**PSYCHOLOGY 704**

**Lifespan Development**

**Fall 2018**

Research Hall 202

T/R, 12-1:15pm

**Instructor**: Thalia R. Goldstein, Ph.D.

David King Hall 3055

tgoldste@gmu.edu

703-993-6460

**Office Hours**: Tuesdays & Thursdays 1:30-2:45pm, Wednesdays 12-3.

**Course Description:**

This class explores typical developmental psychology. Students explore theories of development and historical and modern research findings. Students gain an understanding of 1) the current state of research in both social and cognitive development; 2) enduring and remaining questions about typical development; 3) change and growth from infancy through the lifespan. This course is intended for advanced graduate students. There is a careful analysis of developmental theories, with an emphasis on research findings and methods as reported in the current literature. Any week of this class could be an entire semester’s (or lifetime’s!) worth of work, so keep in mind we are just scratching the surface of what is being done in developmental psychology.

**Course Objectives and Questions:**

1. What are the major theories and who are the major theorists of Developmental Psychology?
2. What are the current areas of research focus in Developmental Psychology, and what is the current state of knowledge in each of these areas?
3. How do parenting, genetics, environment, and culture all differentially shape development?
4. What are the research methods in Developmental Psychology, and how do we critically evaluate research in this area?

**Course Materials:** There is no textbook for this course. If it’s been a while since you’ve taken developmental psychology, any introduction to developmental psychology textbook will work. Class is entirely based on articles posted each week on Blackboard. Slides will also be posted on Blackboard before the beginning of each class for your reference. However, you will find my slides very unhelpful if you do not attend class.

**Official Communications via GMU E-mail**: Mason uses electronic mail to provide official information to students. Examples include communications from course instructors, notices from the library, notices about academic standing, financial aid information, class materials, assignments, questions, and instructor feedback. Students are responsible for the content of university communication sent to their Mason e-mail account and are required to activate that account and check it regularly.

**Class Cancellation Policy**: This class will entail frequent use of email, blackboard, PowerPoint, etc. Please check blackboard and your email regularly. If class is cancelled, I will notify you by email/blackboard and how we will make the time up.

**Accommodations:** Disability Statement: If you are a student with a disability and you need academic accommodations, please see me and contact the Disability Resource Services (DRS) at 703-993-2474.

**Honor Code:** George Mason University has an Honor Code, which requires all members of this community to maintain the highest standards of academic honesty and integrity. Cheating, plagiarism, lying, and stealing are all prohibited. It is every student’s responsibility to familiarize himself or herself with the Honor Code. The Honor Code is available at: http://oai.gmu.edu/the-mason-honor-code-2/ All violations of the Honor Code will be reported to the Honor Committee.

**Assignments/ Requirements: (Please see end of syllabus for full assignment descriptions and grading rubrics)**

* Attendance and class participation (10%)
* Popular Press Paper (10%) Due September 20, Before class time, on blackboard
* Response papers (15%) (3 papers, 5% each)- Blackboard
* Response questions (5%) (5 questions, 1% each)- Blackboard
* Class presentation (25%)- In class
* Final paper (35%)
	+ Topic Approval (1%) *Due November 6 Before Class*
	+ Annotated Bibliography (2%) *November 20, Before Class*
	+ Outline (2%) *Due December 4 Before Class*
	+ Paper (30%)*Due Dec 14, 5pm*

**Grading:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade** | **Percentage** | **Quality Points** | **Graduate Courses** |
| A+ | 97-100 | 4.00 | Satisfactory/Passing |
| A | 93-96.99 | 4.00 | Satisfactory/Passing |
| A- | 90-92.99 | 3.67 | Satisfactory/Passing |
| B+ | 87-89.99 | 3.33 | Satisfactory/Passing |
| B | 83-86.99 | 3.00 | Satisfactory/Passing |
| B- | 80-82.99 | 2.67 | Satisfactory\*/Passing |
| C | 70-79.99 | 2.00 | Unsatisfactory/Passing |
| F | Under 70 | 0.00 | Unsatisfactory/Failing |

Attendance is mandatory. You must do the readings before class (including readings for student presentations) and come prepared to actively discuss. If there is a reason why you cannot attend, please email me in advance and ask for an excused absence (e.g., in the case of illness). If you cannot participate one day and do not want to be called on, please let me know BEFORE class, and I will avoid calling on you. Non-excused absences will lower your grade.

**How to do well in this class:**

* Read every article and make a QALMRI
* Make notes in the article, or list questions you have on a separate piece of paper
* Come to class prepared to discuss and think about the article

**Make up/ Extension Policy**: Extensions on assignments will not be granted lightly, and will be reserved for serious, documented problems (e.g., illness) and must be requested BEFORE the due date. Grades will be lowered if no extension has been previously granted. There is no extension without previous approval, by me, in writing. When you request an extension, I will ask to see everything you have prepared for the assignment up to that point, to ensure that you are not simply requesting an extension because you had not yet begun the assignment! Each unapproved day late is a FULL LETTER GRADE off of your grade.

**Attendance**: Students who miss classes, exams, or other assignments as a consequence of their religious observance or for participation in a university activity will be provided a reasonable alternative opportunity, consistent with class attendance policies stated in the syllabus, to make up the missed work. It is the obligation of students to provide me, within the first two weeks of the semester, with the dates of major religious holidays on which they will be absent, and the dates for which they are requesting an excused absence for participation in any university-sponsored activity scheduled prior to the start of the semester, and as soon as possible otherwise. Students requesting an excused absence for participation in a university- sponsored activity must provide me a letter from a university official stating the dates and times that participation in the activity would result in the student missing class.

**Plagarism:** *What is Plagiarism*? ***Plagiarism*** (*v.*) is the act of taking undeserved or unwarranted credit for something. ***Plagiarism*** (*n.*) is something represented in a plagiaristic fashion.

*Severe plagiarism* (a.k.a. “copying”) is the most overt and deceptive form of plagiarism. This involves deliberately misrepresenting all or part of another person’s work as one’s own. For example, a student might turn in a paper written by another student in a previous term. Another common example is writing containing chunks of “copy-and-paste” from published articles or internet sources such as Wikipedia. Papers copied from the internet are typically obviously copied, and can be located on the internet with a simple Google search.

*Irresponsible plagiarism* (a.k.a. “omission”) is the act of paraphrasing or quoting from a source, without giving credit to the source. The author does not necessarily explicitly take credit for the idea or materials (but this is nevertheless implied). Please be aware that not only do ideas need to be cited, but they should also be stated *in your own words*.

*Self-plagiarism* (a.k.a. “recycling”) is the act of representing one’s own previous ideas or materials as new and original. For example, a student might turn in all or part of the same paper for more than one course. This may not seem as bad as stealing another person’s work, but it is *deceptive*, and therefore unacceptable.

*Should I Plagiarize*? You should absolutely not plagiarize. You will be caught and there will be severe consequences.

Sometimes students tell me that they do not know what constitutes plagiarism. All students should go to http://www.indiana.edu/~wts/pamphlets/plagiarism.shtml and read this site carefully. Clear examples are provided about the difference between using a secondary source correctly and plagiarizing from it.

**It is very easy to discover Internet plagiarism by typing in a few words of the plagiarized paper into Google.** **If a student is suspected of academic dishonesty, the matter will be turned over to the Committee on Academic Integrity. Students who violate academic integrity will receive an F in the course, and the Committee on Academic Integrity may determine other more serious consequences.** **I have an extremely strict policy on plagiarism. So please remember, it is never worth it!**

***I also use “Turn It In” which compares your paper to a large library and database of previously submitted and internet-sourced papers and tells me if there is overlap. I do not have a ‘minimum’ percentage for failure, and instead take each example of plagiarism separately.***

**General classroom management:**

* It goes without saying that we are all adults and behavior that shows respect for yourselves, your classmates, and the educational process is expected.
* Please turn cell phones OFF during class. Not vibrate, off.
* Computers are allowed for note-taking purposes ONLY. However: **http://www.npr.org/2016/04/17/474525392/attention-students-put-your-laptops-away**
* Courtesy is expected. Come to class on time and stay for the entire session. If you have an emergency and must come in late or early, please do so quietly.
* The instructor reserves the right to change the syllabus if necessary.
* In the event that the instructor wishes to disseminate information to the entire class outside of the classroom, an email will be sent to all students’ Pace email addresses. It is the students’ responsibility to regularly check email at this address. It would be wise to check email the morning of class. There may be announcements regarding assignments or lecture that would be a good idea for you to see.

**Course Schedule (See below for reading assignments by week)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Week** | **Date** | **Topic** | **Notes** |
| 1 | Tues 8/28 | Intro; History and Methods |   |
|  | Thurs 8/30 | Prenatal Development  |  |
| 2 | Tues 9/4 | Theories of Development |  |
|  | Thurs 9/6 | Object Permanence |  |
| 3 | Tues 9/11 | Facial Recognition |  |
|  | *Thurs 9/13* | *Dr. Goldstein out of town* | *Working on first draft of popular press recommended* |
| 4 | Tues 9/18 | Attachment |  |
|  | Thurs 9/20 | Temperament | **\*\*POPULAR PRESS PAPER DUE!** |
| 5 | Tues 9/25 | Imitation and Agency |  |
|  | Thurs 9/27 | Number |  |
| 6 | Tues 10/2 | Word Learning |  |
|  | Thurs 10/4 | Language Development  |  |
| 7 | Tues 10/9 | *No Class, Columbus Day* |  |
|  | Thurs 10/11 | Symbolism and Representation |  |
| 8 | Tues 10/16 | Pretend Play and Imagination |  |
|  | Thurs 10/18 | Theory of Mind |  |
| 9 | Tues 10/23 | Self Regulation/ EF  |  |
|  | Thurs 10/25 | Emotion Regulation |  |
| 10 | Tues 10/30 | Grit and Mindset  |  |
|  | Thurs 11/1 | Schooling |  |
| 11 | Tues 11/6 | Identity  | \*Final Paper Topics due |
|  | Thurs 11/8 | Personality |  |
| 12 | Tues 11/13 | Sex/Gender |  |
|  | Thurs 11/15 | Race and Ethnicity |  |
| 13 | Tues 11/20 | Prejudice and Intersectionality  | \*Final Paper Annotated Bibliography Due |
|  |  | *No Class, Thanksgiving* |  |
| 14 | Tues 11/27 | Empathy |  |
|  | Thurs 11/29 | Morality |  |
| 15 | Tues 12/4 | Intelligence and Creativity | \*Final Paper Outlines Due |
|  | Thurs 12/6 | Aging  |  |
| FINAL PAPER DUE | Friday 12/14, 5pm |  | Final Papers Due (Early papers happily accepted) |

**DETAILED COURSE SCHEDULE (Subject to change)**

1. **August 28: Intro; History and Methods**
	1. QALMRI Instructions (adapted from Kosslyn et al 2001)
	2. Jordan, C., & Zanna, J. (1999). How to read an empirical article. In R. F. Baumeister (Ed.), *The Self in Social Psychology* (pp. 461-470). Philadelphia: Psychology Press.
	3. Spelke, E. & Kinzler, K. (2007). Core knowledge. *Developmental Science*, 10, 89-96.
	4. Fabes, R. A., Martin, C. L., Hanish, L. D., & Updegraff, K. A. (2000). Criteria for Evaluating the Significance of Developmental Research in the Twenty‐First Century: Force and Counterforce. *Child Development*, *71*(1), 212-221.
2. **August 30: Theories of Development**
	1. Baltes, P. B. (1987). Theoretical propositions of life-span developmental psychology: On the dynamics between growth and decline. *Developmental psychology*, *23*(5), 611.
	2. Flavell, J. (1996). Piaget's legacy. *Psychological Science*, 7(4), 200-203.
	3. Bronfenbrenner, U., & Evans, G. W. (2000). Developmental science in the 21st century: Emerging questions, theoretical models, research designs and empirical findings. *Social development*, *9*(1), 115-125.
3. **September 4: Prenatal Development**
	1. Dominguez et al. (2008) Racial Differences in Birth Outcomes: The Role of General, Pregnancy, and Racism Stress. *Health Psychology 27,* 194-203.
	2. Flak, A. L., Su, S., Bertrand, J., Denny, C. H., Kesmodel, U. S., & Cogswell, M. E. (2014). The association of mild, moderate, and binge prenatal alcohol exposure and child neuropsychological outcomes: a meta‐analysis. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research*, *38*(1), 214-226.
	3. STUDENT: Cabrera, N. J., Fagan, J., & Farrie, D. (2008). Explaining the long reach of fathers’ prenatal involvement on later paternal engagement. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 70(5), 1094-1107.
4. **September 6: Object Permanence**
	1. Landers, W. F. (1971). Effects of differential experience on infants' performance in a Piagetian Stage IV object-concept task. *Developmental Psychology*, *5*(1), 48.
	2. Baillargeon, R. (1987). Object permanence in 3 ½ and 4 ½ month-old infants. *Developmental Psychology, 23*, 5, 655-664.
	3. STUDENT: Topál, J., Gergely, G., Miklósi, Á., Erdőhegyi, Á., & Csibra, G. (2008). Infants' perseverative search errors are induced by pragmatic misinterpretation. *Science*, *321*(5897), 1831-1834.
5. **September 11: Facial Recognition and Processing**
	1. Mondloch, C. J., Lewis, T. L., Budreau, D. R., Maurer, D., Dannemiller, J. L., Stephens, B. R., & Kleiner-Gathercoal, K. A. (1999). Face perception during early infancy. *Psychological Science*, *10*(5), 419-422.
	2. Sangrigoli, S., Pallier, C., Argenti, A. M., Ventureyra, V. A. G., & de Schonen, S. (2005). Reversibility of the other-race effect in face recognition during childhood. *Psychological Science*, *16*(6), 440-444.
	3. STUDENT: Langlois, J. H., Roggman, L. A., Casey, R. J., Ritter, J. M., Rieser-Danner, L. A., & Jenkins, V. Y. (1987). Infant preferences for attractive faces: Rudiments of a stereotype? *Developmental psychology*, *23*(3), 363.

*September 13: No Class, Dr. Goldstein conference presentation.*

 *I recommend you spend class time finding your popular press article and the original research article it is paired with.*

1. **September 18: Attachment**
	1. Ainsworth, M. D. S., & Bell, S. M. (1970). Attachment, exploration, and separation: Illustrated by the behavior of one-year-olds in a strange situation. *Child development*, 49-67.
	2. Johnson, S. C., Dweck, C. S., & Chen, F. S. (2007). Evidence for infants’ internal working model of attachment. *Psychological Science, 18*, 501–502. \*\**short*
		1. *But see (optional):* [*https://thepsychologist.bps.org.uk/volume-30/january-2017/overrated-predictive-power-attachment*](https://thepsychologist.bps.org.uk/volume-30/january-2017/overrated-predictive-power-attachment)
	3. STUDENT: Ahnert, L., Pinquart, M., & Lamb, M. E. (2006). Security of children's relationships with nonparental care providers: A meta‐analysis. *Child development*, *77*(3), 664-679.
2. **September 20: Temperament**
	1. Kagan, J. (1997). Temperament and reactions to unfamiliarity. *Child Development*, *689*, 139- 143.
	2. Krassner, A. M., Gartstein, M. A., Park, C., Dragan, W. Ł., Lecannelier, F., & Putnam, S. P. (2017). East–west, collectivist-individualist: A cross-cultural examination of temperament in toddlers from Chile, Poland, South Korea, and the US. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *14*(4), 449-464.
	3. STUDENT: Schwartz, C. E., Wright, C. I., Shin, L. M., Kagan, J., & Rauch, S. L. (2003). Inhibited and uninhibited infants" grown up": adult amygdalar response to novelty. *Science*, 300(5627), 1952-1953. \*\**short*
3. **September 25: Imitation and Agency**
	1. Meltzoff, A. N., & Moore, M. (1977). Imitation of facial and manual gestures by human neonates. *Science*, 198, 75-78.
		1. *But see (optional): Oostenbroek, J., Suddendorf, T., Nielsen, M., Redshaw, J., Kennedy-Costantini, S., Davis, J., ... & Slaughter, V. (2016). Comprehensive longitudinal study challenges the existence of neonatal imitation in humans. Current Biology, 26(10), 1334-1338.*
	2. Shimizu, A., & Johnson, S. (2004) Infants' attribution of a goal to a morphologically unfamiliar agent. *Developmental Science*, 7(4), 425 – 430.
	3. STUDENT: Barrett, H. C., & Behne, T. (2005). Children's understanding of death as the cessation of agency: a test using sleep versus death. *Cognition*, *96*(2), 93-108.
4. **September 27: Number**
	1. Wynn, K. (1992). Addition and subtraction by human infants. *Nature, 358*, 749-750.
	2. Wakeley, A., Rivera, S., & Langer, J. (2000). Can young infants add and subtract? *Child Development*. 71(6), 1525-1534.
		1. Wynn, K. (2000). Findings of addition and subtraction in infants are robust and consistent: Reply to Wakeley, Rivera, and Langer. *Child Development, 71*(6), 1535-1536.
		2. Wakeley, A., Rivera, S., & Langer, J. (2000). Not proved: Reply to Wynn.
		*Child Development. 71*(6), 1537-1539.
	3. Saxe, G. B. (1988). The mathematics of child street vendors. *Child Development*, 1415-1425.
	4. STUDENT: Starr, Libertus, Brannon (2013). Number sense in infancy predicts mathematical abilities in childhood. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 110,* 18116-18120.0
5. **October 2: Word Learning**
	1. Saffran, J. R., Johnson, E. K., Aslin, R. N., & Newport, E. L. (1999). Statistical learning of tone sequences by human infants and adults. *Cognition*, *70*(1), 27-52.
	2. Heibeck, T. H., & Markman, E. M. (1987). Word learning in children: An examination of fast mapping. *Child Development, 58*, 1021-1034.
	3. STUDENT: Senghas, Kita, & Ozyurek (2004). Children creating core properties of language: Evidence from an emerging sign language in Nicaragua. *Science, 305,* 1779-1782.
6. **October 4: Language Development**
	1. Lynch, J. S., van den Broek, P., Kremer, K. E., Kendeou, P., White, M. J., & Lorch, E. P. (2008). The development of narrative comprehension and its relation to other early reading skills. *Reading Psychology*, 29(4), 327-365.
	2. Pearson, B. Z., Conner, T., & Jackson, J. E. (2013). Removing obstacles for African American English-speaking children through greater understanding of language difference. *Developmental Psychology*, *49*(1), 31.
	3. STUDENT: Walker, Greenwood, Hart, and Carta (1994). Prediction of school outcomes based on early language production and socio-economic factors. *Child Development, 65*, 606-621.

*October 9: Columbus Day, Monday classes, no class*

1. **October 11: Symbolism and Representation**
	1. DeLoache, J. (1987). Rapid change in the symbolic functioning of very young children. *Science, 238*, pp. 1556-7.
		1. *Optional: DeLoache, J., Miller, K., & Rosengren, K. (1997). The credible shrinking room: Very young children’s performance with symbolic and nonsymbolic relations. Psychological Science, 8, 4, 308-313.*
	2. Bialystok, E. (2000). Symbolic representation across domains in preschool children. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, *76*(3), 173-189.
	3. STUDENT: Sheehan, K. J., & Uttal. D (2016). Children’s Learning from Touch Screens: A Dual Representation Perspective. *Frontiers in Psychology* 7
2. **October 16: Pretend Play and Imagination**
	1. Ma, L., & Lillard, A. (2006). Where Is the Real Cheese? Young Children’s Ability to Discriminate Between Real and Pretend Acts, *Child Development, 77,* 1762-1777.
	2. Haight, W. L., Wang, X. L., Fung, H. H. T., Williams, K., & Mintz, J. (1999). Universal, developmental, and variable aspects of young children's play: a cross‐cultural comparison of pretending at home. *Child Development*, *70*(6), 1477-1488.
	3. STUDENT: Skolnick Weisberg, D., & Bloom, P. (2009). Young children separate multiple pretend worlds. *Developmental science*, *12*(5), 699-705
3. **Oct 18: Theory of Mind**

##### Wimmer, H., & Perner, J. (1983). Beliefs about beliefs: Representation and constraining function of wrong beliefs in young children’s understanding of deception. *Cognition, 13*, 103-128.

* 1. Onishi, K.H., & Baillargeon, R. (2005). Do 15-month-old infants understand false beliefs? *Science, 308*(5719), 255-258
		1. But see: Powell, L. J., Hobbs, K., Bardis, A., Carey, S., & Saxe, R. (2017). Replications of implicit theory of mind tasks with varying representational demands. *Cognitive Development*.
1. STUDENT: Birch, S. A. J., Li, V., Haddock, T., Ghrear, S. E., Brosseau-Liard, P., Baimel, A., & Whyte, M. (2016). Perspectives on Perspective Taking: How Children Think About the Minds of Others. *Advances in Child Development and Behavior*.
2. **October 23: Self-Regulation and Executive Function**
	1. Kidd, C., Palmeri, H., & Aslin, R. N. (2013). Rational snacking: Young children’s decision-making on the marshmallow task is moderated by beliefs about environmental reliability. *Cognition*, *126*(1), 109-114.
	2. Kochanska, G., