kind of thing. And I think that message that several on Council continue to have and on Pub Committee during that period of time eventually did culminate in some of the changes that were potential changes that were made.

Emde: During the, perhaps even your last meeting at Kansas City . . . the Minority Affairs Committee came to Governing Council and said, "We recommend that our committee be disbanded because you are not listening us."

Osofsky: I doubt it though, because that was--wasn't that in New Orleans? I was involved and I also was actively involved in the program. One of the things, by the way, that I was associated with planning was the program, from the time that I retired as Secretary. It's also an area where you have a lot of freedom.

And that's one of the issues that would come up and actually program people, at least Mark Appelbaum and I as Program Co-Chairs, made it very clear. And also, I mean, it's a plus, but it also needs to be brought out and that is that we have all kinds of materials and issues and interdisciplinary topics included in program. But a lot of it was not represented in our regular publications and one had to ask why. Now, granted you have more freedom and flexibility in the program.

Emde: I think there was a slight interruption in the recording, but perhaps you could finish this thought and we can pick up again after a pause.

Osofsky: I was going to say that there is more freedom and openness in program material. However, I think that at that point if one pressed a little bit more and say weren't there other ways to include more of these issues more fully in the traditional publications of the Society as well.

Emde: Okay, Joy, continuing this interview now, in another building, I think its time for a few perspectives now that we've been through the interview, looking back and suggested by the Archives Committee and their outline. So first, I'd like to ask it very broadly, as you look at your career thus far, and you've seen changes in students teaching, funding patterns and your own creative productive life what are some of the major changes you would highlight that might lead us to some prospects and looking to the future, things you'd like to see and hopes, which the outline also asks us about. Comments?

Osofsky: Yeah, I like that question in a way, because it's important, I think sometimes to be able to reflect and look back. As I mentioned, I had listened to the first tape and talked about my devotion, dedication and love for SRCD, and the strong influence that it's had in my life. In my professional life, as you know, I started very early to do research and intervention work with high risk populations long before many people were doing that work and long before it was seen as something acceptable--acceptable in the sense of a scientific endeavor as it is now. And I have seen what I would consider to be an important shift in the field of child development and developmental research from my perspective in terms of an increased acceptance and focus on interdisciplinary perspectives on intervention work with diverse populations, much more recognition that our understanding of child development does not focus only on white middle class youngsters growing up in suburbs of our communities and intact families, because that isn't the way our society is anymore. And I think that we have seen shifts in our field reflecting that personally. I have found much more acceptance in my interdisciplinary/multi-disciplinary orientation combining research in child development with clinical work at the time that I went through the transition and did more clinical training, many of my developmental colleagues said to me 'you know you can't be a researcher and a clinician' and my clinical colleagues said 'you can't be a clinician and a researcher'. And so, since I'm fairly adaptable, I did what I was supposed to do for the moment and then combined it. Fortunately, with a wonderful funding opportunity that I had in 1981 from the first group of preventive intervention research grants that were offered by NIMH--which actually, I think, had a very strong influence on seeing intervention research as a major part of our field.

I think that we will move forward and play a much more important role as child development people in the overall concerns of our Society as well as our scientific endeavors by having this broader perspective that certainly continues to respect basic scientific work in our field, but also sees the importance of work that's more applied; that includes intervention, that has public policy implications, that includes diverse populations, diverse ages and a broader developmental perspective, even one that includes concern for intergenerational issues over time.

Emde: Let me ask you one last, evocative if not provocative question, it's been a lot of concern as in SRCD that it's--as a measure of its own success--that it's drawn in more and more psychologists and fewer from other disciplines outside of psychology and outside of mainstream psychology. You've been very optimistic and not just enthusiastic, but optimistic in your views of past issues and how they've been resolved as well as prospects, but let me ask you, with a bit of a more cutting edge, do you think SRCD has made any grounds in terms of what was a concern of its losses in terms of its

multi-disciplinary emphasis which it had at the beginning? Has it--is it treading water? Has it made up ground or is it losing ground in that area?

Osofsky: I think what's really going to make a difference in this field has to do with the leadership of the Society, keeping it front and center and currently, as you know, I've been asked to chair the Interdisciplinary Affairs Committee and one of the issues that's being brought up to that committee that I think you, as a past-president are working with as well as Glen Elder who's current president, is trying to find new and creative ways to increase the membership of people from different disciplines in the organization. I think we're doing more than treading water. I think we're making advances in this area in terms of percentages, but even more the perception. But I think it's going to take much more hard work to be successful in the area. I think that we're making better progress than, for example, if you look at the percentage of women who are at high levels on university faculties or medical school faculties, you find that the percentage really is not very high and has increased in a minuscule way. I think we're doing better with the Society, but actually, to tell you the truth, I probably will be able to answer that question better in a year, as I involve myself more in actually trying to build in these directions for the Society. I think, or I know, there's much more openness to these issues than there has been and I think less resistance, you know, in terms of how much we will accomplish. I think that remains to be seen.

Emde: Um-hm. Well, I'd like to thank you, Joy, for, especially for the interruption for which I apologize--a pause of a year between interviews and having, having lost part of the original second part of the interview--for participating in this and, certainly, your enthusiasm and high energy and commitment to the organization just shines through every aspect of this interview, as well as the wonderful subthemes that I see in terms of your commitment to communication, your skills at negotiation, your interest in reciprocity and fairness, and your broad multi-disciplinary interest that go across clinical "applied" lines as well as very tight traditional lines in psychology and clinical sciences. So I'd like to thank you for this interview and your enthusiasm over the years and your continuing commitment to SRCD. We'll end this here.

Osofsky: Thank you as an interviewer.