

Lorraine Nadelman

- Born May 12, 1924 in Bronx, NY
- B.A. (1945) and Ph.D. (1953) both in Psychology from New York University

Major Employment

- University of Michigan: 1963-present

Major Areas of Work

- Cognition, personality development, infancy

SRCD Affiliation

- Member



SRCD ORAL HISTORY INTERVIEW

Lorraine Nadelman
University of Michigan

Interviewed by John Hagen
At the SRCD Executive Offices
In Ann Arbor, Michigan
June 15, 2005

Hagen: Okay. This is the 15th of June, 2005. This is John Hagen speaking at the executive office of SRCD and we're beginning the oral history interview with Lorraine Nadelman, PhD. And let's ask a couple of questions to begin and then we'll go and check that it's working okay. And as you know from the interview protocol, Lorraine, that we sent you, we like to start with some family background, including some information about you, your parents, where you lived, and some educational background. Okay?

Nadelman: Sure. I was born in 1924 at home in the Bronx, New York, on University Avenue, and my five-year-old sister tried to throw me out the window. My father was a successful dress designer, William Nadelman. My mother had been working as a garment machine operator since she was 14, never went to high school, but became a homemaker when she married dad. And they were quite happy, and we were, I gather, fairly affluent. But about nine years into the marriage, a little less than that, he had a coronary thrombosis and was in bed for the whole next year—which is not the way they would treat it now—before he died. And he died before I turned 3, so that left my 29-year-old mother with an 8 year old, a 3 year old, and an 8 month old.

Hagen: Okay.

Nadelman: During the year that dad was ill we moved to his mother and brothers' home, also in the Bronx, and when he died—I didn't know him at all—when he died in April of 1927 my mother took the eight month old and me—by then I was almost three—to her mother who lived in Brooklyn in the Williamsburg section. I don't remember much about schooling at that point. I guess I entered kindergarten but when the teacher didn't pay attention to my raised hand and I peed in my pants I didn't go back. So in those years you didn't have to go back to kindergarten. Mother was a widow for four years and then she married Charlie King, who was a—I'll call him a craft carpenter, worked indoors at skilled carpentry stuff. That was in 1931 and I was seven, and the first thing she did was buy the multi-volume *Book of Knowledge*, which I was beginning to work my way through. I did start school there. I didn't like it very much, and I guess the teachers didn't like me very much, because they gave me a Stanford Binet Intelligence Test and shipped me off in my third grade to P.S. 208, another school

not too far from where we lived in Brooklyn in East Flatbush. And I have to tell you about that school because it was experimental. They had what they called IPC classes which were Individual Progress Classes. There were 30 children in the third, fourth, and fifth grade all in one room, 15 girls and 15 boys, and our homework for the third grade, in my case, was in a filing cabinet in the back of the room, 100 assignments which you could do at any pace you wanted: arithmetic, you know, spelling and stuff like that. But in the classroom the—we decided on a topic for the term that all three grades, third, fourth, and fifth grade, could do so that, for example, one term I remember it was Colonial America. Of course, we thought we'd picked it. I'm sure the teacher did. The teacher, by the way, was Mrs. Lander, whom you'll hear a lot more about. And I said—we all had to do a project at that age and I said I wanted to do clothing. So she said, "Fine, go to the library"—I'm in third grade—"Go to the library and find out what kind of clothing they wore and where the material came from and whether they made it themselves or what have you." So you know, you'd go and do your research independently and come back, and she said, "You'll have to report it to the class. How do you want to do that?" And I said I could write a paper and hand it out. "No, that's boring," she said. "How else can you do that?" And I said, "So I will make little dolls and put the clothing on them. I'll make little clothing." She said, "That's fine, but you know, it's awkward to hold dolls and try to talk. What else could you do that would be more comfortable?" So I thought a while and then I said, "Oh, I can put them in a room," and she said, "Fine, go to the library and figure out what the rooms looked like, where the furniture came from, how they handled the whole business," and I did that. The point I'm trying to make is that in this kind of an experimental class even at the third grade we were learning to do independent research, we were learning how to communicate our results, we were learning to be independent, and we were learning that learning was fun. And when my mother would say, "What are you learning?" I would say, "Oh no, I'm playing," because for me playing and learning were synonymous. So that was kind of really special. I stayed with that teacher. She then, you know, followed us up through the eighth grade, the 30 of us, and so I had her for—what was it—five years. And she was a tremendous influence on my life, and after she quit—she was not old, she was about 26 at the time I met her—but after she retired early we kept in touch and I followed her down to Florida in fact and stayed in touch.

Hagen: Could you tell us just a little bit about the social class and ethnic or racial composition of the school?

Nadelman: Right. The East Flatbush, which—this is near Church and Utica, that particular school was about four blocks up at Avenue D, and it was working class and I would say low middle class. Homes were very nicely kept, a lot of one-family homes. We lived in a six-family home, three stories, connected to another six-family home. The block—our block was a mix. Our two connected houses were Jewish, but the one-family house to the right of us was Italian, the one to the left of us was Catholic, and so it was totally mixed and fairly mixed economically as well, a lot of interaction however. There was a church on the corner, about a half a block further down there was a synagogue, so there was mixed religions as well. And I was very lucky in that respect. My husband grew up in what I call an affluent Jewish ghetto in the Bronx, but I didn't. I've never been in that kind of a segregated situation.

Hagen: Okay, good. And how about high school?

Nadelman: Oh, that was really too bad. My teacher meant well, Mrs. Lander, but she thought I wanted to be a costume designer, so she sent me to Girl's Commercial High School, which had a terrific art and sewing type course, which involved a trolley and a train for me. And when I got there the dean took a look at my record and said, "You can't do this, you have to go into liberal arts," and at that point I should have said, "Thank you," and gone to my local high school—which was Tilden, which most of our Ann Arbor friends seem to have gone to—but I stayed there. The teachers were good, and there were good courses in liberal arts, but there was no competition and so I graduated valedictorian and won every single award that I was eligible for. So I have pleasant memories. I had some good friends there. But it was not the high school I should have gone to. And from there I applied to Brooklyn College and NYU. My advisor at the last minute said, "Oh, you should have tried for Smith," and I said,

“We can’t afford it,” and she said she’ll get me a scholarship, so she got me a 200 dollar scholarship. That’s all; the scholarships were going—this was by now 1941—were going to refugee people, so we turned down that possibility. I got accepted at both Brooklyn and NYU. NYU did offer a free four-year ride and so that’s where I went, to NYU.

Hagen: And can you tell us how you began to discover your intellectual roots that led to what became your career?

Nadelman: Yes. Well, in college my child development teacher, instead of a report, sent us to work in nurseries, which is what I have done with students ever since when I teach it. And I got very interested in that. There was a very good nursery teacher running the place. The children in—at this Flatbush Center were there by 7:00 in the morning. The fathers were often in the Army. This was 1941 to ’45 when I was in college—and they were there till usually 7:00 at night.

Hagen: So mothers were working?

Nadelman: And the mothers were working in the factories, yes, usually the munitions factories, actually. So the volunteer work was just, you know, one or two times a week, but at the end of the college career, before I started graduate school, I was a paid nursery school teacher and really enjoyed that very much. In college one of the advantages, I think, was that I kept changing majors, so I really got a rather broad background. I started in journalism, and the journalism teacher quietly told me, you know, “Don’t tell my chairman, but don’t major in journalism. Major in something substantive like, you know, history or economics or something.” So I switched to economics thinking, Well, I’ll go into labor organizing, and—but I managed to get into a psych course in my sophomore year that Ted Schneirla taught and that decided it. So I became a psych major. He was tremendous. He would assign a textbook. I can’t remember if it was—which was it—the textbooks back in those days in undergraduate psych—

Hagen: Does Stone and Church (the textbook) go that far back? Stone and Church—

Nadelman: —’42—

Hagen: Yeah, I don’t remember.

Nadelman: No, it was earlier than that—

Hagen: Okay.

Nadelman: —it was earlier than that, and I think that Jersild was the child development one (Jersild textbook).

Hagen: Right.

Nadelman: So it wasn’t that one. Anyway, he assigned the book, told us to read it, and then lectured in class on whatever he wanted to lecture on. I didn’t understand all of it, I admit. That was the only course I took in college where I think I didn’t understand all of it. But it just turned me on, and I took all of his courses. Comparative Psychology, he taught that; he taught Thinking. I took him in graduate school and I took him as my chairman of my thesis.

Hagen: So how many years did it take you to finish your bachelor’s?

Nadelman: Bachelor’s was straight four years. That was fine—

Hagen: And then you went directly—

Nadelman: —and then I went—

Hagen: —into graduate school or—

Nadelman: —no, I went to NYU. I was going to apply to Yale, because I was interested in clinical by that time, but my chairman at NYU said, you know, “Why don’t you stay here?” And it meant not having to fill out anything, any papers or anything, so I just stayed. That was a terrible mistake. Again, the teachers were great, but they were not professional. They didn’t go to conventions, they didn’t introduce us to anyone, they didn’t teach us the professional stuff. As an example, when I wanted to publish my thesis Schneirla said, “It’s really very good. Let’s publish it as a monograph,” and in my ignorance I sent it—he didn’t tell me where to send it, and I sent it to *Psych Reports*, and I didn’t send it right away either because he had said, “You don’t rush to publish. You make sure of your data. You go over everything and you don’t rush to publish.” So between the gap of the PhD and publication time and the fact that it was not in a really good professional journal, people tended to ignore it, except the people in thinking, which was important. What else in college?

