

Judy Rosenblith

- Born 3/20/1921 in Salt Lake City, UT
- Spouse – Walter Rosenblith
- A.S. (1942) Occidental College, M.A. (1950) Radcliffe College/Harvard University, Ph.D. (1958) Radcliffe College/Harvard University



Major Employment:

- Wheaton College – 1965-1968, Associate Professor
- Wheaton College – 1969-1970 (& 1977), Acting Chair
- Wheaton College – 1984, Emerita Professor

SRCD Affiliation:

- Secretary (1965-69), Chair for the Committee on Convention Arrangements (1979-81), and History Committee (1990-94), Chair (1993)

SRCD ORAL HISTORY INTERVIEW

Judy Rosenblith

Interviewed by Marion Radke-Yarrow
In Washington, D.C.
April 1997

Radke-Yarrow: This is an interview with Judy Rosenblith. It is April 1997, and the interview is done at the time of the SRCD meetings in Washington. And since it's early in the morning we will be in good condition. Judy has described the background, her family background and early background in detail, so we will begin with the second question, which asks for her to select the experiences that were most important in her intellectual development. Judy, what were the early adult experiences? Which ones were important to you? I thought it was early, but I guess it's early adult.

Rosenblith: I think that, probably, the most important early adult experiences were: being denied candidacy for the Ph.D. at UCLA, which is described in more detail in section one; being a married graduate student with two children under three and ending up at Harvard with a trunk full of data, relevant to Allport's work; having both a very successful and very traumatic experience at Harvard, where my first try for getting a degree went awry, partly over relationships with Allport; and later returning to Harvard under the aegis of Bob Sears, although just at the time he was leaving. The people I had contact with at Harvard, as professors were certainly extremely important to my intellectual development. Bob Sears is clearly the most important of them.

Radke-Yarrow: He was leaving at the time, how did you keep up with him?

Judy: When I was in social relations I was his teaching fellow his very first year at Harvard, and he was very unhappy about my being bounced out of social relations without it even being discussed with him. We maintained a contact during the intervening time, and specifically when I knew he was leaving was when I tried to get back into graduate school because I knew I had a very strong friend in court.

Radke-Yarrow: And was that back into social relations, or? –

Judy: No. It was into the PhD in education program.

Radke-Yarrow: Do you want to mention any particular people other than Sears, or is that --?

Judy: I think that Bea Whiting had a strong influence on me, although I doubt that she knows it, but watching her work, as I did at Palfrey House was very important.

Radke-Yarrow: Were they in the --?

Judy: Pat – In the Six Culture studies, right. Pat Sears was also important, but we had absolutely no professional contact, only a personal one. The fact that when I was in social relations I had a seminar with Donald Hebb, as he – (well, he was in psychology) as he was enroute up to Canada. I heard Skinner give the William James lectures. I had Tolman as a visiting professor. This was as a result of his being fired at Berkeley due to the oath controversy. Gilhausen had been my most important mentor at UCLA and Tolman had been his most important mentor, and so I almost felt like I knew him when he started, and that was a wonderful experience. And Bruner was very exciting.

Radke-Yarrow: Was that early in his day there?

Judy: Fairly early.

Radke-Yarrow: Yes, I would guess so. Now the next question is about the origins of your interest in child development. Sometimes that's hard to answer.

Judy: Actually, in my case it's not at all hard to answer.

Radke-Yarrow: Good.

Judy: When I was attending graduate school at Harvard I had two children, and when I started their ages were one and two and a half. I had very consciously rejected child development when my UCLA mentor suggested that was appropriate for a woman, and I didn't want anything to do with what was appropriate for a woman. But as I watched my children grow, and as I watched them react to the world, I got very interested in developmental things. And there were a couple of specific examples that I might give about that. Having just collected all those data on prejudice in South Dakota. What happened when we crossed the country with our children? They had never before seen a black person, and we were at the Mark Twain Hotel in Hannibal, Missouri, and it was late and we were almost the only people in the dining room, and our daughter, age two and a half, says "mommy, daddy, who's that man with the dirty face and hands," and I, "Uh, oh." And when we arrived in Cambridge, we lived – well, we first lived in Fort Devens. When we moved into Cambridge, we lived in a Harvard housing project surrounded by Cambridge community, and one of the black boys in the community came in as we were unpacking and stuff, and I suggested to our daughter that she might like to invite him in for some cake, and milk, and she said, "No." And I took her inside to discuss it with her, and she said, "No, he wouldn't like cake, he doesn't have a mother." Why doesn't he have a mother? Because his face and hands are dirty.

Radke-Yarrow: So she still had that –

Judy: This was just a few months – a month or two later.

Radke-Yarrow: Yes. Yes. Right.

Judy: And then later on I had taken the children to California, and my son was just getting seriously verbal at the time, and when we came home from California and we went over to the lab to pick up daddy one afternoon, going through the rather black high school area in Cambridge, he looked up and said, "Oh, look at all the pullman porters."

Yarrow: How old was he?

Judy: Two. Just over two. And so having been interested in prejudice, and seeing these things in my kids, obviously gave me a big kick off, but they kept building on that. And I would ask them questions obviously that, I suppose most parents wouldn't. I had them comparing heights of the people in daddy's laboratory, to

daddy, “Is that person taller than daddy, shorter than daddy?” And they were very accurate about that in general until we came to one man who was definitely, very definitely shorter than daddy, and both children agreed that he was taller than daddy. And when I said, “Why?” They said, “Because he fixes everything.” So when I took a social perception course with Bruner, I had a basis for choosing my research hypothesis in that course.

Radke-Yarrow: I didn’t realize that you’d said earlier that you had collected the data in --?

Judy: South Dakota.

Radke-Yarrow: Were you living there?

Judy: Yes. Both of our children were born in South Dakota during World War II.

Radke-Yarrow: And a study of prejudice – you were doing –

Judy: I was doing a replication of Allport and Kramer’s “Roots of Prejudice.”

Radke-Yarrow: Oh, I see. Yes.

Judy: -- and I had discovered so much prejudice in South Dakota, and yet they didn’t have any contact with these groups, and so I was really interested in trying to find out more about that.

Radke-Yarrow: Well, that was an era when there was a lot of – then and after the War, much research on prejudice, and then it evaporated.

Judy: Right.

Radke-Yarrow: Interesting. It says, “What political and social events have influenced your research and training?” And in a sense, that’s an answer you’ve given.

Judy: Well, the political and social events, the War certainly accounted for the fact that I interrupted my graduate education to help my family, because my husband’s job opportunities, a standard thing, were not good where we were. The good job was in South Dakota, so I said, “Fine, we’ll go to South Dakota and I’ll have my family, and then I’ll go back to school.” I should say in that connection that that may have been usual, but when I went to apply when we went to leave South Dakota, it was done on the basis that I applied to graduate schools in towns where my husband was likely to be able to find a job. That was his and my arrangement.

Radke-Yarrow: I see. I see.

Judy: It ended up by accident, because he was going to see Allport for me, that he got offered a job at Harvard, and I said, “Well, there’s enough educational institutions in Boston, that I can apply there,” I hadn’t previously.

Radke-Yarrow: That’s good. It made things easier for you. It’s asking about the influence of these events on teaching. Well that takes a jump, you weren’t teaching then.

Judy: No. I did teach high school in South Dakota. But I think that clearly being married to a European, seeing World War II through his eyes as well as my own, always impacted my teaching, in the sense that I think I was always more sensitive to certain kinds of issues than if I had never had this European contact, and this –

Radke-Yarrow: More aware of –

Judy: -- and this depth of feeling about the War.

Radke-Yarrow: Yes. And did that continue through your whole career?

