

Susan Goldberg

- Born March 25, 1938; died June 14, 2005
- B.A. in Psychology and Mathematics (1959) Antioch College, M.S. in Experimental Psychology (1964) Tufts University, Ph.D. in Experimental Child Psychology (1975) University of Massachusetts

Major Employment

- Research Assistant in Psychology, Tufts University: 1960-1965
- Assistant Professor of Psychology, Brandeis University: 1974-1981
- Research Scientist, The Hospital for Sick Children: 1981-2005
- Professor of Psychiatry and Psychology, University of Toronto: 1982-2005



Major Areas of Work

- Infancy, attachment

SRCD Affiliation

- *Child Development* Editorial Board (1977-83, 1991-93), *Monographs of the SRCD* Editorial Board (1998-99)

SRCD Oral History Interview

Susan Goldberg

Interviewed by Daliah Chapnik, Kirsten Blokland, & Natalie Myhal
At Susan Goldberg's home, Toronto, Ontario
April 18, 23, & 26, 2005

Chapnik: So this is the interview with Susan Goldberg. The date's April 18th. Okay. For the SRCD Oral History Project. So we're going to start off with just a general question about—this is a big question, so maybe we should break it down—it says describe your family background, along with any childhood and adolescent experiences that may be of interest. It's a big question.

Goldberg: Yeah, yeah.

Chapnik: Include the educational and occupational characteristics of your parents. Where were you born, grew up, what was your schooling like, any military experience, early work experience?

Goldberg: So I grew up in New York City. I was one of three children. I was the oldest of three children. My father was a pharmacist. My mother was a great schoolteacher. And my father certainly thought of himself as an intellectual, and the house was always filled with books and we were always reading books and talking about books. I went to the public school, PS 76, which was about three blocks away, which—that wasn't particularly exciting or stimulating, although I discovered when I got to Antioch College that I'd had a better grade school and high school education than many of the students who came from places other than New York. I went to Evander Childs High School—

Chapnik: How do you spell that?

Goldberg: —E-V-A-N-D-E-R Childs—just the way it sounds—and I think I did get interested in science things there. In fact, when I left high school my intention was to major in biology, but I think I got a little bit ahead of what was being taught in universities at that time and I found that Antioch really didn't have a lot of courses in cell biology, which was my interest at the time. And so I floundered for a while and I ended up majoring in something called life sciences, which let you take courses in

psychology, biology, sociology, and anthropology. It was kind of a way of not making much of a decision. And about my third year—Antioch was a five-year course—the person who held that program together left Antioch and the program fell apart. And at that point I had more psychology classes than anything else and so I finished up in psychology. I also had put off doing a required course in mathematics, I think, until my third year and we had to write—the first thing we had to do in the course was write an essay on what is mathematics, and why I hated it. And I realized when I wrote that that I didn't really hate mathematics, I just hated arithmetic. And I actually got very excited about contemporary mathematics in that course and decided that I was going to try to take as many math courses as I could, so I actually graduated with a minor in mathematics. Maybe that's all I can say.

Chapnik: You answered the second question as well, which is what—but you might want to add something, because the question is what early adult experiences were important to your intellectual development? And then it goes on and says collegiate experiences, so I think you've begun to answer them.

Goldberg: Yeah. I do remember that when I was in high school I was actually the laboratory assistant in the biology lab course and that was kind of what got me interested in science and in biology. What else can I say about that? Not too much. I'm just thinking that it might be important to say that I went through grade school very quickly and finished when I was 12 years old. So I started high school when I was 12 and graduated when I was 16, which is how old I was when I went—I'd gotten to Antioch College. And I think it took a while for me to really find my niche, because I was always a bit out of step with other kids at school in terms of interests, social interests. I think the thing that saved me was that I went to summer camps where I did spend time with kids who were my own age, and I think that's where a lot of my music experience and music interest came. And I think there's a place later on where it asks us about other interests.

Chapnik: Yes, there is, yeah. Is there anything you want to add about music as it is such an important part of your life?

[Telephone interruption]

Goldberg: I'm also thinking that interest in early childhood is very common in my family. My mother was a grade school teacher, but eventually worked many years at a New York City daycare center that she helped to start, and my sister also worked with young kids and has, for the last—I'm not sure how long—10 or 12 years, been the administrator of the lower grades in a private school in New York. So somehow we were always, all of us, interested in young kids. And you know, of course, many of my mother's friends were also teachers of young kids, so there was a lot of talk in the house about teaching young kids and problems of young kids.

Chapnik: What individuals were important to your intellectual development?

Goldberg: Well, I would say initially when I was growing up it would have been my mother and teachers that she worked with. The way I eventually got into child development was after Antioch I went to a laboratory assistant job, and in the laboratory you have somebody who studied mathematical models of group functioning and dabbled in graduate courses at the same time. And I think about my third year there I took a laboratory class in child development with Zella Luria—I think it is Zella Luria, but Joan Grusec may know this better than I—and at the end of the course she pointed out to me that I now had enough credits to get a master's degree and I'd just done the pilot for a master's thesis as part of her course. So she was the one who really convinced me to follow that up, and that thesis was about children's mathematical concepts of probability and it was based on some of Piaget's work. And Tufts, where I was at that time, was a very nuts and bolts kind of industrial psychology department, and so as soon as I got into this thesis work I became the local child development expert.

Chapnik: What year was this? Do you remember the year?

Goldberg: It would have been—well, it would have been early '70s, because I got my master's in '74.

Chapnik: What about colleagues? Were there any significant colleagues or other mentors at that time?

Goldberg: Well, other than Zella Luria I didn't have any major mentors at that time, but we—I was at Tufts because my husband was getting his degree at Harvard, and after he finished his work we went back to Yellow Springs and we taught at Antioch for several years. And on the campus at Antioch College there's an institute called Fels Research Institute, which started in the 1920s, one of the first consistent longitudinal studies that was still going when I was there. And when I started looking for a job I went to Michael Lewis's infancy lab, and I would say that Michael was the person who really professionalized me and got me interested in infancy, which was quite new then. There weren't many people doing infancy work, so that we were kind of real pioneers together. And is the next question about SRCD?

Chapnik: Coming up, so—and actually there's a whole section on personal research contributions, so maybe we should save sort of this line—

Goldberg: Okay.

Chapnik: —for a little bit later. But the next question is what political and social events have influenced your research and writing and teaching?

Goldberg: Early on I would say there was nothing in particular, but in more recent years I got interested in the peace movement and model that physicians were using, and I did a number of surveys of children's attitudes and views and concerns about nuclear war. That was probably the biggest political thing that I was engaged in.

Chapnik: Would you characterize the development of your ideas in the field of child development as evolving in a rather straightforward fashion or in a way that involved sharp turns in theoretical or research style, and why do you characterize your work in this way?

Goldberg: Well, I think I would have to say that my work was not a straight and narrow path. One of the things I've always liked about research is that it leaves you the option of moving to new topics, and it's always felt like I've moved from one thing to another, not just frivolously or by accident, but I would say that there wasn't any big overhauled plan of where I was going. I remember after I came to Toronto Klaus Minde asked me once what did I expect to be doing in ten years, and I remember telling him, "Probably just what I'm doing now." I had no kind of—no sense of where I was headed. So I didn't really have any clear path.

Chapnik: I hope there's the question—I think that we'll get to it next, but I want to hear more about, you know, especially attachment and how you got involved in that. But I think it'll come up. Okay. So we're finished—so this is the next section is the—is about your personal research contributions. Okay? What were your primary interests in child development at the beginning of your career?

Goldberg: At the very beginning I guess I—I've already mentioned that I started with children's mathematical concepts, especially about probability, but then when I got into the field of infancy I realized how much was unknown about infants. And I think even from the beginning I was always interested in social relationships: infants and their mothers, or fathers, or siblings. When I first came to Toronto, Klaus Minde was doing a study of prematurely born infants and using attachment measures, and I had, earlier on, had some interest in looking at infants with various medical problems as a sort of natural experiment. I was interested in infant influences on their parents and, you know, medical

problems seemed like a kind of natural experiment that you could look at, so I had started out doing some work on the development of prematurely born babies. And then when I came to Toronto and Klaus Minde was working with prematurely born infants, and also with attachment, that was my first introduction to attachment.

Chapnik: What continuities in your work are most significant? What shifts occurred and what events were responsible?

Goldberg: For about my first eight or ten years at the Hospital for Sick Kids, you know, I was interested in medical influences on social relationships and looked at a number of different groups. After the preemies we looked at children of cystic fibrosis and we were interested in the conditions that were identified early in life. So we looked at children with cystic fibrosis, we looked at children with congenital heart disease, somewhat later we did some work on children with diabetes, but after a while, I guess, I got more interested in the theoretical side of attachment and I started to move away from the medical side of things and more into the emotional development side of things.

Chapnik: And what—how would you describe that shift in your—what would you say would be responsible for that shift in focus?

Goldberg: I'm not sure. I was also—I was based in a psychiatry department and one of the things we were looking at in most of my early studies was how these early developments in parent-child relationships might be affecting later behavior problems. And I'm just thinking about, you know, at some point I guess the shift was that I got more interested in the general issue of emotional development and how—what things gave rise to behavior problems and was less interested in the medical side of things. I think that's probably what happened.

Chapnik: So we're on to question number three, reflecting on the strengths and weaknesses of your research and theoretical contributions, the impact of your work, and its current status.

Goldberg: Well, I think one of the strengths of my work was to have been looking at the medical conditions as a natural experiment to have had interest in the effect of infants and parents, which was—both of which were relatively novel contributions and areas that weren't being worked in by many people at the time. I think one of the weaknesses of my work was always that I—I didn't always follow through all the ideas that I had, so you know, I'd often come up with great ideas for research studies and then never do them. And there are, in various places in my drawers, unpublished studies that we never finished or never completely wrote up. And I always regretted that and I often felt that I just wasn't ambitious enough to stick with some of these things. What was the rest?

Chapnik: The impact of your work and its current status.

Goldberg: I think one of the reasons that my work has had an impact is that I write pretty well and I really enjoy writing, so I think a lot of the things that I've written have gotten a lot of attention because people enjoyed the writing. You know? Certainly the textbook once it was written, you know, has been having an impact, because there aren't many texts on attachment and development, and I think I only knew of one other one when I started my book, and I think I—one of the strengths is that I used the book to explore some new ideas that I was working and thinking about that I knew I would not get into researching, but it did serve to make people think about some things.

Chapnik: What are examples of the—

Goldberg: Well, one example would be the section on attachment and physical health, which was something that I was just beginning to get interested in towards the end of my work. And you know, it really struck me that illness has always been described as an attachment situation and that we've done practically nothing to look at illness and attachment, or health and attachment. So you know, that whole section, that whole chapter was really kind of speculative and I think relatively novel.

Chapnik: So if you were to say what was a theory or a hypothesis for future research work, what might it—if you could design a study in the area of attachment and physical health, what would be your research questions?

Goldberg: Well, it's interesting that it sort of takes me back to where I started looking at medical conditions and their influence on child development and parent-child relations. But I think if I were to begin researching that area I would want to think about ways to actually look at parent-child interactions around the illness per se, which in the beginning I didn't really look at. Klaus Minde did a number of studies observing parent visits to the intensive care unit. But I'm thinking that there are also lots of everyday caregiving interactions around children's illness-related situations that we should figure out how to look at.

Chapnik: Another question?

Goldberg: Sure.

Chapnik: Okay. What published or unpublished manuscripts best represent your thinking about child development? Which of your studies seem most significant? Which contributions the most wrong-headed?

Goldberg: I think I might leave that one for the next time.

Chapnik: That's a big question. Okay.

[break in tape]

Blokland: —Kirsten and Sue picking up on the interview from where Daliah and Sue left off a few days ago. It's now Saturday, April the 23rd, 2005, and we're picking up starting now on section two, personal research contributions beginning now with question four in that section. So this question for Sue reads as follows: what published or unpublished manuscripts best represent your thinking about child development?

Goldberg: Well, I guess I'd have to say that the textbook *Attachment and Development* is probably the most comprehensive and the best thing, and I did look at it when I was writing it as a kind of summing up of everything that I've learned in the last ten years or so. Now, do I have anything unpublished—I don't think so. I think I'll leave it at that.

Blokland: Okay. That's great, thanks. And in terms of your studies, which of your studies seem most significant to you?

Goldberg: I think that the early studies of children with various medical conditions that showed that medical conditions have—per se—have very little influence on attachment I think were relatively important, because we all expected that we were going to see some negative effects of medical conditions and we didn't.

Blokland: That's pretty significant. And in terms of contributions that you feel might have been the most wrong-headed, any thoughts on that?

Goldberg: That were wrong-headed? It's always hard to say that you've been wrong-headed or made a mistake. I might want to come back to this one, because I can't think of anything right now that I'm really embarrassed at.

Blokland: Okay. I'll just circle this one in case you feel like coming back to it like you said. Okay. Question five: please reflect on your experiences with the research funding apparatus over the

years and comment on your participation in shaping research funding policy, implementation—for example, study sections, councils—securing support for your own work, and related matters.

Goldberg: Again, I don't feel as if I've had much impact on the funding system at all. I was on the Ontario Mental Health Foundation committee for—I forget how many years you serve, but two or three years or however long your term is supposed to be.

Blokland: Yes.

Goldberg: And I think there was—and Ontario Mental Health, I think, has probably been one of my main funders, and I remember that in my early years I always felt like I was spending about a third of my time trying to find money and it cut back quite a lot on how much you could actually do. And I remember that there was a period when OMHF decided that they would try to make available some five-year grants. I think they only made two-year grants, and they decided they would give some five-year grants to people who were getting lots of money from them consistently so they wouldn't have to read them every two years and people wouldn't have to be running them every other year. But they got cold feet and they never awarded any of those, but I did try to get one. I think the other thing we've had a little trouble with is what used to be the Medical Research Council and became CIHR, Canadian Institute for Health Research. When we were trying to do studies that included both attachment and physiological measures we always seemed to get our applications into the wrong study section. I think we were just too complex for—they sent us, I think, once or maybe twice to behavioral sciences A, and got a lot of feedback that suggested that our proposals were being read by people who were accustomed to tiny neat experiments and kind of didn't understand the scope of what we were trying to do. I think eventually we solved that problem. I don't remember how, but we did. And that's maybe all I can say on that.

Blokland: Okay. That's great. Now, we're starting a new section. This section is called your institutional contributions and the first question in this section is in which institutions have you worked, what were your dates, and in what capacities?

Goldberg: I guess my first institution was—after I got my PhD was Brandeis University. I taught for, I guess, six years and then didn't get tenure.

Blokland: What were they thinking?

Goldberg: I don't know, but moving to Toronto was the best thing I ever did.

Blokland: I'm glad.

Goldberg: And that was what moved me to the Hospital for Sick Children in Toronto, and I guess when I was at Brandeis I was trying to link up with hospitals in the area and not being that successful, so I was very excited about actually being in a hospital situation. And yeah, that's probably it.

Blokland: Okay.

Goldberg: Now I've lost my train of thought.

Blokland: So the best thing was moving to Toronto—

Goldberg: Toronto and being in—

Blokland: —do you recall your—

Goldberg: —in a hospital—

Blokland: —and being—okay.

Goldberg: —and I was very excited about that.

Blokland: Yeah. What was your date again that you moved to Sick Kids [The Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto]?

Goldberg: '81.

Blokland: '81, yeah.

Goldberg: The fall of '81, or the summer of '81 actually.

Blokland: And your capacity there—

Goldberg: And my capacity there was as a researcher, and I guess it took me a long time to figure out how the research institute at the hospital worked. Because you had an appointment in the research institute and an appointment in a clinical department, and mine was psychiatry. And the psychiatry department that I was in, I guess their hope and wish was that I should teach psychiatrists how to do research and act as sort of an in-house research consultant to the main psychiatrists in the department. And the research institute saw things quite differently. They expected me to do the research I wanted and not have any responsibilities in the clinical department. And then the research institute kind of reorganized itself and went to what they call the “matrix” organization where we were put into groups according to—and this was only the researchers—according to what level of complexity in the human body we were working on. And I guess I should say that the research institute was really focused mostly on molecular research and had a head who was a molecular researcher, so I guess those of us who were behavioral scientists always felt really not understood. Anyway, when they went to this matrix organization I got put into the brain and behavior section, and the—I think it was—I forget whether it was development—it wasn't developmental biology. I felt like that was where I belonged, but they thought I belonged in—I forget what they called—

Blokland: I'm trying to think of it myself. I should remember. [It was called “Integrative Biology”.]

Goldberg: —and it was sort of everybody who was looking at whole organs, and I felt that that didn't really relieve me of any psychiatry department functions, you know, that I still had all my psychiatry responsibilities. I still had all my U of T [University of Toronto] responsibilities and now I had two different research departments to be part of and go to meetings, and that was really the point at which I decided I was going to take early retirement as soon as I could because it's the first time that I really felt that there was no way I could do all those things that were expected. So I guess—I don't remember exactly when that happened, but—

Blokland: Sometime during the early '90s, early to mid '90s?

Goldberg: Really?

Blokland: I don't—I remember that switch over, but I don't remember the date.

Goldberg: Yeah, I was very unhappy with that whole idea. I felt like it introduced a level of complexity instead of simplifying things. I think that's what they were hoping to do. But that was when I decided to develop my five-year plan for retiring.

Blokland: You always seemed—this is not on the protocol, but from my perspective you always seemed so graceful with your sense of calm, being under control, everything got done, you were efficient, and I don't know how you did it all given all those responsibilities.

Goldberg: Well—

Blokland: Did it feel pretty stressful trying to kind of—

Goldberg: —what happened when the research institute went to this reorganization was it was the first time I really had to decide not to do some of the things I was supposed to do, because there was just no way I could keep up with everything.

Blokland: That makes sense. Yeah. Time for another question, or did you want to add anything to that?

Goldberg: No, I think that's all I can say about that.

Blokland: So the same section, we're still in your institutional contributions, and this is question number two. For persons connected with well-known research sites such as NIMH, the various universities, free-standing research institutes or foundations—so I guess that's you—

Goldberg: Is it? I don't know.

Blokland: Free-standing research institutes or foundations, so that would be the Hospital for Sick Children and connected with the U of T, the various universities, well known research sites. Sick Kids is a well known research site, right?

Goldberg: Yes.

Blokland: Okay. So why don't—I'll ask the question, and then you can see if you think it applies.

Goldberg: Okay.

Blokland: Okay. So please describe your role within that facility; describe the changes in this unit that occurred during your time there, what objectives were being pursued, what achievements and frustrations were encountered, and the role you believed was played by that unit in the history of child development research. It sounds like you've covered a lot of that already—

Goldberg: Yeah, I think I—

Blokland: —in the previous question.

Goldberg: —covered a lot of that in the previous question. And I guess I should say that the research institute that I was part of was not really interested in child development, was interested in molecular biology and I always felt that a lot of the things that they were doing didn't have to be done in a children's hospital. It could have been done in another setting. And I guess they had started out in that direction, but that's what was hot at the time and that's what they were committed to. But I didn't really feel that they had any big role to play in child development per se. They were really interested in dealing with medical problems.

Blokland: We've finished the entire first page. That's a lot. I mean—

Goldberg: That was quick—

Blokland: —you and Daliah did two-thirds of that and then we did another third now, so we've just got this much left, and we'll just do whatever number of questions you kind of feel like doing. Is it okay to ask you another one now?

Goldberg: Yeah.

Blokland: Yeah? Okay. So question three, same section still, describe your experiences as a teacher of child development research and/or trainer of research workers. What courses have you taught? Please comment on the tension between teaching and research in the field of child development.

Goldberg: I guess when I first came to Toronto I think I taught a child development course every third year or something like that, you know, a basic child development course. And then I started getting involved in team-taught courses. So Joan Grusec and Jenny Jenkins and I did a course on attachment and I taught some things with Carl Corter and some people from OISE [Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto] on parenting I think they called their courses. And of course, I always had students working in the lab and that was how most of my teaching got done, and our lab group met sort of once a week and talked mostly about our ongoing research. But you know, it was a little bit of a seminar for us, and we did sometimes read articles, or review articles, or talk about information we had brought back from meetings [i.e., conferences], so that was kind of an informal seminar. But I think most of my trainees learned about research by being apprentices the lab. I think that's about all I can say about that.

Blokland: Okay. Are there any comments you have regarding tensions between your teaching responsibilities and interests and your research in the field of child development?

Goldberg: I guess I didn't feel that so much. You know, because I thought of teaching quite broadly, not so much as courses and lectures and whatever, but as a general enterprise and people could learn in many situations, and learning by doing was one of them.

Blokland: Okay. This is the last question now in this section. Question four: describe your experiences in so-called applied child development research and applied work in general. Please comment on your role in putting theory into practice.

Goldberg: I guess I always felt that I didn't do this that much, but in fact, I realize in retrospect that a lot of my teaching was done in sharing research findings with front-line workers in the hospital and in other places, you know, outside the hospital and in other disciplines. You know, I myself didn't feel that I really did anything that was explicitly applied or that I thought was explicitly applied. Other thing—other people may have thought some of my research was more applied than I thought. But mostly I saw my role as bringing the research information to the people in the front lines.

Blokland: Is there anything you'd like to comment about regarding the video you created called "A Simple Gift" in terms of this idea of the applied aspect of your work?

Goldberg: I'd forgotten about that, and that wasn't my idea. That was probably Diane [Benoit]'s idea. I thought it was a brilliant idea. I think that was a very satisfying project and we did try to do a brief evaluation of it, but you're right, that's kind of a useful product that came out of our work, trying to give parents some of the simple messages that we could give from our attachment research and theory.

Blokland: Okay. Are you okay to go on, or would you like to rest a little bit?

Goldberg: I think maybe we should stop—

Blokland: Okay.

Goldberg: —because Everett [Waters] is going to show up soon and—

Blokland: Yeah, okay.

Goldberg: —and I do want to have a break before he—

[break in tape]

Myhal: Okay. So we're going to start with what published or unpublished manuscripts best represent your thinking about child development. Which of your studies seem most significant, which you answered already—

Goldberg: Yeah.

Myhal: —and now which contributions the most wrong-headed?

Goldberg: I think this is where we ended last time, because I found that a very difficult thing to answer. I know that I've changed my mind about a lot of things, but it's very hard to put my finger on one thing that was really wrong-headed or embar—you know, that I'm embarrassed to look at now and think that I actually published it and said X, Y or Z. So I think we should move on and—

Myhal: Okay. Maybe there just simply aren't any.

Goldberg: Yes. Well, you know, I can't say I've never been wrong headed, or I've never—well, you know, I've already said I've changed my mind about a number of things. But—

Myhal: Well, maybe there weren't any publications—

Goldberg: —maybe that's the answer.

Myhal: It's possible. Yeah. Certainly when I was working for you there didn't seem to be any. Okay.

Goldberg: Well, but you know, you joined the lab—my lab, you know, sort of towards the end in—

Myhal: In '91, yeah.

Goldberg: —'91, and we really have to go back to the '70s, so there may have been earlier things that were wrong headed. Anyway why don't we go on and if—

Myhal: If it comes to you and something else sparks your memory—okay, this next group of questions are about your experiences with SRCD. First one is when did you join SRCD?

Goldberg: I'm not sure exactly when I joined. I think the first SRCD meeting that I went to was in the mid '60s when I was working with Michael Lewis and—I don't remember—I probably joined that year or shortly after that first convention.

Myhal: So what are your earliest contacts with the Society and with whom? What were your earliest contacts with the Society?

Goldberg: I think my earliest contact was going to that first convention and I may or may not have seen some of the newsletters before that.

Myhal: Describe the first biennial meeting you attended.

Goldberg: Oh, the first one that I attended was in New York and it was quite small compared to SRCD now. And it was in a single hotel. I think it might have been the Ritz Carleton. I'm not sure. And I believe there were, sort of, only four or five things going on at once, and there wasn't that much infancy work being presented. So I felt I could cover all the infancy things and also go to some other

things, you know, that were not my area or my specialty. And you know, sometimes in the early years I found those were the most interesting.

Myhal: What did you do at that meeting? Did you present something?

Goldberg: Yes, I presented some work on sex differences in play of one-year-olds that Michael Lewis and I had done. It later got published and Michael has said to me many times, “We would be really rich if we had gotten money each time the pictures from that paper had been reprinted.” Well, now there’s something that was wrong headed. Because the—one of the important observations in that study was that—well, I should probably say a little bit about the study. We had mothers of girls and mothers of boys coming into a playroom together, and after a certain amount of play in the playroom the room was divided and the mother and the toys were put on one side of a barrier and the child was stuck on the other side. And our finding was that girls were more likely to stand in the middle of the barrier and make appeals to the mother for help, and boys were more likely to be at the ends of the barrier trying to push it away or climb over it or something like that, and we interpreted that as girls being—you know, already learning about the helplessness of femininity and the boys being more active. Ten years later Michael and somebody else—I forget who—looked at the two year old data from the same longitudinal study where they had used the same paradigm and they found that at age two the boys were the ones who stood in the middle and appealed to mother, and when you looked at the data—or another way of looking at it was that girls were actually more advanced in language and communication and boys eventually caught up to them in that area and that was the thing that accounted for the differences. So that first paper got lots and lots of attention, because it confirmed everybody’s stereotypes of sex differences. But I have to say it turned out it was wrong.

Myhal: So now we’ve covered two questions in one. And I just want to know—

Goldberg: Oh, about the SRCD meeting?

Myhal: Yeah, yeah.

Goldberg: I think the other thing I remember in those early years was that there were meetings in the—often big symposia in the evenings. And in those days posters hadn’t yet been introduced, because the meetings weren’t that crowded, so there were only spoken presentations. And I’m trying to think. There was another young woman from Fels, Anne somebody, who I’ve totally lost track with, whom I roomed with at that meeting. And I don’t remember that we spent much time exploring New York, and that may be because I grew up in New York and I didn’t feel like, you know, it was an exciting new tourist place. So I literally spent all my time at sessions. And I’m trying to remember, and I’m sure—but I can’t—I’m trying to remember who I met at that meeting—

Myhal: Yeah, that’s what I wanted to know. Who did you meet that was really exciting?

Goldberg: —and I must have met people who were exciting.

Myhal: Yes.

Goldberg: But I can’t remember who, but I certainly laid eyes on a lot of people whose work I had only read, you know, and had never seen in person and I was kind of impressed.

Myhal: That’s the way I felt when I went to these SRCD meetings—

Goldberg: Yeah.

Myhal: —these people and the real faces and I’d read their stuff, and it’s exciting to see them.

Goldberg: And I always think that was one of the exciting things about taking students and lab assistants and so on to those meetings, and giving them a chance to lay eyes on some of the stars and lesser lights.

Myhal: Well, if somebody pops into your head let me know. We're going to go on to the next question.

Goldberg: Okay.

Myhal: Describe the history of your participation in the scientific meetings and publications of the Society. That's a good one.

Goldberg: Well, I was never very active in any particular way other than going to the conventions every—I guess every other year, and I missed very few. You know, it was kind of a must-go thing for a long time. And I don't recall any specific writings for any of the publications other than submitting papers to *Child Development*, and that first paper about play and one-year-olds that I talked about was published in *Child Development*. I'm trying to think. I think it was probably many years before I published anything else in *Child Development*. My CV will show that, but *Child Development* was always one of the first places I thought about submitting work for empirical papers, and sometimes for thought papers, too. But I don't think I had tons and tons of *Child Development* publications. I don't think I ever submitted anything to the newsletter, although I always read it from cover to cover and looked forward to it when it came.

Myhal: Can you say something about your participation in other non-governance aspects of the work of the Society?

Goldberg: Yeah, I was never involved in governance. I think I probably occasionally—as years went by I continued to present stuff at meetings, and eventually I worked at organizing symposia. And the nature of the meetings changed a lot, because they got bigger and bigger and the poster format came in. And in the beginning I found posters kind of very confusing. I didn't really know how to put them together or how to read them and understand them, so that was a skill that I had to develop kind of late in my career. And I guess I eventually discovered that posters were—at least this is my view—that posters were really supposed to present not the whole story, but kind of a little teaser to encourage people to ask questions and talk to you. And I also began to find the meetings sort of more and more overwhelming. There was more and more infancy material, and even when I was working in a special area there seemed to be more and more material that related to my own work. And so I really ended up going to fewer and fewer sessions that weren't directly related to my own work and it was one of the things I missed in the later years, and especially when the meetings ended up being in several hotels and you had to race from one to the other. I found that I couldn't spend all my time at sessions, and if I went to one session and then had to get to another hotel I had to sort of skip the next session. And towards the end I planned just not to spend the whole day at meetings. I would aim for maybe two or three sessions during the day and not make myself work so hard.

Myhal: I know the answer to this next question, but just for the record, did you participate in SRCD governance? You said no, right? So we'll go on to the next one. What do you believe are the most important changes to occur in SRCD and its activities during your association with it?

Goldberg: Well, I guess I've already described the way in which the conventions changed. And I have to confess that I've never been that much aware of what the Society does or did aside from its publications and the conventions. I guess I should say that I was on a number of review panels for selecting presentations at various times. But I don't think there were a lot of other things that I was involved in, so I think I had kind of a relatively distant relationship with the organization.

Myhal: Okay. Let's go on to another area and that's the field—your field, infancy. Comment if you will on the history of the field during the years that you participated in it, major continuities and discontinuities and events related to these.

Goldberg: Well, I guess when I joined SRCD I was already looking at infancy work, and infa—but infancy work was relatively new at that time, and there was a small group of maybe—it was called the—I think the committee on research in infancy, like, about 40 infancy—30 to 40 infancy researchers that met. I don't recall whether it was on an annual or biannual basis. I was never a member of that, because I think I was still a student in the days that that was happening. And what I've seen happening to infancy work is it's gotten more and more differentiated and more specialized. I guess when I first got into it people had just discovered ways to ask infants questions, so a lot of the work was on infant attention and what things infants could discriminate and how early concepts developed. And my recollection is that there was very little attention given to social development. It was all more perceptual sensory learning, cognitive, and if you go—and, of course, there's now a society and infant—an International Society for Infant Studies and it has its own conventions in the off years from SRCD. And that meeting has gotten bigger, and bigger, and bigger and more differentiated, and so that it's kind of become a world of its own. And there's definitely kind of a social-emotional developmental track I guess in it, but even social-emotional development has gotten more and more differentiated and detailed. And I think that's a natural pattern for a lot of areas that people start out looking at in a general and relatively superficial way and then they get mo—

Myhal: —saying the phenomena—

Goldberg: Right. And so people get more and more specialized and there have been whole areas in infancy where people have developed—you know, for example, the early sensory and perception stuff that we were doing has certainly continued, but also gotten more detailed and people have—there's kind of a whole linguistic development area, and the area that I've worked in most recently, attachment, is kind of a segment of the socio-emotional development work. And there was a period when it was sort of the big thing that was very popular, and you could look at the schedule at SRCD even and it would be just packed with sessions on attachment. I think that's easing off a little bit now, but—and then, of course, even within attachment it's gotten kind of more and more differentiated, so—

Myhal: What do you mean by that?

Goldberg: Well, you know, in the beginning everybody was looking at, I would say, infant attachment and its consequences. And then partly because of the work that was done on the adult attachment interview there's now a whole area of work on adult attachment that wasn't there once—wasn't there at the—in the early days, and the other kind of relatively recent work has been about disorganization and the kinds of parental behaviors that seem to contribute to it. So all of that is sort of relatively new work in attachment. But there are sort of similar developments in other areas of infancy that people started out looking at; linguistic development, and then people got into looking at the use of specific kinds of languages and scripts. People keep finding new phenomena to explore, so it's just like an explosion of new areas and new questions.

Myhal: Have your views concerning the importance of various issues changed over the years?

Goldberg: I would say yes. One of the definite things is that I think that applied work and applied interests have been introduced and more, kind of, social concerns have been introduced, and that's fairly recent. I guess that's one of the big things. There have definitely been other shifts in interest. I can't think of specific things that I could document there, but I think if you went and looked at just the titles of the invited symposia at either SRCD or the infancy meetings you would see those kinds of changes in what people were thinking about.

Myhal: What are your hopes and fears, if you have any, for the future of the field?

Goldberg: I don't know that I have specific—well, I guess my fear would be that the funding for the kind of research that's important dries up, and there's always been a phenomenon of the availability of money driving what kinds of things get done. And I sort of would hope that we continue to have enough funding and enough freedom that people can follow their interests and not be constrained by considerations other than the science itself.

Myhal: Okay. This will be my last question. On a personal note, can you tell us something about your personal interests and your family, especially the ways in which they may have had a bearing on your scientific interests and contributions, and on your applied contributions?

Goldberg: Well, I think I said at the very beginning that the family I grew up in, when I think about it, included a lot of people who were really interested in young children. My mother was a teacher and she originally taught in grade school, but I think fairly early she shifted to working in daycare with young preschoolers. And my sister also—well, she was always what we call an early childhood person. I remember my sister getting up at my mother's retirement party and saying, "I followed my mother into early childhood." So my mother and sister and a lot of friends of my mother were also preschool teachers or people with some interest in kids. So there was always a lot of talk about children and young children when I was growing up. At the time I don't think I was aware that it, you know, at the time it didn't particularly make me think, This is what I want to do, or, This is where I want to work. In the family that I created I had three children, and I think, you know, people sometimes say to me, "Did your academic—how did your academic work help your own childrearing?" And I don't think it helped at all, but I think some of the insights I got from having kids of my own have influenced my work and my ideas. I've always kind of been fascinated by young children, and how they think, and, you know, it just makes you kind of see the world and think about the world in different ways. I'm thinking of when you watch a baby trying to do something new, like trying to reach for things, you realize how many complicated things you just take for granted. And it's really kind of a miracle how kids learn to do things and develop. And I think they remind us about things that we forget, so in that way watching my own kids and having my own kids has been an influence. I think there was more on that question—

Myhal: A bearing on—well, you said your scientific interests and contributions. And on your applied contributions, have they had a bearing on that?

Goldberg: I don't think so. I don't—I think I've said I don't think of myself as having made a lot of direct applied contributions. I mean, mostly I've spent a lot of time doing research that has potential applications and I always have felt a responsibility—and this probably comes from my family—I've always felt a responsibility to share what I've learned and shared my research with people working on the front lines and people who can make use of it. So over the years I've given a lot of talks to medical people, to teachers, to occupational therapists, physiotherapists, medical people, home visitors, that kind of thing. I don't know if I can add much to that.

Myhal: That's okay. Is there anything else you just want to say? That's the end of the formal interview.

Goldberg: I don't think so. We even managed to think of something I think I published that was wrong headed—

Myhal: Wrong headed—yeah. Thank you so much. Nothing else?

Goldberg: Nothing else.

[End of interview]