Hagen: And what year would that have been—

Nadelman: The—

Hagen: —that you did your dissertation?

Nadelman: —I started it in 1950, but since I went to teach at Mount Holyoke in ’51, I didn’t finish it till ’53. It took three years, mostly summers that I did it.

Hagen: Why don’t you talk a little about Mount Holyoke? You were there for about—

Nadelman: Oh, I loved it.

Hagen: —three or four years.

Nadelman: Yeah, I was tenured there. I was there for 1951 to ’55 and then on maternity leave for the following two years. My chairman said since I had had a three-year contract and a five-year contract that I was tenured at Mount Holyoke, so I really was not very happy to leave it. But I did get married two years into Mount Holyoke, and—

Hagen: So that would have been in ’53?

Nadelman: —’53 we got married, and so he was teaching part time at Mount Holyoke. The president called me in and said they liked him and they would hire him full time if I would resign since they had a very strict nepotism rule at that time.

Hagen: That’s something we’ve heard in a lot of our interviews.

Nadelman: Oh, you did, really?

Hagen: Yeah.

Nadelman: So in ’55 when he got an offer from Michigan we both picked ourselves up, I went on maternity leave, and moved to Michigan, and stayed home for seven years and just decided to raise a family. So that we had—

Hagen: But your degree was all finished?

Nadelman: In ’53.

Hagen: Right.

Nadelman: —the degree. I got married the week after I finished the degree.

Hagen: Okay.

Nadelman: I didn't get to go to graduation for my PhD, because Sidney's father inconveniently dropped dead on us the week before the wedding, so we didn't have the wedding, and I didn't go to graduation.

Hagen: So now you've left New York and you're in Ann Arbor, Michigan—

Nadelman: I left Massachusetts—

Hagen: —left Massachusetts—

Nadelman: —and I'm in Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Hagen: Okay. So you had both been living in Mount Holyoke—

Nadelman: Right.

Hagen: Okay.

Nadelman: —seven room apartment for 55 dollars, a faculty apartment where they took care of everything. And I said to Sidney—when he came here looking I stayed behind because I was in my ninth month. I said, "It's going to cost us more money—"

Hagen: Okay. We're all set. Just let me make note here, tape one—

Nadelman: Mount Holyoke, Massachusetts. You had jumped to Mount Holyoke before I told you something that I think was important at NYU—

Hagen: Okay.

Nadelman: —which was that, although I started the first year in clinical and we had good people like Piotrowski and Wechsler and stuff, it was a night program at NYU at that time. The classes were at 4:00, 6:00, and 8:00 at night, and I was a GA—I guess they called it graduate instructor—for 60 dollars a month at that point. But at—because I was starting in clinical I took those psychometric courses and learned how to do the Wechsler and the T.A.T. and the Binet and a whole bunch of personality and intelligence tests—

Hagen: I did all those things at Stanford.

Nadelman: You did too?

Hagen: Yeah.

Nadelman: Yeah. And then I supervised it for several years in Harlem, which was really an important experience for me. At—even though I was at—

Hagen: Was that for research purposes or for actual diagnostic—

Nadelman: —no, no, we were supervised—we were doing actual Binets and—

Hagen: Okay.

Nadelman: —Wechsler and tests of children whom they couldn't decide whether to put into special ed classes or what. You know, they were not doing well in school—

Hagen: Right.

Nadelman: —most of them. But it was definitely a Black—it was 125th Street Black School, at P.G. 116. I did one school in the morning and one in the afternoon. And while it was tough—it was two hours from my home—it was a really, I think, important experience because I was not doing the testing after the first year. I was supervising testing, so I could really watch children going through these experiences and I think I got a considerably better picture of kids than some of my colleagues, who are bright and specialized, but so specialized that they really never worked with the whole child in a variety of things other than their own specialty.

Hagen: That reminds me of something else that other people have commented on. When you were in—well, as an undergraduate, especially as a graduate student, were some of your student colleagues minority?

Nadelman: At NYU? Let me think a minute. The—we did have them at Girl's Commercial in the high school, but at NYU not very many if I recall. It was an expensive school in those days; it's a private school and I got a scholarship on grades. Whether they gave Blacks scholarships I don't really know. I don't remember many Black—

Hagen: Okay.

Nadelman: —Black students at that point. And at Mount Holyoke there were three.

Hagen: Three—

Nadelman: Black students—

Hagen: Really?

Nadelman: —when I was there. Small school, small town, and there were three.

Hagen: All female—

Nadelman: Yes, it's a—

Hagen: —three, and three—

Nadelman: —Mount Holyoke's a female school.

Hagen: —and is it still—

Nadelman: And I got into trouble on a race question. The faculty at Mount Holyoke every four years—once every four years does a play, the faculty does the play. The year I was there they did Ulysses, and the president, of course, was going to be Ulysses and the dean was going to be the maid to his wife. So she was doing it in blackface, in blackface with a turban and a drawl and a long gown and stuff. And I said—I was a siren and one of the faculty members of Ulysses. I was leading a conga line, if I recall. And I said, “You can't do this, you really can't do this blackface stuff. It's 195-something, you can't do it anymore.” And their reaction was, you know, this New York person—what they really meant was this New York Jew—there were three Jewish faculty that I knew of, and I'm sure there was a little

more that kept it quiet. And I kept saying, “No, you can’t do this,” and they kept saying, “Yes, we’re going to.” So I quit the performance, at which point my chairman, Stuart Stoke—who’s a wonderful man—said maybe he should quit too, and I said, “There’s really enough uproar as is, so you stay.” But they were very upset with me and I was not invited to the all-faculty party after the play, which was too bad, but which I really remember with pride, actually, ever since.

Hagen: So that was just before the Brown vs. Supreme Court in 1954, right?

Nadelman: That’s right, that’s right.

Hagen: Okay.

Nadelman: Yeah, yeah.

Hagen: Interesting, yeah.

Nadelman: And, in fact, in ’54 or ’55 right after that Amherst boys came to do a play at Mount Holyoke, and they did Othello and the dean, who sat in front of me, kept looking back and smirking, because she thought that the fellow was in blackface, and I smiled back, because I could tell it was a Black man who was playing Othello. So that was another highlight for me actually.

Hagen: Okay. Good. Are you ready now to get to Ann Arbor?

Nadelman: Sure.

Hagen: Okay. So—

Nadelman: Okay. So after seven years in Ann Arbor—

Hagen: And you should mention your husband—

Nadelman: Oh, I’m sorry. He—

Hagen: —worked in a new campus, right?

Nadelman: —he worked—first he worked here on the main campus from ’55 to ’59, but then they formed a branch campus, UM-Dearborn, and Dr. Lichtenberg, who was in the English Department here, persuaded him to come over to Dearborn. He was—then he became one of the 13 faculty they hired; he was the first one. And they opened with only 33 students at the time, because they were afraid to announce its opening, since they hadn’t gotten the money yet. So they opened that way. It was very congenial, and of course it very rapidly got bigger. It was a senior college, junior and senior year only, and they decided they really were not that thrilled with what was coming from the community colleges to them, so they became a four year college and it really blossomed. And at this point I think it’s something like 6,800 students or 8,600 students—

Hagen: And the campus facility is very famous—

Nadelman: —it’s the Ford Estate with his home—

Hagen: Fairlane, right?

Nadelman: —it’s 200 acres at least, been building like mad; they just bought the Fairlane Center, which is a magnificent building, which the Business School uses as does the School of Education. It is a beautiful building. They could never have afforded to build anything like that, and they were able to

persuade Lansing to buy it for them because they got it at 30 percent—and Ford wanted to get rid of it, and they got it at 30 percent of what it was worth.

Hagen: Now, back at this time what was the status of the U of M generally? We know now it's considered one of the—

Nadelman: Best, yeah.

Hagen: —best of the public universities.

Nadelman: Well, it was obviously something that the people at Mount Holyoke envied our going to, so I gathered that it was good at the time. I didn't get into it until I was here for seven years, so that brought it up to '62. At that point the department and the students in it, the Psych Department, were telling me they were the best. I thought they were a little arrogant at the time. I didn't see that they were the best of undergraduate programs from what I could tell. The—it obviously really did get better as it went. It got bigger; it started developing areas and programs that worked with other areas better, so I think at this point it probably definitely really deserves its reputation. I got a call about six years into my stay here in Ann Arbor to come teach Intro Psych, and I said no. I got a second call to do with child development and extension teaching, and I said no, and the third call my husband said, "Hang up and tell them you'll call back." And he said, "You can't keep turning them down and then expect to teach here." So I took the extension course at Mount—at Rackham in Detroit and taught there for three semesters at night so that our children were not even aware I was gone. And I met some nice people, like Algea Harrison who was taking a course there, and Stanford Erickson—remember him?

Hagen: Of course.

Nadelman: Stanford Erickson and I decided--

Hagen: His son goes to my church.

Nadelman: That she shouldn't be there. She should really be here in Ann Arbor, and we got her to switch over and get the money and stuff. But after the three semesters there I started teaching on this campus a quarter time, which was a four-credit hour intro course, and gradually that built up to two intro courses—

Hagen: Who, who—

Nadelman: —which they still considered half time.

Hagen: —who was the chair of the department at that time?

Nadelman: McKeachie

Hagen: McKeachie. And was he the one you negotiated with, or was it a chair of undergrad studies?

Nadelman: I really didn't negotiate. It was, you know, they call—oh yeah, I did actually, and he—I stupidly negotiated with him. I should rephrase that. I negotiated stupidly with him, because he offered me a lectureship, which I shouldn't have taken, and he offered 8,000 a year and I was only getting one quarter of that, which was 2,000 a year, to teach two four-hour Intro Psych courses. So I was really—it takes two to be exploited, but I was being exploited at that point for a half-time salary when I finally worked up to half time. I didn't go full time until 1966 or '67—

Hagen: It was right after I came—

Nadelman: —when I—yes—

Hagen: —which was '65.

Nadelman: —well, we should go into that.

Hagen: Yeah.

Nadelman: They did not have a separate developmental program at that time when I entered the department. They did not even teach child development in our department, which I thought was outrageous. They sent them over to the School of Ed to take a child course, and of course our students didn't go over to the School of Ed to take it. So in '65 or so, '64 or '65, Klaus Riegel, Dave Birch, Joe Veroff, and I split the developmental psych program out of the personality programs, and hired John Hagen and hired Marty Hoffman. Marty Hoffman was chair, and I—

Hagen: —one more.

Nadelman: —pardon?

Hagen: And one more.

Nadelman: Who—

Hagen: Dave McNeil was hired at the same time.

Nadelman: Oh, he was—

Hagen: Yeah, the three of us—

Nadelman: —in language McNeill,

Hagen: —right, the three of us—

Nadelman: —in language, right.

Hagen: —came in '65.

Nadelman: Yeah, I didn't remember Dave. No, I mean, I remembered him, but I didn't remember him being hired at the same time.

Hagen: Right, yeah.

Nadelman: And Klaus had a little language research award, you know, money. Marty—I don't know if he had any money. You didn't come with money, but we managed. And I left in '65 for a leave—I don't know if they called it a sabbatical since I had been a lecturer—and while I was gone I put in for a child development course to be taught, which they accepted. So when I got back in '66 I started the child development course which rapidly, as you know, became the gateway course in our area in developmental psych. And the following semester I started the lab course. I should say that the lab course really started at Mount Holyoke where I was hired to teach an experimental child psych course, and so the—a lot of the projects that I did at Mount Holyoke I carried over to Michigan. Some of them I couldn't do involve equipment from there, like the Tilted Room, that I couldn't do here. But it was exciting. It was a lot of work to be teaching an auditorium course and a huge lab course at the same time. I did finally get TAs, teaching assistants, but I do remember that with four teaching assistants in

child development and four in the lab course, eight—to teach eight teaching assistants how to teach, how to grade, how to do anything, was a huge amount of time. I really knocked myself out. And when McKeachie said, “Why aren’t you publishing more?” I said, “I don’t understand how you people are publishing. I’m doing 70 hours a week and I don’t seem to have any time to breathe.” And he said—they didn’t say anything. They didn’t say, “You’re teaching a heavier program than your colleagues,” or anything like that, but I was.

Hagen: And then Marty Hoffman was chair of the developmental program—

Nadelman: Right.

Hagen: —for the first several years.

Nadelman: Right.

Hagen: And the faculty did get together and got the first training grant from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

Nadelman: And you became chair—

Hagen: I became chair, I think, in ’72.

Nadelman: That’s right.

Hagen: Right.

Nadelman: Right.

Hagen: And—but I think it’s interesting that this was the time that a lot of federal money began to be available.

Nadelman: Right.

Hagen: And at the same time, Dave Birch and Klaus Riegel got a big program project grant.

Nadelman: Right. And I got—

Hagen: Which was the language development program.

Nadelman: —and I got an NSF—I got an NSF Faculty Science Research Grant—

Hagen: Okay.

Nadelman: —in 1965 I guess it was when I went to England and I worked under Bowlby. He was my supervisor, and I did my first big piece of research since the thesis. I should have talked more about that thesis, but I will later. I did the sex identity, what you would call gender identity, study in England on 100 five year olds, and was very, very lucky. Dan Miller and others had told me, “You’ll never get any research done. It’s going to take you months just to break into the system.” But, Elise Osborne was her name, worked in the school system in England, and she said, “Let’s not start at the top and work our way down. For permission let’s go to the head mistresses of the school and get permission there and then they’ll get permission from the London county council,” which is how we worked it. So I did get to work in, oh, something like seven different schools and did collect the data myself and published it. It was wonderful at Bowlby’s Tavistock Clinic. I took 13 courses in clinical and I really wanted that kind of dynamic background for my child development course—

Hagen: And this was all in London?

Nadelman: —in London—

Hagen: And your family was there too, right?

Nadelman: Oh, we all went, we all went. We had a nice little apartment in Chalk Farm, near Hampsted I guess, and it was a wonderful experience. The children went to school there in the London—

Hagen: Okay. Now we're on the second tape, side one, of the interview with Lorraine Nadelman on June 15th, 2005.

Nadelman: We were talking about at NYU. You were coming and Marty was there, et cetera. It says, "Who were your significant colleagues?" Actually, Keith Smith at UM was tremendously helpful to me. He not only helped me decide what stat to use for my own research, but for the lab course. I would always check for each of the experiments we did in the lab course whether I was doing the right statistics. Danny Weintraub was very helpful on the perception studies. I was doing Müller-Lyer illusion and some others I remember, and he was helpful on that. And Dave Krantz just took a very general interest in the lab course because he was trying to teach research to his experimental—

Hagen: And these were all faculty—

Nadelman: —these are all faculty—

Hagen: —the experimental program at that time.

Nadelman: That's right. Yes.

Hagen: Right, okay.

Nadelman: Well, Keith also I guess—Keith—

Hagen: Right, Keith is—

Nadelman: —but Danny and Dave were in the experimental program. And I was getting a lot of students, not only from development and personality and social, but I was getting some from experimental. The funny thing was, although we were really hoping to get the clinical students into this because they need practice in research before they do their MAs and their PhDs, we got almost no clinical students coming. They—

Hagen: Their programs were—

Nadelman: Yeah, much heavy—

Hagen: —very, very heavy. Yeah.

Nadelman: —right. The—and then I've already mentioned that Bowlby was a big influence, as well as the other people at Tavistock on helping me develop research ideas and abilities, basically. Okay. You wanted to go to the political and social influences.

Hagen: Sure.

Nadelman: Alright. While I was growing up the big things in the world, really in America at least, were the Depression, the Holocaust, World War II, the Cold War, and then the hot wars in Vietnam and Korea

and now Iraq, the BAM strike in 1970—the turmoil in the 1970s was the BAM strike—the turmoil in the '60s and '70s in general. I guess the things that interested me and affected my thinking and research were several. I've already mentioned that working in Harlem really got me tuned to questions of race and class, so that I do do that in my research: different classes and different races. The '60s were very permissive, '60s and '70s, and I remember in my teaching beginning to emphasize discipline and setting limits more than I had before. And then the big one for me was the feminism which hit, of course, in the '60s, but actually at Mount Holyoke the girls, when I got there in '51, were very interested in that whole issue of gender identity and masculinity, femininity, so we started doing research on that. There was almost no research among the psychologists. There were for the clinicians on that topic, but Kagan and others really were not publishing until the '60s, and we were doing it in the early '50s. And the last one I'll mention is the Hands-On Museum, which I founded—co-founded and worked at from 1978 to '85, and then again when we got a big NSF grant on Geometry in our World and I had my students doing the observing and testing and interviewing, and—because NSF needed an evaluation, so I did that.

Hagen: And you should say this was the Ann Arbor Hands-On Museum—

Nadelman: Hands-On Museum.

Hagen: —but it was a private—

Nadelman: It's young.

Hagen: —it was not part of the city of Ann Arbor.

Nadelman: No, we got—the building was an old firehouse and the city let us rent it for a dollar a year. It took us four years, from '78 to '82, to get enough money together to renovate the place and build things. I did get an International Year of the Child grant from Harold Shapiro, who was then president, and built the first seven exhibits or projects that we had for the Hands-On Museum, which we had first because our museum was not ready for us. We put it at Rackham for a while and then we put it in an empty storefront on Main Street and then we sent them off to each public school in the city on an outreach basis. And by '82 we had cleaned up and fixed up the firehouse enough to start work there. But I really worked very heavily. I used my leaves, I used my sabbaticals almost full time on that museum.

Hagen: And you should mention that it's been highly successful—

Nadelman: Oh really, it's one of the—

Hagen: —and that it's still thriving.

Nadelman: —treasures in Ann Arbor. It's really--I'm terribly proud of that place.

Hagen: Right.

Nadelman: I really am.

Hagen: And other faculty have—

Nadelman: Oh yes, Scott Paris has been involved in it, Margaret Evans is involved in it, and the faculty from physics have been heavily involved in that one. Richard Crane, physicist who was a Medal of Science winner in the country, was there virtually every day and helped us build and maintain a whole bunch of our projects. Our general policy was to—we started out with a small group of seven or eight of us, but we were told, "If you really want to get money you better get a distinguished group of trustees," so we ran around to bank presidents and corporation presidents, et cetera: Jerry Weisbach

at Warner Lambert, Parke Davis, Fitzgerald—I'm sorry—Fitzsimmon, President of University Microfilms. And we got them all involved as either officers or trustees and that—and then we could get a grant. And we got a challenge grant, and on and on.

Hagen: So this was an example of applied child development reaching out to the community.

Nadelman: The history is very interesting. Right.

Hagen: Okay.

Nadelman: Yeah.

Hagen: Good. Anything else under four or are you ready for five?

Nadelman: Well, let's do five.

Hagen: Okay.

Nadelman: Let's see. Would I characterize the development of my ideas in the field as developing rather straightforward or involving sharp turns? No, it really didn't involve sharp turns, because of Schneirla I really started in the field knowing and believing very strongly in an interaction between heredity, environment, nature/nurture, whatever you want to call it, mind and body, et cetera, and I also believed very strongly in the interaction between any of the variables you were going to study. I had what I'll call a dynamic eclectic approach right from the beginning in undergraduate years, so that really has not changed very much. The—I think for me perhaps there's been a little more emphasis on the neuroscience stuff, because I really didn't know much about genes when I was in college, so—but I still, you know, feel very, very, very strongly that while that's terribly important, that is not a determinant of your behavior. It—you have to consider the other factors, the other environmental issues that go into it.

Hagen: I think a lot of contemporary work is certainly supporting that.

Nadelman: Right, right. Also, one of the changes for me, but it's not a sharp turn, is that at Tavistock I did infant observation as one of the courses I was taking, and was so impressed with how much I was learning that I put it into both my child psych course and my lab course, and it is—I think for me it reflects what's going on in the field. Infancy became a much bigger and more sophisticated field in the last couple of decades.

Hagen: Are you ready to move to the personal research contributions?

Nadelman: Yes, yes.

Hagen: Okay.

Nadelman: That's fine. Alright, let's see. My primary interest in child development at the beginning of my career? I guess I started out interested in the clinical, but I was already working in the intellectual as well as personality development because of the work I was doing in Harlem and teaching. My thesis was on cognition. Cognition in 1950 was not, for most departments, an acceptable thesis and Schneirla had to work five months to get my department to let me do it, because they thought it would be too risky. All I wanted to do was extend and revise Heidebreder's theory of concept formation. She had a theory that you learn concepts, you acquire concepts, in the order objects, form, and numbers and I felt that you had to look at how you're showing those concepts, and—in terms of whether it was serially like she did it, or whether it was going to be comprehensively with everything on the table of the concept instances. I also felt that she was using drawings and I felt you should also try to do three-dimensional objects and see what happens there, so concreteness and accessibility

were two of my variables. And then I thought that she was using buckles as one of her object concepts and I thought that I could get an object concept, which was a higher level of abstraction, which would be harder for the student than the numbers that she used. Mark-maker—which is a much higher level of abstraction than buckles—mark-makers would be much more difficult than all the numbers, except possibly number two. I thought two was so perceptually available that two would come out pretty high. And that’s what happened, and what I—

Hagen: And what were the ages of the children?

Nadelman: They weren’t children. At that point they were adults—

Hagen: Oh, okay.

Nadelman: —I took all of the equipment and stimuli with me to Mount Holyoke and Barbara Gengstacken did use all of that equipment to do it with children, so we did follow up immediately with the children. But the important thing was that—was that one of the things that showed up very clearly, which now we think simple minded but at the time was not, your conclusions that you got, the results that you got depended on how you scored your data, and I scored it in 14 different ways and got different results depending on how it was scored. That was one thing. The other thing was you couldn’t make simple statements about concreteness, like three dimensions is better than two-dimensional. You had to consider the other thing, which was how did you present it, serially or comprehensively. So that the interaction among your variables was terribly important, and these were things that, you know, I was learning in my first big piece of research which really stood me in good stead the rest of my life.

Hagen: And were your subjects recruited from NYU or where they—

Nadelman: They were volunteers. They weren’t even paid—

Hagen: Okay.

Nadelman: —they were not psychology students. They’d have to have had a certain grade on the ACT test—remember, that was the test that they took to get into college—and they had to have at least an 80 average in high school so that these were reasonably bright, competent volunteers, totally ignorant as far as courses went in psychology. They were not psych students.

Hagen: Okay. I know the work then you began at Tavistock was very different in some ways—

Nadelman: Oh yeah.

Hagen: —and that was—

Nadelman: Five year olds—

Hagen: —with children and it was looking at sex identity.

Nadelman: Right, gender.

Hagen: This development—

Nadelman: Yeah, that was—it was an extension of work I had done at Mount Holyoke with the students there in the lab course. We worked with recall and knowledge and preference of items that were sex typed by adults as masculine or feminine, and the five year olds in London, they had that and they had a battery of other things, perception of parents from Kagan and other things I was interested in. But I redid it in America. I published that. I redid it in America with five year olds again and eight year

olds. I also, in both places, had used very low working class and comfortable middle class, so I had a class difference there. In America I had the two ages and, of course, in both places I had the two sexes, so it was a two by two by two in America and a two by two in England. And I think for me what was really interesting was that it was an international study, which was not that common at the time. I was doing this in '65, '66 in England and in '68 in America. And it was a decade ahead of the time that American psychologists got into the topic. Most, I think—in '65 or '66 there was almost nothing in the literature on sex identity other than the psychiatric literature. The couple of people I quoted were the only ones that had anything published at least on the topic. And that got me very interested and really has continued my interest in that topic a long time. The—it appears in both books, which we'll talk about later, in both of my books. I kept it in both books.

Hagen: And the second one is what continuities in your work are most significant? We've already talked about that a little bit.

Nadelman: Yeah, the empirical approach—

Hagen: And what shifts occurred—

Nadelman: —yeah, we did talk a little about that. The empirical approach has always been, undergrad and grad, very important to me, and any course I teach is very heavy on research. The students have to either do or read a lot of research. Also, the dynamics, family dynamics in particular, which were reinforced when I went to Tavistock, is something that I push into all the courses whether it's a lab course, a child development course or any other course.

Hagen: Of course, that's become a major emphasis—

Nadelman: Right.

Hagen: —in the literature now if you look at—

Nadelman: The general system theory and the family therapy stuff were really big influences for me, the notion that, you know, a family is made up of elements and interactions and that is constantly shifting and changing, even though they remain mostly together, but that as they get older they separate and people move out and away. I think all of that is something I sort of have assimilated deeply. What else? The only shift I really talked about, and it wasn't a shift but was a development, was more interest in neuroscience. I really was interested even as an undergraduate and graduate in physiological psych, because of Schneirla and because I had Herbie Birch. As you know, Herbie Birch, he became an MD afterwards and he worked with Thomas Chess and Korn and the others on those very, very influential books. He was a very important person for me, because he kept pushing. In fact, when I take a course with him, he would tell me, "You're either going to get an A or an F, and so you better crack the books."

Hagen: A lot of that work really began the interest in temperament, which—

Nadelman: That's right.

Hagen: —many people at that time viewed as being a primarily biological—

Nadelman: Yeah.

Hagen: —kind of—

Nadelman: Well, it's a combination obviously.

Hagen: —right.

Nadelman: Also, in those years, cognitive style—

Hagen: Right.

Nadelman: Jerome Kagan's stuff was very important, and in fact, it's one of the few theoretical articles I have. I was in a panel at a reading—a conference and we were discussing the controversy over the Matching Familiar Figures Test, because there really was a big controversy over Kagan's test at the time, and I did a rather elaborate presentation on that one. Most of the time my articles are empirical and the theory depends on what mini theory relates to the topic I am doing the research on, in the class or on my own.

Hagen: Are you ready for three?

Nadelman: Strengths and weaknesses? Okay. I guess the—what I'm most proud of are that at least in three of my research fields I was way ahead of the field, the psychologists. The cognition was one, and I'll talk about that in a minute. Again, the sex identity—gender identity stuff was the second, and sibling, which is the one I'm into now, is the third. We—I'll do them in order. The cognition one I've already said I did in 1950, finished it in '53, didn't publish it till '57, but it was a really important study, and ahead of—as you know, cognition didn't really come into its own until the '60s, and now it's burgeoning—

Hagen: Right.

Nadelman: —tremendously. The sex identity stuff we started in the early '50s. It became a very hot topic in American psychology in the '60s, but we had really anticipated a good deal of that. The sibling study Audrey Begun and I started at about '78. At the time I did not know that Judy Dunn was doing a very similar study in England, and at an SRCD meeting in '81 she and we were the only people doing anything reportable at least on siblings, so that we were early on that one too. And I was very, very pleased and—

Hagen: Begun was a doctoral student here at Michigan—

Nadelman: She was, she was—

Hagen: —at that time.

Nadelman: —social work and—

Hagen: Social work, psych—

Nadelman: —and psychology, yeah. And so she started with me. She pulled out in the middle of the experiment, because she decided to have a baby, but she did start it with me.

Hagen: Okay.

Nadelman: And we published, we published a piece of the results, the one on the mothers' reports. We were doing the effect of the newborn on the older child and we published that as a rather long chapter in Michael Lamb's book on sibling relationships across the lifespan. So we were the first chapter, Judy Dunn was the next chapter. So that was really—I really liked very much—as the strength. As the weaknesses, I don't publish fast enough. I noticed as I was going through this pile of my articles that a lot of the research is just in the developmental psych reports. We had a program of publications locally—

Hagen: Right.

Nadelman: —and I've got a whole bunch of them in there, which I should not have put there. I mean, I should have put it there, but I should have sent it for publication. So I don't have a long publication list. The 1982 book *Research Manual in Child Development* and the second edition in 2004 are really my biggest contributions, I think. They take the hassle out of doing the research course because I did introductory lectures for each of the 12 or 13 topics that they're doing projects in. I give the alternate hypotheses, I give terribly detailed procedures, I give the stimuli, I give empty tables so that they don't even have to figure out what statistics to use if they don't want to, I give discussion questions so that their formatted discussion is APA style, and I give very long bibliographies. And I'm trying to get psychology faculty to teach child research courses in order to have the kids read whatever they're reading with better understanding and prepare them if they're going on. The few people who went on of mine to graduate school tell me it really gave them a huge leg up when it came to doing their MA. They knew what they were doing and others were just stumbling around. I think there's a difference between teaching research by having students work on your research project and teaching research by having students do different age groups, different projects, different theories, et cetera. I don't think it's the same thing at all, and I really think they should have had—they're not anymore in our department, but they should have had a research course in child research, you know, child development, and then go and work in somebody's research project.

Hagen: Well, I think a lot of that happens, but it's not on a formal organized—

Nadelman: Right, right.

Hagen: —basis, but it happens at a certain—

Nadelman: Yeah, well, they were getting 80 people in the child psych lab, but I gather it's been cut.

Hagen: I'm not even sure—

Nadelman: Yeah, they cut down from the department—

Hagen: —but there are many—

Nadelman: —it's been cut down.

Hagen: —many different lab courses and I think undergrads now, if they're a major, have to take two lab courses before they graduate.

Nadelman: Well, one'll be Peterson's general lab course. I believe he's setting up a general lab like we used to have, which didn't work, so he's trying again because our chairman, Gonzalez, Rick Gonzales, who has my book, asked if he could give it to Chris Peterson precisely because—

Hagen: I didn't know that.

Nadelman: —Chris, Chris is doing a lab course—

Hagen: Okay.

Nadelman: —which would be the first level lab course that everybody would take.

Hagen: I see.

Nadelman: I thought he had started, but I didn't know whether he did or not. In fact, I have to go get my book. It's—I only have one copy.

Hagen: On number four you talked about that the two books are probably—

Nadelman: Oh yeah.

Hagen: —your major contributions.

Nadelman: And also, I think that sibling chapter in Lamb's book is—

Hagen: Okay.

Nadelman: —is really one of my—

Hagen: And what year was that?

Nadelman: —better ones—'82.

Hagen: '82?

Nadelman: Yeah, that was really one of the better ones. I have the data now on black research, Black sibling—I'm sorry—research on Black siblings, and I've presented it at conventions, but I haven't written it up. It's got statistics that are finished and everything, but Sidney's illness for a year and a half just—it was a lost time, so I will hopefully get to do that one. They've just had us move out of our retiree offices.

Hagen: Well, Bill McKeachie wasn't too happy.

Nadelman: He's going to be less happy when he realizes I'm his roommate.

Hagen: Oh really?

Nadelman: Well, I think that's pretty funny. You know? No, he had a lovely office all to himself, but now he—at least my filing cabinet is there—

Hagen: And he's there every day too. So—

Nadelman: —he has been, yeah. I'll talk to him about when he's not there—

Hagen: —right.

Nadelman: —if I can get an article written. We're always—

Hagen: Let's see. Last thing in there is what's most significant and what were the most wrong-headed. Do you have any you feel that were wrong headed? Under four—

Nadelman: Just a second here, let me see. Okay. I'm—on the impact of the work, of course it would be the books. The current status—I've mentioned what I'm doing on the research. I think for me the long impact is the impact I've had on students. I'm still getting emails from people I taught in the '60s here. I always have gotten them from the Mount Holyoke students in the '50s, but I'm getting them from people in the '60s and '70s and '80s. Our chair recently called to tell me they were researching graduates of the program and he wanted to send me a paragraph that somebody had written about my course. I think that that is probably the most satisfying for faculty members to know that they've really impacted—had a big impact on a student in their lives. And many of them went on in psychology and those are the ones I hear most from, but many of them didn't. The last two letters I got, one was from a dentist and one was from a lawyer and wanted to let me know how they were using my stuff in their practice.

Hagen: Yeah, I've had—

Nadelman: I thought that was nice.

Hagen: —similar too—

Nadelman: Yeah, you get that.

Hagen: —former student from way back who's now the prosecuting attorney in Traverse City—

Nadelman: How nice.

Hagen: —and said how important an experience working with my course for the kids work. Students worked with kids in institutions, and—

Nadelman: That's nice, yeah.

Hagen: —he's been able to change the—

Nadelman: Oh, that's right. Not only that course. I remember—

Hagen: —the way—

Nadelman: —helping you—

Hagen: Yeah.

Nadelman: —a little bit in that course. But you and I and Bill Morse—

Hagen: Right.

Nadelman: —taught a course on research in educational settings—

Hagen: In the—with the Ann Arbor schools.

Nadelman: —at—in Ann Arbor schools.

Hagen: Right.

Nadelman: And they would tell us what they were interested in—

Hagen: Right.

Nadelman: —and then we had them—and, in fact, Nancy Shiffler and a couple of other students and I published a really nice article on one, a project we did in the open school, which at the time was in Bach School—however you pronounce it—on self esteem and how they acted in class depending on their self esteem.

Hagen: Right.

Nadelman: Number five, funding; aside from the NSF grant and the—from NSF—and the International Year of the Child grant from Harold Shapiro as president of the university, the only other money I've gotten has been either from the Rackham grant—and I've gotten several of those—and also from the

vice president for research for that trailer that we used for several years at Burns Park School until they gave us a room in—

Hagen: Right.

Nadelman: —the school. But otherwise not. I did try with Bill Morse and five other groups of people to do a huge—what do you call the project when it's a multi project thing? It's not a—

Hagen: Program project?

Nadelman: —a program project grant, and—but we used Stanley Garn's, his criteria for biological maturity and they didn't like it. He didn't use balls to say what the size of the testes was, and he didn't use a ruler to say what the length of the penis was. He used 12 other things which we all used as—because we were all doing early and late maturing as one of our variables. I was doing resilience with Bill Morse, which I thought was a great topic and hadn't been written at the time, and they turned it down on our use of maturity level. Al Cain looked at the criticisms of our work and said we should send it in again. But that had taken so many years and so much work with six groups of people to put together that Bill Morse and I just gave up. And I shouldn't have, I should have, you know, done it. But because resilience is now a great topic—and we were ahead on that one too. Yeah.

Hagen: Right, yeah.

Nadelman: But I thought the course with you and Bill on the research in education settings was a really good one for the students and for us, actually.

Hagen: And I think it also helped get in the door of the Ann Arbor schools for other things as well—

Nadelman: That's right.

Hagen: —because there were some rocky relations at that time, and there was a lot of pressure on the schools. So—

Nadelman: Yeah, well, in '70, I guess, when I moved my lab course to Burns Park School I had to go through the whole rigmarole, not only our own ISRs, but you had to go through the board of the Ann Arbor Public Schools—

Hagen: Right, I remember.

Nadelman: —you had to go through the research committee of their board, you had to go through each principal, you had to go through the teachers, and then you had to go through the parents, so it was a lot of work to get organized. And then of course you have to do an ISR on every darn project you use in your lab course.

Hagen: I think it was actually that way in many public schools, especially if there were nearby universities—

Nadelman: Yeah.

Hagen: —because they were—

Nadelman: You often used the church schools, didn't you—

Hagen: Yeah, we used Saint Thomas and—

Nadelman: —Lutheran or something.

Hagen: —you're right, a Lutheran school. That's when Barbara Anderson worked with us—

Nadelman: Yeah, yeah.

Hagen: —and she was active in the Lutheran community, so—

Nadelman: Yeah, I remember that, yeah.

Hagen: —you're right, yeah.

Nadelman: Yeah.

Hagen: And some of those had much less red tape at that time. That goes back a few years too. Anything else on five or should we move into—

Nadelman: Institutional—

Hagen: —institutional?

Nadelman: —contributions. Okay. Which institutions have I worked—

Hagen: I think you've already mentioned—

Nadelman: —yeah, '41 to '45 was NYU, and I graduated with a BA Summa Cum Laude and Phi Beta Kappa. Then I continued teaching—working at NYU for several years, became an instructor there for my last year there, and moved—it would have been '50 to '51 as an instructor with Harold Proshansky at NYU and others like that, and then moved in '51 as an assistant professor to Mount Holyoke, even though I had not finished my thesis. And at Mount Holyoke I was responsible for designing and teaching the experimental child psych course, the child development course, occasionally the intro course, the psychometric course, and we designed the Gorse Child Study Center. I did the lab half of it and Lorraine Benner did the kindergarten nursery half of it. And that still exists there and they're still using it. Then I came here in '62 as an extension teacher after the seven years at home and taught extension for three semesters, and then came to the main campus quarter time, finally it became half time; it didn't become full time till I got back from England and the children were—the youngest was eight years old. I became an associate professor in '69, from lecturer jumped to associate professor.

Hagen: And what was your year of retirement? We might as well get that.

Nadelman: '93, I retired in '93. I was 69 years old at the time.

Hagen: Okay.

Nadelman: But I stayed on campus. I had an office—

Hagen: Right.

Nadelman: —on the main floor and they—

Hagen: Was that right about the time we moved to East Hall?

Nadelman: You moved to East Hall in '94 I think.

Hagen: I've got—

Nadelman: I think we spent a year in Mason Hall, and then came here.

Hagen: Okay.

Nadelman: Something like '93 or '94.

Hagen: I remember in those days what a pain it was to get that move accomplished.

Nadelman: Right.

Hagen: But it did happen.

Nadelman: Yeah. And so I had an office. I came in about three times a week and I did the research with the Undergraduate Research Opportunity Program, Black students—

Hagen: Right.

Nadelman: —as my assistants and we did a large research—almost 200 students I think—on Black sibling relationships in young adults, with college freshman.

Hagen: I have a student in that program right now.

Nadelman: You do? Yeah.

Hagen: It's a summer research opportunity and—

Nadelman: Yeah, I've used them—

Hagen: —she's actually from Princeton. She's an undergraduate at Princeton and—

Nadelman: But she's—is she a graduate student—

Hagen: No, she's here—she's between her junior and senior year. They come here for six weeks in the summer—

Nadelman: Oh, that's right.

Hagen: —I've had them before, yeah.

Nadelman: And you can do it through—

Hagen: Yeah, it's really—it's called SROP, Summer Research Opportunity—

Nadelman: Oh yeah.

Hagen: —it's under Rackham.

Nadelman: That's nice, yeah. So that's what I did, and I had these Black students as research assistants and they did the testing so that it was, you know, Black students, Black examiner, which I thought was important. And then I had other students helping me with the data entry, computer stuff, et cetera. Daria Ray from the School of Ed was doing her MA and so she designed a questionnaire to add to my battery. It was really quite nice and I hope to get that published. But as I said, we already reported most of it at conventions.

Hagen: Number two is—may not apply that much. It's people that have been—

Nadelman: No, that's not germane—

Hagen: —NIMH and so forth. So let's move on to number three, the teaching. You've already talked some about that, but you might want to speak a bit more—

Nadelman: Okay. What courses have I taught? Alright. I taught not only the two that I originated here, but I have taught—and the ones that I mentioned at Mount Holyoke already—at Michigan, in addition, I taught Socialization of the Child, I taught honors undergraduates—what is the first course called—Introduction to Psychology, whatever they call the first course, I taught the honor section of that for many years and then coordinated these ten or eleven sections we had and got it staffed. I taught the graduate seminar with you on research in educational settings, the hands on one, and I taught Infant Development. I taught a—that was a graduate course in infant development, I taught a graduate course in the Bayley Infant Scales separately. It'll show up on the vita—

Hagen: Right, as—you have a vita for it.

Nadelman: —yeah, not with me, but I will—

Hagen: Okay.

Nadelman: Let's see.

Hagen: How about the tension between teaching and research?

Nadelman: Oh yeah. For me that was particularly difficult, because I spent a huge amount of time on the teaching and the students in particular, and the teaching of the graduate instructors, so that it was always a question of the timing between the two. There was not a theoretical conflict between the two. I didn't have any trouble with that. The things I was doing research on, theories that were there, were in my classes as well. I think I had probably more difficulty trying to do both at one time than many of my colleagues. And as I said, part of it was because I really was doing too much teaching compared to my colleagues. And, I should add, a huge service component—service in the area, the department, the college, the university, and the community.

Hagen: And was that still true after you became associate professor—

Nadelman: Yeah, oh yeah. I have taught the graduate—excuse me—the undergraduate child psych auditorium course and the laboratory course virtually every semester. I finally hired Lois Hoffman to teach the child development course in alternate semesters. She often taught it by asking all of us to do guest lectures, and I know the three semesters she did that I won the best teacher award each time. I think that puzzled my colleagues who of course were better known in their fields, but I think that what the students react to was the better knowledge of the whole child, which I do have.

Hagen: Did you teach the inteflex course?

Nadelman: Oh, I forgot that. Yes, John, thank you for reminding me.

Hagen: Yeah.

Nadelman: I taught that for many semesters, and that was fascinating because it's a very diverse group of students—

Hagen: Yeah, you should say what it is—

Nadelman: —oh, inteflex course—

Hagen: Yeah.

Nadelman: —consisted of very bright high school students who had decided they wanted to be doctors, so they very competitively were accepted into this inteflex program, which at the time was a six-year program that got you a BS and an MD at the time you graduated. They've changed it in the following years to a seven year program, and then when it started looking like it was going to be an eight year program the medical school said, "We really don't want kids who've been told or decided they were going be a doctor when they graduated high school." So—but the ones I had—what was good about it was they really made an effort to get women into it and they made an effort to get a very diverse population into it, so I not only would have, you know, Black and Asian students, but I had them from all countries, you know, Egypt and Pakistan and you name it, and if I had six out of the 50—it was a class of 50—whose names I could pronounce, because lots of names I couldn't pronounce, I was lucky. I taught it as a child development course initially. It was supposed to be their first psych course, so sort of a combination of intro and child, but then I made it a life span course.

Hagen: And I think, too, the interesting and important thing about it was that there was an equal commitment from the med school and LS and A—

Nadelman: To do this—

Hagen: —and Don Brown from our department was—

Nadelman: —was the director—

Hagen: —was sort of the director on the LS and A—

Nadelman: Yeah, right.

Hagen: —and Al Burdi was the person from the medical school—

Nadelman: Right.

Hagen: —and I think they did many innovative things educationally.

Nadelman: Right, yeah. And we met often. If a student asked for leave we would meet to see whether they should get a leave or whether we should advise them to get out of this program or what have you.

Hagen: Right.

Nadelman: You know?

Hagen: Right.

Nadelman: It really was fun and I did extremely well in that course. I really liked that and the students really liked it.

Hagen: And as I recall, some faculty really liked it and some didn't.

Nadelman: Yeah, right.

Hagen: A num—a variety of faculty taught it, and it worked for some and not for others.

Nadelman: Yeah, I remember Wellman was very happy to get out of it.

Hagen: Right.

Nadelman: I think Lois Hoffman taught it once. I'm not sure about that.

Hagen: No, I think more than that.

Nadelman: Did she teach it more than that?

Hagen: I think she taught it at least two or three times. Yeah.

Nadelman: Right. And who taught it after I left, do you know?

Hagen: I don't recall right now.

Nadelman: I don't remember either.

Hagen: I don't recall right now. Yeah.

Nadelman: Yeah. What was very interesting to me was, at least with the first class, they learned after that, when—I don't give multiple choice and true/false, which I know people do do in our department. I don't, so it's, you know, short answers and essays mostly, and you can't do it from one page in a book or from one lecture. You have to have combined different lectures, different readings, et cetera, and so for the first test there were a lot of Cs. They were not used to getting Cs, these very top high school students, and I had to tell them that this is not a memory course, this is a thinking course, and you're going to have to change the way in which you pay attention to your books and to me, and after that of course they did very well. But that initial test, the first test each term, which I give early so that they know what they're getting into, came as a shock to students who have been so imbued with rote memory kinds of things.

Hagen: Oh, I decided about ten years ago I'd not give any more tests, and I haven't given a test since. I do portfolios and a variety of assignments—

Nadelman: Oh, that's nice—

Hagen: —which ends up—these days they have to do PowerPoints and poster presentations—

Nadelman: —well, great.

Hagen: —and so forth rather than—

Nadelman: That's very good.

Hagen: —papers, yeah.

Nadelman: Yeah, Scott Paris was pushing the portfolios—

Hagen: Right, yeah, yeah.

Nadelman: —for a really long time.

Hagen: I find that the students really like it, and I think they—

Nadelman: Yeah.

Hagen: —learn a lot. Yeah. And of course, now they're getting so technically sophisticated—

Nadelman: Yeah.

Hagen: —that they can do things I can't do—

Nadelman: On the PowerPoint?

Hagen: Right, yeah.

Nadelman: I still haven't learned PowerPoint. Seth, our son, does it for me.

Hagen: Yeah.

Nadelman: Okay. Let's see.

Hagen: How about number four—

Nadelman: Where are we up to here? Oh, the applied—

Hagen: Right.

Nadelman: Well, the museum of course was the big one. The—and the Geometry in Our World exhibit, which is still traveling around the country here, is another big one. Some of the work we did in that Research in Educational Settings course turned out to be fairly applicable and practical. The article with Shiffler on self esteem and classroom behavior showed that the higher self esteemed kids were more task oriented and the other ones who wandered around the room were having self esteem problems. We weren't sure which was first—esteem or task-orientation. Work with Algea Harrison on conceptual tempo and inhibition of movement, where she used the impulsivity/reflection test of Kagan, and Maccoby and your tests I guess. I don't know whether you were involved, on the inhibition of movement—

Hagen: Yeah, no, I actually did that—

Nadelman: —where you go along slowly and—

Hagen: —right, we did that actually with Jerry Kagan too. That Maccoby, Hagen, and Kagan.

Nadelman: That's right, that's right, that's right. I thought that was a practical study also. But—and I did talk to you about the critical writing I had done on the Matching Familiar Figures Test. Otherwise, no, the main stuff is really, for me at least, the Hands-On Museum and I suppose, to some extent, the infant observation in the lab. Even if they're not going into research or graduate school, once they graduate from U of M, that infant observation course for them, where they are going to this person's home every week and watching an infant develop over several months, was very practical to them. And—

Hagen: And those were undergraduates or graduates?

Nadelman: I do it in both—

Hagen: Both? Okay.

Nadelman: I do it in both. In child development courses, instead of writing a report paper, they work in the nursery or they—if it's a lifespan course they can work in an old age home as well. But many of them chose to do the infant study.

Hagen: Right. Okay.

Nadelman: Where am I?

Hagen: Anything else from that? Otherwise we're moving into SRCD.

Nadelman: I was not involved in the governance. I guess I did volunteer work under—when Algea Harrison was chairman of the volunteers for the Detroit meetings of SRCD—

Hagen: Right, in 1983—

Nadelman: —probably. I was very involved in that one. So I was not an editor or council member. And other than—oh, and the other committee I guess I was on is I did a lot of review panels for the conventions. I was in that very often.

Hagen: When did you first attend the meetings?

Nadelman: Boy, let me think. I joined, I think, in the '60s. You would know when I joined actually, maybe in '67. You have a record of when I started—

Hagen: Um, yeah—

Nadelman: —and I started going regularly to those meetings. Usually I was presenting papers. I did a lot of taped presentations, but never published them, which was my problem. The—and I ser—I'm trying to remember some of them—

Hagen: Well, you probably went to every meeting for many years—

Nadelman: I chaired a couple, if I recall, of the symposia. I presented a few symposia. We'd have a standing room only one at one of the SRCDS, I don't know if it was Denver or a different one, where I had a panel on research courses in child development, and that had a terrific turnout.

Hagen: What's your—

Nadelman: Well, I got—my vita might have it—

Hagen: —this year for the first time we offered a pre-conference workshop on teaching of child development, and we had a—had to come early and pay a hundred dollars. And he (Murray) was one of the speakers, yeah—

Nadelman: He sent it to me, yeah—

Hagen: And that's—people rave about it again—

Nadelman: That's a good idea. Yeah.

Hagen: That's one of our attempts to, yeah, reach out to the teaching and training aspect—

Nadelman: That's great.

Hagen: —more.

Nadelman: Maybe I'll get into a pre-conference workshop the next time.

Hagen: Yeah, yeah.

Nadelman: Where's our next meeting?

Hagen: Boston.

Nadelman: Maybe I'll get into that one.

Hagen: Yeah, Boston, yeah, yeah. It should be a lot of fun.

Nadelman: What year?

Hagen: Yeah, it'll be a year—it'll be—

Nadelman: '07?

Hagen: —'07, right, early April '07—

Nadelman: Most changes—I think the changes—I think we were paying more attention for many years now internationally—

Hagen: Very much so.

Nadelman: —you began rotating the chair of SRCD, and I do remember that it did not have that much international stuff when I first began with it. But you do now—

Hagen: Almost a quarter of the articles in child development are—other than the U.S. now. Yeah.

Nadelman: Right, right. Yeah.

Hagen: Yeah.

Nadelman: Well, that is laudable and the publications. I think in your governance—

Hagen: Oh yeah, we've made an effort—

Nadelman: You've made an effort to get more international people doing that. I thought that was great. That's about it actually.

Hagen: What—you might say a little more, because you've been interested in the years of minority children and representation and that's been a constant issue. As you know, Algea Harrison and Margaret Spencer and Vonnie McLoyd, among others, have been very vocal critics of the fact that we haven't had enough, and that the—both the field and the society—

Nadelman: Yeah, but first of all you have to get them majoring in the field. Now, Michigan gets a lot of Black students majoring in psychology. I'm not sure that's true elsewhere. And now I think they're heavily going into the technology level stuff, you know, the computers and that kind of thing. The—I'm trying to think in terms of what we could do to get the Black students—oh, one of the things that happened, I was undergraduate chair in psychology for 198—oh God, when was it—1985 to '87, something like that, and—yes, 1985 to '87, and one of the changes I had made in addition to increasing the number of credits you needed for majors, increasing the breadth of courses students take and so forth, one of the changes for psych majors was that they take 402 statistics instead of statistics 300, which was a nothing kind of a course. One of the deans wrote to say could we reconsider because that will discourage Black students from taking psychology as a major, and we ignored it because we felt he wouldn't have said that to any of the other science departments. I did not see a drop in the number of Black students coming into psychology and, in fact, when I did my research on Black students and

young adults we got them from the psych courses, and I did get over 200 Black students, which I don't know how many are your initial—what are they—a thousand or something initial—

Hagen: Probably, yeah.

Nadelman: —in undergraduate psych, which was not a bad number. Our problem is we get raided. We get them as undergraduates and we can keep most of them if they're not in athletics, but we can't hang onto them easily because in graduate school they get now courted by Yale and by California and by Princeton and Harvard, and certainly our faculty get raided. So we lost—what's his name, he was just here visiting, he and his twin brother—

Hagen: Claude Steele?

Nadelman: —yes, Claude Steele got—left for California—

Hagen: We lost Vonnie of course—

Nadelman: —we lost Vonnie. Vonnie also left for someplace else first—

Hagen: Duke first, and now North Carolina, right.

Nadelman: Yeah, yeah. I don't know what to tell you in terms of SRCD and what you can do.

Hagen: Well, one thing we started in '99 was a minority scholars program, which we've named for Fran Horowitz, and we recruit juniors and seniors and we bring them to the SRCD meeting, and each of them has both a junior and a senior mentor, and they come a day ahead and they get an orientation—

Nadelman: Well, that's great.

Hagen: —and we're just starting to get data, and many of those are going into the field.

Nadelman: That's good.

Hagen: So that is, I think—and we've had good support from the Grant Foundation and Ruby Takanishi, the Foundation for Child Development—

Nadelman: Yeah.

Hagen: —has given us money.

Nadelman: That's good.

Hagen: And so it, you know, it's not huge, but it brings about 30 students at the undergraduate level who are minority to our meetings.

Nadelman: Good.

Hagen: And then we're doing follow up on them so that—

Nadelman: To see if they go into—

Hagen: Exactly, right to see—and, of course, we don't require that they just go into narrow child development, because we're multidisciplinary—

Nadelman: Right.

Hagen: —so if they go into pediatrics we view that as a positive. You know?

Nadelman: Sociology—

Hagen: Right, sure, yeah.

Nadelman: Yeah. That's very nice, John. Yeah. I don't know what else you can do given that you're limited in money, because money speaks very—

Hagen: Well, we're frankly limited, and the students that have the time and the talent and the inclination, you know—and actually that gets into a little bit in the field now—

Nadelman: Your next questions for me: the history of the field during the years that I've been in it, which is 1941 on, and have your views changed over the years, and how? Well, I already mentioned about the increasing importance of infancy, both in my own work and in the field. I think that—

Hagen: In fact, I think it's really been a revolution in infancy—

Nadelman: —right, I really think so. And the infancy project in the lab course is probably the most popular of the projects that I do with the students. I think that my own emphasis on the biology and on the dynamic dialectical relationships in development has become accepted widely. It wasn't way back in the '40s. I do remember back in the '40s when they were still blaming the mother for having an autistic child.

Hagen: I remember that even in the early '60s.

Nadelman: Yeah, well I didn't believe that in the '40s. I kept lecturing to my classes, because I started teaching as an undergraduate actually—

Hagen: —clearly wrong, yeah.

Nadelman: —that no one will ever convince me that a mother with four kids smiled a little less at one than the other, and therefore that child became autistic—

Hagen: Oh, I had the same response to schizophrenia, because I did some work in California with schizophrenic patients—

Nadelman: Yeah.

Hagen: —and then when I came here I did the work with taking kids to the hospital, and you saw the exact same pattern.

Nadelman: Really?

Hagen: And you know, and I just thought two totally different parts of the country and you're seeing all these sort of stereotypic behaviors and speech patterns and so forth, and there's got to be something—

Nadelman: Yeah.

Hagen: —that's biological.

Nadelman: Well, I took an abnormal psych course as an undergraduate and Dr. Craft made it very clear that environmental stuff cannot explain all of schizophrenia, that there has to be a question of the wiring in the brain—

Hagen: And one of our early colleagues who left pioneered in that too, Sarnoff Mednick, remember?

Nadelman: Oh yes, yes.

Hagen: He was here and then he moved to—not the Netherlands—Denmark, because he had access, he had ready access to—and he—I think his work really showed an interaction—

Nadelman: That’s right—

Hagen: —that there were patterns, that there were also clearly things that were environmental—

Nadelman: Yeah. Well, the fact that it shows up in the adolescents heavily really means that there are some changes physiologically—

Hagen: Right. There’s—

Nadelman: —happening at the same time—

Hagen: Right, yeah, yeah. I think that’s true in a lot of these things.

Nadelman: Yeah. That was either—

Hagen: One, and the next one is—

Nadelman: Hopes and fears for the future of the field.

Hagen: Are you optimistic?

Nadelman: I guess one of the things I’m concerned about is that it should not turn into a female field. I’ve been talking—

Hagen: —that’s unpopular to say.

Nadelman: Yeah, I know it’s not, and I got scolded by some of my colleagues when the admissions—I said to the admissions committee, “You can’t just rely on this GPA so heavily.” I mean, they had—if the boys are not getting such high GPA scores as the girls, but are doing as well or better on the national tests and are getting as good or better letters than the girls are, I don’t think we should be ignoring them. We would wind up sometimes with all girls as our new graduating—

Hagen: We frequently did.

Nadelman: —group and—yeah, and I—when I said that, boy, the girls who think they’re feminists in our area really were very annoyed with me, but I kept saying, “You don’t understand. You turn this into a female field, and its reputation goes down and the pay goes down.”

Hagen: Well, I think it’s—I think it’s more than that. I think you need to have it from every intellectual perspective including—

Nadelman: —right, yeah.

Hagen: —sex and race and nationality, all of those are important factors—

Nadelman: Absolutely. The first time I ever taught child development was at NYU and it was at the end of the war, '45 I guess I was teaching it, and I had 50 students in the class; 47 of them were veterans and three were females, and I thought, Wow, you know, that's as bad as having all girls—

Hagen: Yeah.

Nadelman: —you really need to have both points of view.

Hagen: Well, there's only to some extent that can be controlled, though—

Nadelman: Yeah. Other than that I would not like to see the field go too heavily into, you know, the MRI and CAT scan and—I think it's important, I really do, but I still think that a lot of the social-emotional stuff is still not receptive to that kind of technological research. You know?

Hagen: Right.

Nadelman: Although, you know, John Murray's been doing it with the MRI—functional MRI and violence and aggression, but you know, I still feel that that's too narrow.

Hagen: Well, I think it's here to stay and we're going to have more of it, but I think you're right. It has to be put in perspective and the other work not downgraded because of it.

Nadelman: And downgraded financially—it adds up as well. Yeah.

Hagen: Yeah, I see some of that—

Nadelman: Yeah.

Hagen: —but I think, on the other hand, the interest in cross cultural and transnational and so forth would be a good—

Nadelman: Would help—

Hagen: —antidote for that—

Nadelman: I hope so, yeah. Are we up to personal questions?

Hagen: —personal.

Nadelman: Okay. Let's see. I got married, as you know, in '53, and my husband, Sydney Warschausky, W-A-R-S-C-H-A-U-S-K-Y, was a Columbia graduate, undergrad and grad, who went into English literature. He did serve in the Army Air Force for three years and was then, for his last year—the bomb had dropped, so even though he was going over to attack Japan, he went over as an occupation—

Hagen: Occupation, right.

Nadelman: —officer. While he was there he volunteered to teach English to the citizens of the small town he was stationed in and had a wonderful 10 months in Japan, came back, went back to graduate school—went to graduate school. He had gone straight from college to the Air Force, went to graduate school at Columbia, taught at the University of Illinois for several years, Holyoke—when we got the job at Mount Holyoke when we got married, part time, and then came to Michigan full time. He has spent most of his career at the branch campus at the University of Michigan at Dearborn where he chaired the humanities division—that's nine different departments—the humanities division a number of times.

He retired at 65 years of age. I kept working and I retired at 69. We have three children: Seth, Judith, and Carl. Seth is now an associate professor in the medical school in the Department of Physical Rehabilitation, and—

Hagen: Physical Medicine—

Nadelman: —Physical Medicine, you're right. He's a pediatric clinical psychologist. He does their neuropsych testing. He sees children inpatient and outpatient, he has to deal with the families of the children who have been incapacitated, sometimes permanently, by their injuries, gets a lot of children with brain and spinal trauma. He also works with the cranial facial department. He has been doing a lot of publishing, articles and—

Hagen: Attends meetings a lot—

Nadelman: Pardon?

Hagen: He attends meetings a lot. I've seen him over at—

Nadelman: Oh yeah, he does a lot of conferences and gets invited as keynote speaker essentially. He's doing extremely well nationally and internationally. He's on the NSF/NIH panel to review proposals, that kind of thing. So he's doing great. His wife has a master's of public health degree who administered the neurology clinic for a long time and then was responsible for the big move in for the cancer geriatric center, and now has changed and works for herself, and she does meditation and—what shall I call it—self mindedness healing stuff. She's very active. She's working with corporations as well as private people. Let's see. Second child, Judith, she is also a clinical psychologist from Boston University. She went to Brandeis and then Boston, and she has a private practice in Evanston and in Chicago. I should have said both of them, Seth and Judith, each have two boys for their children. She is married to a clinical psychologist who worked at DePaul University mental health clinic for a while, but is now school psychologist and director of a program at Parker School, which is an affluent K-12 school in Detroit in the—excuse me—in Chicago. And they have two kids, two boys. Carl, Carl is our maverick—

Hagen: Entrepreneur.

Nadelman: —he's my entrepreneur. He's a CFO, a chief financial officer. He worked his way up from the bottom at Searle Pharmaceutical, got called over to their parent Monsanto in Saint Louis, then got called back to the Chicago area by Searle to become their CFO. When Searle got—and Monsanto got bought by Pharmacia they—he was urged to move with them with a lot of goodies to New Jersey or New York. I forgot where their headquarters were, but he would not move his family again. He lived in Winnetka, which is a suburb of Chicago. He likes the schools, he likes the neighborhood, he likes his friends, and they're not moving. So he then found a job with a spin-off of Monsanto called Merisant, which does the little Equal sweeteners, and was the CFO there for—I forget—three years or something, and then got a sufficient severance pay, so he took a whole year sabbatical, had a wonderful time with his family, took courses on Ulysses and other things and he really, really enjoyed being away from the stress that he'd been under. And now he is, as of February, last February, the CFO at something called Chef Solutions, which is a big firm that supplies readymade food to restaurants and supermarkets and things like that, the ones that don't have a full time person preparing food themselves. You know? So he's doing that. He hopes to do that for about three years and then see what he wants to do. What else? Let me think.

Hagen: And what does his wife do?

Nadelman: Oh, his wife is a homemaker.

Hagen: Okay.

Nadelman: She's the only of our family, so we have—they have four children—excuse me—

Hagen: Right.

Nadelman: —and so we have eight grandchildren, seven of them boys, one a girl, and they range at the moment in age from 8 to 16. And, you know, a lot of soccer, et cetera, athletics, a lot of music, Seth's children both play piano very well. In fact, it's really been a pleasure.

Hagen: And are there ways that they have a bearing on your own professional or scientific interests? Well, your family—

Nadelman: Well, certainly watching them develop was my own lab course at home. I did—you know, that really does inform you tremendously. I remember Dan Miller telling me that each new child changed his theories of child development. And I said, "That wasn't my problem, but they are very different in personality"—

Hagen: I remember you're saying that about Seth and Judith and—

Nadelman: Oh God, yes, as a child.

Hagen: —when Carl came along and was even more different.

Nadelman: Right, so very different. And you have to learn to adapt and your own personality sometimes can't change so easily—

Hagen: Seth was more, as I remember, more introspective and—

Nadelman: That's right.

Hagen: —and Judith was very emotional—

Nadelman: Oh God, yeah, as a child.

Hagen: —and Carl was—

Nadelman: Carl was very—

Hagen: —his own person.

Nadelman: —extrovert—

Hagen: Yeah, I knew them pretty well, too. No, that's fine. They're just—

Nadelman: What else? Let me think. Well, the applied we've been through a number of times—

Hagen: Yeah.

Nadelman: —part of my interest in the Hands-On Museum was because they needed somebody to take these physical scientific explanations of how these things worked and put them into English that a fourth grader and up would understand. Because for each project—and we have over 200 now in the Hands-On Museum—there's, you know, what's happening and how does it work on cards that they can read. So that was kind of what I was doing, and taking my children there to see and work the exhibits.

Hagen: Great. Okay.

Nadelman: Okay?

Hagen: Well, I'd like to thank you very, very much. If there's—

Nadelman: Well, I really appreciate your doing this, John.

Hagen: It was most interesting and fun for me, since we've known each other—I came here 40 years ago. Right, just finished my 40th year—

Nadelman: That's nice, yeah.

Hagen: —at Michigan, and—

Nadelman: I also worked 40 years, but in three different colleges.

[End of Interview]