Judy: Oh, I think so. I think so. And even though I went into child, my interest in prejudice and things like that never stopped through my whole career. I made sure that students knew what instances of prejudice we had been exposed to as a result of my husband being Jewish, and that's very shocking to most students, they don't think that exists anymore.

Radke-Yarrow: Well, they haven't been around I guess.

Judy: Right.

Radke-Yarrow: Those questions cover what's called, 'General Intellectual History.' Is there anything more you want to say about that before we go into personal research?

Judy: I think there's one more thing that I should say, and that is that in almost all of my work experience subsequent to my having my doctors degree has been in a context where I have not had peer colleagues in my field, and that's largely a function of teaching in an undergraduate college. And it's only in the later years that my department grew big enough that there were two developmental psychologists in my department.

Radke-Yarrow: So you began to reach out farther for your –

Judy: Yes.

Radke-Yarrow: -- immediate colleagues?

Judy: That may have been why meetings were very important to me.

Radke-Yarrow: Yes. Right. Well, now we're on the edge of talking about your research. What were your primary interests at the beginning of your career? We have some hints of that already.

Judy: Actually, we ought to probably go back again and look at this link between social psych and child. I obviously became very interested in the early acquisitions of prejudice as a result of the experience with my children, and part of my falling out with Allport lay over my thesis topic. I had made an arrangement with the Harvard nursery school, which had made an arrangement with a nursery school in Roxbury, that the schools would trade three students in the second term of the year, and I was going to go in and look at doll play with white and black dolls, in the nursery school prior to this exchange and after this exchange. And Allport, who actually did not like children at all, was profoundly, I think, disinterested in this topic. What he always said was, "It isn't practical. You can't do it." But I'd already made the arrangements to do it, and so he told me to go off and work with somebody else. And I think that probably had an impact on the fact that he was the one who, when I left social relations, K.O.'d my going immediately into the graduate school of education program. So, that's sort of, you know, an unfinished bit of my life. I never got back to that topic.

My primary interest then was probably what I would then have called sex roles, I guess we now call it gender, and that's an interest that dates way, way back in my educational life that has never disappeared. My strong interest, starts in fourth grade when I refused to embroider a map of California, and insisted on making a jig-saw map of California, over much, much protest from school, and my parents having to go down and get it arranged.

Radke-Yarrow: Excuse you.

Judy: Right. And then I discovered in high school that Cal Tech would not accept female applicants, and that was – I was interested in science and going into medicine at that stage in my life, and so I was very, very put out about that refusal on their part. I carried on quite a correspondence with them about it. Ah, but --

Radke-Yarrow: Well, at Harvard, you were not – the females were not accepted either –

Judy: You were Radcliff, and that meant that at Radcliff there were no graduate fellowships for you, so I was able to be a teaching fellow, plus taking care of the children and family, plus being a full-time graduate student. And they relented on the number of courses I had to take, because I had taken two courses in the summer session, the summer before my official entry into Radcliff. But that did me a favor, I was Brewster Smith's first teaching fellow, and he taught a marvelous course in social psychology, unappreciated by his students, but very appreciated by me.

Radke-Yarrow: Well, the question asks really for you to continue, that is, what happened in your research? Did you shift interests?

Judy: Right.

Radke-Yarrow: What was responsible --?

Judy: When I went into Palfrey House, I actually built my thesis topic on top of Bill Hartup's, and I was looking at imitation in kindergarten children as a function of the sex of the model and the way in which the model interacted with the child, and in relation, obviously, to the sex of the child. And I was looking both at very goal oriented imitation, and not goal oriented. Kids were doing mazes; they had a first turn where they got as far in the Porteus mazes as they could get. The second time they come back the adult is there, they play with some toys. When we start we give the adult who wasn't here before the first turn, and he starts with the maze that they first failed on, he or she, and continues, and then it's the child's turn. Well, in addition to doing the maze carefully and slowly so the child can see carefully, he/she chooses a different color of pencil periodically, so we both looked at how many more mazes did the kid pass, and whether or not they chose the same color of pencil. The two things don't behave the same way, in relation to the variables. It was fun work and it would have been worth following up on, but the only academic job available when I finished my degree was at Brown University, where one requirement of your job was to work on a project, the National Collaborative Perinatal Research Project, looking at mothers prior to their infants being born and following the infants through to age seven, and that's when I went into infant work.

Radke-Yarrow: So you never would have predicted that, and it's always the questions, not necessarily in this interview, but everywhere, I always kind of assumed that a thought-through process, and just landing at Brown was not a thought-through process.

Judy: It certainly wasn't, because actually they (the staff at Palfrey House) had told me I was going to be hired at Harvard the next year, and then Whiting, who was on leave came back and said, "We don't have the money to hire her," and they were so embarrassed they went looking for a job for me. And they didn't find one.

Radke-Yarrow: Oh, you found one.

Judy: And I said, "Well, did you try Brown?" "Well, no, it's in Rhode Island." Well, they had tried Clark, which is equally far away. "Do you want us to try?" "No, no, I'll do it myself." So Lew Lipsitt and I arrived at Brown as their first developmental psychologists, simultaneously, and both of us connected with the Collaborative Project.

Radke-Yarrow: Well, and that's still being followed at Brown –

Judy: As a matter of fact, I recently sent all of my raw data back to Brown –

Radke-Yarrow: Those children are now middle-aged, right?

Judy: -- where Lew Lipsitt has a grant looking at later outcomes, and where a post-doc of his may look and see if there was anything in my neonatal records.

Radke-Yarrow: That's exciting.

Judy: 'Tis indeed.

Radke-Yarrow: What continuities in your work are most significant?

Judy: Oh, I stay with the same things forever. I did so many papers at meetings on the prejudice stuff that Stan Schacter once asked me why I didn't ever change my research. And one of my follow-throughs on the prejudice was back in New England again, and the relationships that Allport and Kramer had obtained no longer held -- and I had a paper or monograph, I've forgotten, that stressed the importance of time in looking at these relationships, which I thought was a very important thing. I quit prejudice after that.

I also carried on a line of work on perception that started with the things I did in the Bruner seminar. But I changed direction from looking at judgments of the height of human figures versus geometric figures, to looking at orientation judgments in children at different ages, using a very simple methodology where they pushed great, big indicator buttons to say whether two things were the same or different. I followed that longitudinally and compared some problem children with learning disabilities to normal kids as well. I had grant support for that on my own when I went to Brown, as well as the Collaborative Project.

Radke-Yarrow: So you, in a sense, you had the opportunities to continue what you wanted in many phases of your career?

Judy: Yes.

Radke-Yarrow: So it meant some input on your part?

Judy: Yes. The time when I left social relations I taught at Cambridge Junior College and at the New England Conservatory for one year, jobs which Allport got for me. Then I got a job for myself at Simmons College. I taught there for a year. Then I was "unemployed" for a year. Supposedly I was going to be the New England Director for NORC (National Opinion Research Center) on the Health Information study, and it was slow getting off the ground. So it turned out it got off the ground just when I went back to graduate school.

Radke-Yarrow: Oh, so you didn't get involved in it?

Judy: Oh, I did.

Radke-Yarrow: You did

Judy: I ran an NORC office in Boston with a staff of twenty-five interviewers and coders and whatnot, at the same as being a teaching fellow and a graduate student.

Radke-Yarrow: Gracious. Well, now –

Judy: But my Vita has all these overlapping appointments, because I kept the NORC job after it the HIF study ended – through school, Brown Massachusetts General, and into the Wheaton years.

Radke-Yarrow: You kept busy. Now for some self-criticism. Reflect on the strengths and weaknesses of your research and theoretical contributions, the impact of your work and it's current status?

Judy: I've never been very strong on theory. I guess I'm a dust-bowl empiricist.

Radke-Yarrow: From the Midwest?

Judy: Actually, no, from where they went. California.

Radke-Yarrow: I see.

Judy: So I don't think I have made any great contributions to theory. I might have made a contribution to theory if I had persisted in the adult/child relationship things that I was doing in imitation, because that is more directly theoretical in terms of Freudian variables and learning variables than my other work has been, so I don't think I've made any theoretical contributions to the field.

I've contributed a great deal of data, and I have an awful lot of data that I haven't contributed, because I never had the time to write it up. I think that, well, clearly one of my greatest weaknesses is to do more than I can get written up. I don't think that any of the research I've done is anything that I am ashamed of, or that I would say, "Well, why did I do that?" that's not interesting, or who cares or what have you. I had a fairly long line of continuity in the perceptual research. I certainly have a long continuity in the infancy research, and, as I say, there was a fair amount of continuity in my prejudice research and my gender research as well. This is perhaps best reflected by the papers I gave at meetings.

Radke-Yarrow: Do you think now that prejudice research probably has different labels now?

Judy: Very different.

Radke-Yarrow: But do the researchers pick up on the early work?

Judy: I don't think so.

Radke-Yarrow: They don't know that it was done almost.

Judy: Right. I have the feeling that one of my weaknesses is probably that I'm not a good advertising agent. I do think that the series of findings from Allport and Kramer and myself and my final paper on prejudice using his questionnaire, (which I had modified to include American Indians and Scandinavians against whom there is prejudice in South Dakota).

Radke-Yarrow: Against Scandinavians?

Judy: Sort of the same prejudice as that against Jews. "They get one person into the school board and they take it over." While still having prejudice against Jews who hardly existed there, and Blacks who didn't exist, etc. –

Radke-Yarrow: Well, who's the majority?

Judy: A lot of prejudice against the Indians. The best bar in Rapid City, South Dakota was the Indian Room, it had a sign in the window that said, "Indians and dogs not permitted."

Radke-Yarrow: Oh, how ugly.

Judy: Yep. Anyway, my weakness is not publicizing things or not networking. I think that there are some serious contributions involved in the infancy work, though not exactly of the sort that perhaps I was starting out to look for, but because the work is published, some in psychological journals, some in pediatric journals, some in European journals, I don't think anyone knows what the whole purpose of the work is, except maybe two people or so. I think there are some very interesting methodological points that came out of the work.

Radke-Yarrow: They've been taken up in various places?

Judy: No, I don't think so. Maybe Evelyn Thoman's going to take one of them up. One of the things was that when the project was formulated, I was in on quite a bit of the formulation period, and I argued for testing kids when they were in stressful adaptational periods, and I was talked down. So you have the eight

month Bayley examination, and the four year everything examination, sort of, and those are not very stressful times in kids lives. It turns out that the infant measures practically had no relationship to any of the variables at four years of age, but they are related to variables at seven years of age when the kids are under the stress of school.

Radke-Yarrow: Yes.

Judy: Not only that, but a lot of our infants were tested on different days of life. We can't replicate this anymore because they aren't in the hospital long enough to --

Radke-Yarrow: Right.

Judy: -- but kids who are tested in the first two days after birth, when they were still under the stress of adaptation, their scores are more predictive of later outcome than kids who were tested at three to four days after birth.

Radke-Yarrow: So it's predicted under stress.

Judy: So that prediction, from under stress to again under stress, which I think is a really important point, but I don't know whether people will pick up on it or not.

Radke-Yarrow: You may not know what people have picked up, because they obviously read your literature, but they aren't necessarily going to cite, Judy this is the source for the next idea.

Judy: Well, the other thing is that, I think the SID's research that grew out of my work on the project was just very badly timed, because we were saying there may be indicators in the newborn period that will tell you which kids are especially vulnerable to SID's. It was at a time when the overall medical community and establishment generally were saying, "No, these were perfectly healthy kids who suddenly died," and we got a lot of flack for suggesting that anything else could be true. It certainly, it was a very small sample -- thank heavens. Out of my fourteen hundred and forty newborns, not too many died of SID's. The last unfunded grant application that I made was to try to replicate our SIDS findings and include some additional variables. I think, for example, the current business that all the babies should sleep on their backs is fine, but I think you could identify a much smaller proportion of babies who need to sleep on their backs, and the times when it's important for them to sleep on their backs, like in warm weather or if they are really tired, or if they've just had a cold. All of those ingredients were in the research that identified back sleeping. It also identified soft mattresses --

Radke-

Yarrow: As what?

Judy: -- as factors. People latch on to one variable and, I think, they lose sight of the whole package that came out.

Radke-Yarrow: Let's see where we are. You've talked about the impact of your work really. You're underplaying it, but you're, by pointing out the things that you found, I think you are represented.

Judy: Well, there were a few people who picked up on the SID's and used the tests that we had found to be related to higher risks, as a test for deciding whether babies were safe to be sent home from the hospital, at risk babies, or near miss babies, what have you.

Radke-Yarrow: Isn't there's a type?

Judy: I've never seen a write-up of that. I've run in to pediatricians who've told me that, or nurses who have told me that, but I don't think it's part of the literature.

Radke-Yarrow: Okay. Do you want to say anything more about your contributions or impact, or what you hope would be the effect of your research?

Judy: Maybe I should say why I got into the infancy research. We could choose anything we wanted to do as long as it had something to do with the Collaborative Project, and I felt that the people who had looked at the relationship between, say the Bayley Infant Scales and later I.Q., were not looking at the right things. I felt that I.Q. wasn't the thing to look at, and I thought that it was quite possible that one could detect, basically detect neurological impairment, and it would show up in various ways that might not be related to I.Q., and then I had been reading the work of Frances Graham. The other thing, I admired Frances' tests very much. I wanted to eliminate the one item in it that required equipment, and I thought might offend parents, namely electrical shocks to their baby's knees, mild as they were, and I also felt that these measures on newborns, we really couldn't assume that the higher the score they had been assigned the better they were, and that therefore one shouldn't use correlation coefficients in evaluating the data and chose instead when modifying her tests at Brown to use Chi Squares where we could see where – and that does pan out to have been a very good idea, because for some measures they are curvilinear and not linear.

Radke-Yarrow: All right. Do you think any contributions were wrongheaded?

Judy: Actually, no.

Radke-Yarrow: Good. I think that's a strange question, but maybe not.

Judy: Well, I suspect that lots of people go off on a tangent that doesn't really pan out.

Radke-Yarrow: Well, let's see. Did we cover four, which of your studies seem most important? I don't know why we have to say everything's 'most,' because you've talked about a number of things, but if you want to pick out something?

Judy: The fact of the matter is, that if I want to say what I think I've done that is most important, it is my textbooks and not my published papers.

Radke-Yarrow: That would not have come out had I not asked that.

Judy: That's not indicated in the question at all.

Radke-Yarrow: No.

Judy: I do have papers that I think were important papers. The replication papers on prejudice among them, and some of my papers dealing with infancy. But, I still think that my major contributions to the field lie in my text books—both the books of readings and the infancy texts. The development of the books of readings started just after I finished graduate school and had to look for a text for Educational Psychology. I convinced my thesis advisor to work with me on readings designed both for Developmental and Educational Psychology. My fellow editor (Wes Allinsmith) and I selected articles and pretested them on Brown and Harvard students. We collected elaborate ratings on each reading and eliminated and added until we felt sure we had a good book—a procedure I am sure is rare for readings books. This resulted in “Causes of Behavior: Readings in Child Development and Educational Psychology” (edited by Rosenblith and Allinsmith). After the third edition for which we added a third editor (Joanna Williams), there was a period in which it was generally thought that with the availability of reprints, professors would compile their own readings for their courses. Hence that was the last edition and for it we were no longer able to pretest.

The infancy text (*In the Beginning: Development from Conception to Age Two*) was done at the other end of my career. It again stemmed from feeling a lack of appropriate text material for undergraduate students, on both me and my coauthors (Judith Sims-Knight) part. This work also received a good deal of pretesting on our Wheaton Students. The second edition, for which I was sole author, is perhaps the work in which I have taken greatest pride. I doubt that I made five cents an hour on this project. Many colleagues told me how great it was and that they used it to prepare their lectures, but did not assign it to students. A hundred

dollars for each of them would have upped my pay considerably. But I cannot measure the rewards in terms of pride or self-esteem.

Radke-Yarrow: Well, they've probably influenced plenty of people.

Judy: More than my research has.

Radke-Yarrow: Well, you can see that there has been concern about funding, so it's one of the questions. You got funding early in kinds of personal ways, didn't you? I mean you kind of went out and got it.

Judy: Well, I did things un-funded. I mean I arrived at Harvard with eight hundred questionnaires.

Radke-Yarrow: Unfunded.

Judy: Unfunded.

Radke-Yarrow: Yes. Right.

Judy: And Allport got me money to get them card punched for the analyses, so that was funded by myself. Some of my later follow-up work on prejudice was funded by myself as well, and by my family, so to speak. My perception work I got small grant funding for when I went to Brown.

Radke-Yarrow: From the government or from Brown?

Judy: NIH. And all together, counting Brown's connection to the Collaborative Project, which wasn't me being funded, but the Brown branch of the project being funded, and then counting non-government private foundation support, I guess I shouldn't complain because I had funding for seventeen years.

Radke-Yarrow: Did it take a lot of your time to get it? I think that's one of the issues.

Judy: Well, I think I gave up on getting it, because I didn't have the time. I think that the SID's Replication study, which was not funded, where I was told that I should re-summit with fancier statistics, but I was told more privately that because I was using a non-prestige hospital to collect the data in, "Why did I do that?" When *IF* I had used Children's Hospital – well, you had to get in line to get a hold of a baby at Children's Hospital.

Radke-Yarrow: Oh, dear. Yes.

Judy: And that's just the point in my life where I said, "I've got too many other things to do, I cannot try to cope with what may be a scientific quarrel and what may be a totally non-scientific quarrel."

Yarrow: Do you think anything that you've done or said, or, you know, on committees or elsewhere, has had some influence on funding policies? Had you gotten into that at all?

Judy: That's uh, no. I think I managed to fail – actually I, in addition to reading for various and sundry funding agents, I served on the Maternal and Child Health Research Advisory Committee, and I was very impressed with the dedication of the people who did that, a lot of work for free, and so on. But I was also impressed by the fact that some of them play political games. For example, there was a grant proposal in from the laboratory of the newly appointed Director of NICHD, and it was a terrible proposal, and we all discussed it as a terrible proposal, and one other man and myself were the only two people who voted against it.

Radke-Yarrow: Let's see, what else they wanted to know about funding? Comment on how you've shaped, study sections – well you said you were on that advisory board. Have you ever served on the study sections other than that?

Judy: No.

Radke-Yarrow: Or councils? I think when this interview was written people did not give credit to all the things that were done without funding, you know, in an earlier stage. There just wasn't the issue of the funding, at least not the same kind of issue.

Judy: I should say one other thing. I have tons of unpublished data, collected, lots of it by students on unfunded research, and I always thought maybe when I retired I'd have time to write up these data; so far it hasn't worked that way. But a lot of that data has to do with – and this is a back-track for the funding apparatus, has to do with sex role stereotyping in kids of various ages and various socio-economic level schools, in various geographic areas –

Radke-Yarrow: It would be interesting in terms of changing times.

Judy: Right. And then we have – I have data sitting on my shelves at Wheaton on the sex role attitudes thing of Janet Spence, taken before Wheaton had a grant to introduce more about women into the curriculum and after Wheaton had had a grant to introduce more about women into the curriculum, to see if it had changed attitudes. And while I've analyzed some of the kids data, I haven't done any analyses whatsoever on the college data, which would still be interesting to analyze.

Radke-Yarrow: So, some funding would help on this?

Judy: Some funding or some colleague, some young person who is looking for a project.

Radke-Yarrow: You should advertise, you'll probably find lots of takers.

Judy: But I think that probably about ties it up. I have one other comment that I didn't make earlier.

Radke-Yarrow: Yes.

Judy: I think that choosing the infancy project to work on at Brown is something of a fit because I think I like infants more than most adults like infants – when they're only one and two and three & four days old.

Radke-Yarrow: So you found pleasure in working with infants?

Judy: Yes. And I was able –

Radke-Yarrow: In which institutions have you worked? Dates? Capacities?

Judy: I think they ought to want to take it out of my CV, as this is pretty dull, but I wrote it down because I couldn't possibly do it from memory. When I was in South Dakota, I not only taught high school one semester, but I was the South Dakota Supervisor for the Psychological Corporation, 1946 and 1947. After my masters degree, I was an instructor at the New England Conservatory and the Cambridge Junior College, 1950 to 1951, an Assistant Professor at Simmons College in 1951-'52, a job which would have been permanent if they had had their druthers, but that the woman on leave to finish a degree decided to return. I was the New England Supervisor for NORC (the National Opinion Research Center) from 1953 to 1957. I was an instructor and a research assistant at Harvard University from 1956 to '57. I was a lecturer at Harvard University in 1962-'63. I was an Assistant Professor at Brown University, 1957 to '61. I had research appointments (whose names changed, but that's irrelevant) at Brown University from 1961 to 1977. I was the Head of the Laboratory of Human Development at the Massachusetts General Hospital from 1961 to '63. I had a research appointment at the Mass General from 1963 to '67; these were positions that made me ostensibly a Harvard Medical School Faculty Member. I was an Associate Professor to Professor at Wheaton College from 1965 to 1984, becoming Emeritas in 1984. I had been acting Departing Chairman 1968, 1970 and 1977, and was their first A. Howard Menneely Professor in 1972, a position that reduced my teaching load for two years. I was a visiting colleague at the University of Hawaii, 1970-'71,

on my first sabbatical, examining Hawaiian newborns, and an Adjunct Professor at Florida International University in 1992. And the overlaps of those things get to be mind-boggling.

Radke-Yarrow: Goodness, I'm glad you had them all memorized.

Judy: Well, they're not memorized, they're written.

Radke-Yarrow: I know, you're reading them. That's amazing.

Judy: There are two interesting stories in there, I think. As Head of the Laboratory of Human Development at MGH, I worked under Professor Lindemann in psychiatry, who was a very marvelous man. I had a totally free rein. (I didn't have any extra rent money coming in, but) I was also able to keep my research going at Brown, in large part because I had a very good research assistant at Brown, who stayed with me for a long time, until we ran out of grant money. I served as a Consultant to the pediatricians and their research projects and so forth. I worked on one research project that my predecessor, who had been my ostensible PhD supervisor (he came in when the data collection was finished), and I realized how absolutely and totally unsupervised my position was, because Dr. Lindeman didn't choose to challenge me on anything or give me directions on anything. That was a period when Timothy O'Leary and Richard Alpert were very active in, you know what, (drugs) at Harvard. And Harvard tried to sell Lindeman on hiring O'Leary to get him off their hands, because there he would be under medical supervision. Lindeman asked my advice, and I said, "No way. There is no supervision here." Well, he invited my husband and myself to dinner with O'Leary to find out how bright he was, and he was very bright. The result of that was that I still told him, "You know you can not do this. He's going to have a legitimate pulpit?" and Lindeman took my advice.

The next sequence in that thing, there's that business of lecturer at Harvard, '62-'63. Harvard fired Dick Alpert very much at the last minute, and they desperately needed someone to teach the course, which I had taught when I was an instructor at Harvard, Human Development for Graduate School of Education students, and came to get me to give those lectures. I agreed to do it, but we had a slight complication, because since I was being paid by Harvard I couldn't be paid again by Harvard, so the money was all banked. And when Lindeman's grant money ran out for supporting me, those additional years that are indicated from Mass General, Harvard then, were supported out of the money that I had already earned. But it's been amusing to me over the years -- that tie in.

Radke-Yarrow: My goodness. Yes. Those are things you don't learn about unless you interview like this. The next question is kind of an administrative question it seems to me.

Judy: It's not relevant to me, I don't think.

Radke-Yarrow: Do you want to just skip that?

Judy: I have not been connected with well-known research sites.

Radke-Yarrow: Well, describe changes in the unit. It doesn't seem to fit.

Judy: It doesn't fit with my academic life.

Radke-Yarrow: Let me try the next. Describe your experiences as a teacher? That you can certainly say a lot about.

Judy: Yes.

Radke-Yarrow: And if there are any tensions between research and teaching.

Judy: And I'll say that. I can tell you about that too. (Break)

Well, having spent most of my career teaching in undergraduate institutions, oh, do I have experience teaching, all varieties of things, although I was allowed fairly early on in my career at Wheaton, to stop teaching introductory psychology, and specialize in developmental and things related to it, but also in methods and teaching of laboratory courses. I took very seriously the job of trying to get students in laboratory courses to understand something about how science is done. I had done this in a methods/statistics course as well.

I'm kind of proud of myself right now, because the first set of recommendations that APA committee has come out with on statistics includes things that I was trying to teach students fifteen years ago, and kept saying these were just around the corner. It was a long corner anyway.

My teaching at Brown is the only teaching in which I had graduate students, and because I was only there four years, I only had two graduate students, both of them for master's degrees. The one was working on my perceptual grant. The other one was doing things in the sex role area. That thesis, her MA thesis, she totally designed herself except for one element, that which had a large base in relationship to my own area of work. Although I was not there for her doctoral degree, I was on her doctoral committee. And then I was on the doctoral committee of one of my undergraduate students when she later got her doctors degree at Tufts University, so I have a very limited exposure to graduate students and their research, and that's probably the only regret I have about my career.

The two masters theses led to an exposure to conflicting views in academe. One was by a student who collected data for my perception grant. He had never written a paper before and I had to rewrite it with him numerous times. When I later published these data the former student complained that he was not listed as an author. When the other MA thesis was published (designed, data collected, and written up with very little help from me), my department chairman complained that I had not put my name on the publication.

At Wheaton, the things that are upper most in my own mind about the teaching, is the fact that I introduced a number of new courses to their curriculum, by and large, courses which have stayed, or at least stayed in modified form in the curriculum. One of those was a course then called *Sex Roles*. I suppose we'd call it *Gender* now.

Radke-Yarrow: Definitely.

Judy: And one was a course on sexual behavior, and that grew out of a senior seminar that I was going to teach about, you know, really ideas about current research in the field, assuming that students in that day and age had basic understanding of their sexual body, and physiology. They didn't, so we started an undergraduate course, team-taught, almost always by a male instructor and myself.

Radke-Yarrow: Wheaton was a girl's school?

Judy: A girl's school. (This usage is politically incorrect, but shows the age of both the interviewer and interviewee.) It was, of course, a woman's college. I might note, however, that when I was being interviewed by the President prior to being hired I asked him what he could say to me to indicate that Wheaton was not still a girl's finishing school. His answer satisfied me.

Radke-Yarrow: Is it still?

Wheaton: No, it's a co-ed school now. I think they still have a course in sexual behavior. I think it's only taught by one person now.

Radke-Yarrow: I see.

Judy: The last time I knew it was taught by a lesbian woman. Anyway, so those two courses are things that I take pride in. The other two courses that I take pride in started – we got a little relief time from teaching so that we could teach two and a half courses one semester instead of three courses each semester.

Radke-Yarrow: That's a lot.

Judy: Yes. And starting as a half-course, I started a course originally called, *Cross Cultural Perspectives on Child Development*, or something like that. It ended up being called, *Child Rearing in Other Times and Places*, which was taught like a seminar, and students gave reports first on western child rearing at some other period in history, then on child rearing in a preliterate culture, next on child rearing in some other literate culture, and then concluded the course by interviewing someone who had been reared in another culture about their child rearing. At some times during the course we interviewed in class a faculty member who had been reared in another culture about their childhood experiences.

Radke-Yarrow: Interesting.

Judy: It was a fun course and, I think, this was introduced long before the current interest in diversity and what not. It clearly grew out of the fact that I was at Palfrey House, but I always loved anthropology, and I think if I hadn't been deciding to get married I might have considered anthropology as an alternative field. But fieldwork wasn't going to be very sensible as a family woman.

Radke-Yarrow: It sounds like a lonely kind of decision.

Judy: So – and then clearly being at Palfrey House at the time of the six culture study, it was very influential. That course was my most fun course in a way. The infancy course was started initially as a half-course, and then a colleague of mine did another half that dealt with the cognitive things, and then we put them together and made it “a” course, and that's the colleague with whom I did the first edition of my infancy text. She dropped out of the second edition, except for one chapter. That colleague played a very important role in my taking early retirement, because the entire department had supported the colleague for tenure, she had the most research students working with her, she had wonderful ratings as a teacher –

Radke-Yarrow: And it didn't --?

Judy: The President didn't want her. And even after her review hearing – and the provost would no longer vote with the President -- the President got one faculty member to vote with her and my colleague didn't get tenure. I took a leave of absence to consider whether I could ethically afford to be associated with the institution any more. I took a second years leave, but I went back because my department was fighting so much with a Dean at that point, and asking so much advice from me that I felt that if I had to go there all the time, I might as well teach.

Radke-Yarrow: Well, that's a sad note.

Judy: Yes. So I think that's the most important aspects of my teaching. Now I would say this is one of those questions where the question really presupposes you taught in a school with graduate students?

Radke-Yarrow: Yes. Yes. The tension and – right.

Judy: Well, there's still is the tension, I mean I always had a research project going on –

Radke-Yarrow: But many people concentrating in undergraduate probably don't.

Judy: And you had better have research going on or you won't get tenured.

Radke-Yarrow: Is that true?

Judy: Oh, yes.

Radke-Yarrow: I see.

Judy: Very much.

Radke-Yarrow: I didn't realize.

Judy: In fact, that's what my colleague got killed on was her "research evaluation." The – so there is –

Radke-Yarrow: There is tension.

Judy: -- that tension is there, but I think there is an assumption that you have graduate students built into the question, which not all of us did.

Radke-Yarrow: Yes. Not training research workers at that stage.

Judy: But I always felt I was trying to train students. I think one of my chief goals as a teacher was to train students to be intelligent consumers of pop presentations of research. That means that I stressed methodology, what kind of a sample is it based on? Is that sample really extrapolatable to your own situation, and questions like that that were a big part of my primary goals as a teacher. Yes, teaching five and a half courses a year creates a tension with your research work.

Yarrow: Oh, dear. It gives you a lot of information.

Judy: Right. And I could not have kept up the Brown research at Mass General and Wheaton if I had not had a very good research assistant on site at Brown, to which I went once a week.

Yarrow: You went to Brown – you were then at Boston?

Judy: I was at Wheaton then. I lived in the Boston area (Brookline). Wheaton was half way between Brookline and Brown, but being at Brown had allowed me to commute by train not car.

Yarrow: Right.

Judy: Yes. I just should mention that I think I owe the Wheaton job to Pat Sears when they were writing around the country seeking a candidate before the formally advertised searches were the era. I think Pat Sears said they should try me, in fact, I know she did, it's not think.

Yarrow: That's a lovely New England setting as I remember.

Judy: Very beautiful. I used to feel rewarded getting there until I was at too many outs with the administration. The odd thing is that the President when I went there was a psychologist, Bill Prentice, and a very conservative man. And there were all sorts of tensions in the school resulting from his conservatism in the period of "student unrest," but he was a gentleman, and no faculty member ever was penalized for taking strong positions in direct oppositions to his when raises were decided or promotions were decided. He had his opinions, but he didn't impose them in this way. And then our first woman President –

Yarrow: Oh, my.

Judy: -- she imposed, and how! She had forced my colleague to serve on a back-breaking committee that met all through January break and one day a week for a semester when she was preparing her tenure case. The president had refused to allow her to resign despite the department's support for her doing so. Then it turned out that my colleague had an independent mind. So, guess what? No tenure!

Yarrow: Not nice.

Judy: Not nice at all. I think the present woman President is not like that.

Yarrow: Oh, good. It ends up a little better. What about this question on applied versus something else?

Judy: Well, that's an interesting question too, because there was an applied component to my perceptual research, clearly since I did look at handicapped kids as well as normal kids. I don't think I saw that applied aspect until my department chair pointed it out to me, and clearly I hoped there might be some application in the infancy research, no question.

Yarrow: It seems to me that theme has come up. You haven't used the word 'applied,' but the issues are issues that are applied.

Judy: Right. I guess I better tell a story. When the first time I came – would have possibly come up for promotion at Brown, (when I went to Brown you have to understand that there was only one tenured woman in the entire University.)--The first year that I could possibly have been promoted was a year in which the first woman was ever promoted to tenure in the psychology department. I didn't expect to be promoted, I mean I'd been told when I went there not to compare my salary with my male colleagues, and all that, and I would have accepted that at that point in my life. I went proforma to my department chairman and asked, "Why wasn't I promoted?" I expected him to say, "Well, you didn't expect us to promote two women in one year did you?" And I would have accepted that at that point in history. What he said was, "We don't know whether you can do research." The perceptual research didn't count because it was applied. It didn't count for anything that I had gotten ed-psych back into the psych department for them, at their behest, had produced a book of readings used with those students and by the child students at the university, (that's for teaching, that doesn't count). And well, how do we know who did your thesis research? You can call up and find out! So, I resigned because that reason was unacceptable to me. Fortunately my former thesis supervisor headed a Developmental Laboratory at Massachusetts General Hospital. I went to talk to him about possible positions (not knowing that he was leaving to go to Cincinnati as Department Chair). He asked me if I wanted his. I said yes and Dr. Lindemann, who was head of Psychiatry in which the laboratory was, hired me. This enabled me to double my salary and avoid a long commute just at the time my kids were about to leave high school.

Yarrow: Well, there are hard things in women's' careers.

Judy: I guess there are things in my infancy research that I think, in fact, are applicable. I don't know whether people are going to apply them or not, but we have clearly identified – Doc's have talked about muscle tonus as being important for a long time, but they never identified the pattern that we did. We allowed two different ratings of muscle tonus thinking we might have some kids with a haemoplegia kind of thing, that they might be stronger on the left than on the right, and their tone may be different than average. It turned out that that almost never happens. Normally tonus in the arms is better than in the legs. We had some kids where the differential was very, very sharp, and a very occasional kid where it actually reversed. That pattern of muscle tonus is one of the things that turned out to have some predictive value for later development. It actually, in what we counted as premature (and especially for three and four pound babies) it accounted for twenty percent of the variances in reading ability at age seven.

Yarrow: Really! That much?

Judy: Yes. And because we had a large sample, things could turn out to be statistically significant and have no practical value whatsoever, but that's something that's enough to pay attention to. We also identified a pattern of abnormal sensitivity to light. All babies, newborns are sensitive to light, but some are very sensitive to light, and because my neonatal examiner (after it wasn't me any more), was very good about making notes about anything unusual about the newborns in addition to filling out the forms. We were able to identify a group of kids, who did indeed, again a small group, but they did look neurologically damaged later on.

Yarrow: These are all from the perinatal?

Judy: Yes.

Yarrow: So Lew Lipsitt will be getting some of these data from you?

Judy: I've turned over all my data to Lew.

Yarrow: That's interesting.

Judy: And then this inability to consistently fight off interference with your breathing, (which is what our tactile adaptive scale was measuring), being related to SID's is I think of real and of practical value, and ought to be studied further. The neonatal item involves their reacting to cotton over their nostrils, and to cellophane over their nose and touching their upper lip, so we're not totally occluding air. We're making them, forcing them to breathe through their mouth. In any event, they don't turn blue, so we're not totally blocking their air, but a normal newborn just fights against these things. They bat their arms back and forth as if they are trying to knock the stimulus off, and they arch their backs and pull their heads away, and they are really very purposeful looking. Each stimulus is applied three times during the course of the exam, and kids who score low on one trial, well, the lowest score that the kid gets is the one that's most predictive in relation to the SID's. [They may have responded well once or even two times, but if they have poor responses on any of the trial of both stimuli they are at greater risk.]

Yarrow: You mean if they don't –

Judy: Well, they may have responded once, even possibly twice, with good reactions, but at least once out of the three presentations for each stimulus they have not responded well, and perhaps not even responded at all.

Yarrow: And that was predictive?

Judy: And those are the kids who seem to be at greater risk, and particularly they're at greater risk if they are a little below average in birth weight, if they've been jaundiced, etc. The replication that I didn't get to do, I was going to have a doctor studying jaundice in the same kids, and really going to be able to put that together.

Yarrow: So that's a lot of applied. It's really much applied content.

Judy: And then another unpublished paper, one that was written but not published, and I can't find it. We have to find out if it's in the archives in the rejected paper file, but I think that the editor at that particular point in time trashed all of his rejected papers.

My sabbatical in Hawaii, I was interested in looking at ethnic differences in newborn behavior to see if they existed, and they did. And one of the biggest differences was exactly on this scale of responding to these noxious stimuli. The part-Hawaiian's, there being no pure Hawaiian's to sample, tended to have poor scores on that, and the Japanese and the Chinese tended to have very high scores, and the Caucasians were somewhere in between.

Yarrow: And is there a difference in this SID's?

Judy: And there is a difference in the SID's rate in Hawaii, according to ethnic groups that perfectly parallels the low Tactile-Adaptive scores. In case it was an accident I got the data for three years, and for three years there is a difference in the SID's rate that parallel's those newborn differences. It's true my samples were small. I only had five Chinese and I think eleven Japanese. I then got the data not just for Hawaii, but for some of the countries themselves and for Japanese-Americans in the United States. The latter had close to a zero rate and the Japanese themselves had a very, very low rate. I could not get the figures for China. The one Pacific island group for which I could get data showed a very high rate of SIDS. My paper on these data was turned down on two grounds – small sample size and ethnic sensitivity.

So I went back to Hawaii on my next sabbatical to enlarge my sample size. Although I wasn't able to stay very long. My mother had died at the point that I was starting to study French babies born with different delivery techniques and I had to abandon that project and shorten my Hawaiian stays. However the hospital in which I originally worked was undergoing renovation that year and the hospital in which I could work had only members of a prepaid health plan and the Orientals were Korean, not Chinese or Japanese.

Yarrow: That's too bad, because that really has implication –

Judy: So, I never enlarged the Ns to be able to go back to the journal and say, "Here it is, I've got the larger Ns." It is all very intriguing. The other minority group I had was Philippino's, and if socioeconomic status was the principle factor, the Philipinos should have been as badly off as the part-Hawaiians, and you know what, they are between the Caucasians – it's Chinese, Japanese, Caucasians, part-Hawaiians, and guess where the Philippino's are? They're up between the Caucasians and the Japanese, not where they're supposed to be. Not if socio-economics is the explanation. So enough of all that.

Yarrow: Well now, what about SRCD? Have you had experiences with SRCD?

Judy: Oh, yes.

Yarrow: When did you join it?

Judy: 1957 was my first meeting, and when I joined.

Yarrow: Where was that meeting?

Judy: Iowa.

Yarrow: Iowa City, no doubt.

Judy: Yes.

Yarrow: What were your earliest contacts? With whom?

Judy: I have no idea actually, I don't remember. I just was finishing my thesis and --

Yarrow: It wasn't so salient for you.

Judy: -- went to SRCD.

(Yarrow: -- wasn't so salient for you.)

Judy: But I had already been a member of APA for ten years at that time, so I was a 'joining professional organization' type person.

Yarrow: That's right. So, describe the history of your participation?

Judy: Well, in less than ten years after joining the organization I was it's Secretary. I was its Secretary in a very interesting period of time. It was the time of the transition between the Bill Martin SRCD, and what one might call the present SRCD. It was also interesting because I was Secretary both when David Levy was President, and when Julie Richmond was President. David was totally out of it as far as the organization was concerned.

Yarrow: He wouldn't have been an administrator in any sense of the word.

Judy: So I would have to go to New York to brief Levy in great detail before any meeting that he had to go to, and if the meeting was in New York I had to go earlier and brief him about it, and of course Julie was just the opposite, very much on to things and interested in getting the organization to be more active and so on. I cheated and went back and looked. I could find a couple of news letters still in my file, and I was able to find one from my period as Secretary and read my minutes and found out that that was also the period when we raised our dues to \$22.00 a year.

Yarrow: That's pretty amazing.

Judy: Also, at that time, counting the graduate students, we had just over a thousand members.

Yarrow: I didn't think it was that big.

Judy: The other aspect of being Secretary that was amazing, or something for me at that time, was that when I was asked to run. I went to my college President and I said, "I've been asked to run for this office, and this obviously requires some secretarial support, and is the college going to provide it for me? And he said, "Yes." And so I ran, then I got elected, and it turned out that the colleges secretarial support was, well I could hand my things in and they'd take their place in the line to be typed, so I ended up typing everything that went out for the Society, and not very well I might add. I'm not a good typist.

Yarrow: You probably developed skill in the process.

Judy: Which I can now use much better at a word processing program. And I would guess, lets see that's now '57 to '97, forty years that I've been a member of the Society. I would guess that I have not missed more than three meetings at most in that period of time.

Yarrow: That's amazing. Yes.

Judy: I'm sure I've served on paper selection committees; it's not the sort of things that I kept track of.

Yarrow: But it would be amazing if you weren't.

Judy: Then I was Chairman of Local Arrangements for the Boston meeting, which was when – I think I made a note about that. Apparently I've not made a note about what year the Boston meeting was.

Yarrow: But you did serve whenever that was. That was at like in the 60's, 70's, 80's?

Judy: No, the Boston meeting was in the 80's.

Yarrow: In the 80's?

Judy: Oh, yes. That was about '81. Yes, it was '81. I've done very little editorially for SRCD. I've been an Editor of *Contemporary Psychology*, not the Editor, but an Editor, and done reviewing for other journals. I rarely did so for SRCD, which is kind of interesting.

Yarrow: I mean that would be *Child Development* and the monographs.

Judy: I have reviewed for the monographs, right. Actually I did write for CD Abstracts and Bibliography for quite a while. I've been Chair of the History Committee, subsequent to the Boston meeting. In fact, I guess I just got off the History Committee this year.

Yarrow: This year.

Judy: And that's at the time when we were doing the big oral history project.

Yarrow: You were part of getting that going?

Judy: It was started before I took over as Chair, but it was just barely off the ground. The interview schedule got a little bit added to as I came on board, or just before I came on board, and – but I would guess of the seventy interviews that are in the files currently –

Yarrow: Is that what they said, or is that –

Judy: That's what they said at the meeting yesterday. But probably fifty of those were done in mine.

Yarrow: Your tenure?

Judy: Yes.

Yarrow: What do you believe are changes in SRCD that have occurred? Size?

Judy: I referred to the Bill Martin period. Actually, I found that period very difficult because I was very fond of Bill personally, and the Society owed him and his wife a huge debt of gratitude. I did indeed feel that the Society had to move to another stage, but I did feel that it could have been done better.

Yarrow: Better, yes. It was hurtful.

Judy: So I was being Secretary at what was a difficult time in that respect. On the other hand, I should say, I hardly noticed that Hess had temporarily been the Executive Officer, but I enjoyed immensely working with Margaret Harlow in her period as Executive. So that change in the Society, which I think was a necessary change, was nevertheless a painful change.

The growth, I'm always of two minds about growth, these meetings were too large. I must have gone regularly to APA meetings until I finally got to the point where I said, "I can't come to the meetings this size," but I think I had something like thirty years of regular attendance in APA with again, one or two exceptions before I gave up on it.

Yarrow: Goodness, you're very faithful. Well, it is pretty big and you wonder –

Judy: Incidentally, I ought to add in addition to enjoying working with Margaret Harlow, it was always a pleasure to work with Barbara Kahn who came on at exactly the same time that I did.

Yarrow: She was there a long time. I think I saw her at these meetings.

Judy: They asked her to come back and fill in.

Yarrow: Great.

Judy: Well, the convention arrangements thing was, I think, the last time that it was done entirely by professional psychologists –

Yarrow: I was going to say by SRCD'ers. That's since been taken over in a professional management way.

Judy: A professional management firm does it now. And I had so looked forward to going to the next meeting with no responsibilities, and one of my very few known relatives turned out to be dying at about that time and I didn't get there. But I've enjoyed working with the History Committee, and for all the problems, I suspect I enjoyed both local arrangements and the secretaryship. The local arrangements, I felt proud of myself for assembling a committee that represented almost every institution of higher education in the Boston area.

Yarrow: Good gracious, that would be a lot.

Judy: It was not, you know, just Harvard and what not.

Yarrow: Well, that was good.

Judy: It was really spread out, and a lot of those people are more willing workers than the ones in the more famous places.

Yarrow: That's so true. Sure. There's a big question coming. Please comment on the history of the field?

Judy: Oh, boy!

Yarrow: That's a hard one.

Judy: Let me say one more thing in connection with the History Committee before we go on.

Yarrow: Okay.

Judy: That sort of was a fit for me. Sandwiched between work on the infancy text (the first edition took eight years and the second took four) I had been interviewing older woman members of APA who had been born prior to the Great Depression on their career histories I did it in locales where I was at a meeting, giving a speech, or vacationing, or driving in relation to any of these. I've got a collection of about thirty some such interviews now, (and I may work with a younger colleague on getting some more) and I keep trying to do some professional work writing them up—they're pretty fascinating. The professional societies have done a good job getting their famous members to give autobiographical materials and so forth. I decided that any woman who was born in that era and became a member of APA was worthy of interest. Also I did not limit my interviews to academicians, but took clinicians also.

Yarrow: You're asked to talk about the field, the history in terms of its continuities and discontinuities.

Judy: Yes. Well, I didn't make any notes on that topic.

Yarrow: Well, let's try. What about your views on the field? That's a little more open.

Judy: Well, I think one of the things that I suggested to the History Committee this week, was that it would be interesting to go back and look by decades or quarter centuries, (got modified), at what were the most important papers in that particular time and reprint them in the journal.

Yarrow: That would be very interesting.

Judy: And I think that would give us a lot more closure on this issue of what some of the changes have been.

Yarrow: Yes.

Judy: I also am, I think, probably like any person who's been around for as long as I have, very aware of the fads that strike the field, and both in theory and in just what I would call the subject matter of research. Now partly those fads are clearly determined by funding, but I don't think they are totally determined by funding by any means.

Yarrow: Not entirely. No.

Judy: And I think they may contribute to changes in funding as well as being determined by funding, and I wish, you know, one had the resources to analyze what those fads have been. As long as I had my big house, (we had to sell it after my husband's stroke) I kept all of the programs and I had in mind to some day try to do a content analysis of the programs, hopefully finding some student to help, obviously. I do think it would give us a very interesting look at our field. I don't think I have, you know, an off the cuff thing. I lived through the period where everything was learning. I'm not sure so much in the Society, but in the rest of my life, certainly it's been a question of Freudian influence. It had been great at one time and has largely disappeared. Then from learning we went on to all being Piagetian's, a very uncomfortable mode for me. I'm very uncomfortable with Piaget's theory. Like I said, I'm not much of a theorist anyway. Then we became cognitive people. As I looked at the program for these meetings I don't think I can characterize them very well. There's a great deal more ethnic material than in past meetings. I seem to see more ethnicity in the names of the presenters than in past meetings as well. Whether that's a function of being in Washington or not, I don't know.

Yarrow: I don't think so.

Judy: But, in one of these – I guess I'm a centrist in some ways. I'm a political liberal, but I think I'm centrist about science. I think our pendulums swing too far, I mean, we throw out babies with the bath water, and we abandon one line of thinking and shift our mode into another. I can't live without some thinking about Freudian mechanisms or theories or what have you, and some plain old fashioned learning theory. I'm not sure I'm terribly comfortable with cognitive theory as a lot of it is being expounded in the recent past, but that's me, that's not the field. But that seems to have dropped out of this meeting. And is this a big new trend or what? And if so, what's going to replace it as our new –

Yarrow: Well, do you think neuroscience is influencing the contents?

Judy: Oh, yes. I certainly do. And clearly, if I were going into the field today, I would probably be interested in the neuroscience aspects. I had a dream back when my husband was finishing his term as Chairman of the Faculty at MIT, that I was going to hook-up my infancy research to the kind of research his laboratory did on studying evoked potentials, and I was really going to get a view. I actually did my undergraduate thesis on EEG. And I was really going to get some notion about what was going on neurologically in these kids. But he didn't go back to the lab, he went on to become provost. And that's, of course, why I've always been at an undergraduate institution, more or less, that my husband was deeply embedded in MIT, and I would not contemplate a big commuting marriage, just a little one. I did get considered for two jobs at institutions with graduate students, one at Brandeis, which I didn't get, and one as Department Chairman at Boston University. I was one of the last two people considered and neither of us got it. The department chose the man, and the President refused to appoint him.

Yarrow: Oh, dear.

Judy: But I know why the Department chose the other man. I said I was going to knock their heads together and make them cooperate more between different fields in the Department, and I told the juniors that I favored tenure, so I was really unpopular.

Yarrow: I guess so.

Judy: But it's interesting, I do think that the neuro stuff is probably going to, in fair measure, replace the cognitive, straight cognitive stuff. It's going to be a mixture. I think we'll get a lot of mixtures of work in both. But whether those neuro people are going to stay identified with SRCD, I think, is another question, and that worries me a bit.

Yarrow: Oh, I see. Well –

Judy: There's some of them who are – who already are, and that's clear. But just as the neuro people have broken off from departments and so on, I'm a little worried about our neuro people splitting off.

Yarrow: If that might happen.

Judy: -- whether they'll be active –

Yarrow: Those are your fears. It says, “What are your fears?” What are your hopes?

Judy: My hopes? One of my hopes is that the History Committee is going to become more active, and that we're going actually to take a better look at our past, and that maybe if we take a better look at our past we can better design our future, but that's maybe a lot to hope for.

Yarrow: But it's pretty vital.

Judy: Yes.

Yarrow: Now, personal notes.

Judy: I've scattered several in along the way haven't I?

Yarrow: You have indeed, but I'll read this as a question. Tell us something about your personal interest and your family, especially the ways in which they've had a bearing on your scientific interests and contributions? It sounds like your long paper gives a lot on that; it seems to me.

Judy: Yes. Pretty well in a brief version, the fact that I married a man who wanted me to have a career, not just accepted the idea that I would have, I think has been very important, particularly understanding that I got married the beginning of my senior year in college, fifty-six years ago. The fact that my children were the sources of a lot of hypotheses in my professional life has been important. I've been enough of a traditionalist about marriage to limit my career in some ways to suit my husbands' needs, wishes, desires. Right now by being his caretaker instead of doing my work.

Yarrow: He's ill?

Judy: He's had prostate cancer, a stroke, congestive heart failure and been diagnosed with Parkinsonism. Subsequent to the interview his state has greatly improved due to the implanting of a shunt for normal pressure hydrocephaly. He also no longer has (or never had) Parkinsonism.

Yarrow: That sounds tough.

Judy: And it's frustrating because I do have all these unfinished projects, but, you know, at a time when other – you know, I just don't know any other women who've had family support in the way that I have. And while my daughter nagged at me for a while about why don't you stay home like other mothers, I said, 'Yeah, people who go play bridge and stuff,' the one year when I was between Simmons College and Harvard Graduate School again, she said, "Oh, mom go back to work." I was so disorganized, and nothing organized my life.

Yarrow: Well, work does a lot to organize, doesn't it? Yes.

Judy: Let's see. What other ingredients were there?

Yarrow: Well, let see. On your applied contributions, what does that mean?

Judy: I didn't write that question. How does the family influence the scientific and the – I don't know why the applied is pulled out.

Yarrow: There it is?

Judy: Well, some people would argue that my adaptation to infancy work after kindergarten children and it's potential applied nature, might have something to do with the fact that I have a much younger sister who has been totally abnormal since birth. I myself think it was just the accident of moving to Brown with its requirement re the Collaborative Project .

Yarrow: I see.

Judy: But because I just divorced myself from the problems of my sister, (even though I am her guardian or conservator as they now say, long, long ago). I think actually that that problem in the family pushed me even more into being a serious student to get away from the problems. But I was career-oriented from seven on (well before her birth). I was going to be a medical doctor. I started to work in a medical doctors office when I was fourteen, and I worked there for six years. He would have sent me to medical school (my parents couldn't have afforded to), and the only reason I gave it up was because I saw that the young woman who had done much the same thing well ahead of me, when she came back became his slave. Now I didn't mind working, but I wasn't going to be anyone's slave, and that's when I switched to psychology as a major, and originally to physiological, closest to medicine. Then living in South Dakota was what threw me into the prejudice, and my children threw me into child. My sisters problems have a lot to do with my attitudes on a lot of subjects about what kinds of kids we keep alive and things like that, because I have very strong biases that result from my family's experiences in that respect. But, I don't think they have ever influenced my career directly.

Yarrow: You have given a life through time as -- whose title is that, Jack Block maybe, or somebody's?

Judy: Yes. I've heard it, but I don't know whose.

Yarrow: It has been a very full and wonderful interview, I think.

Judy: Thank you.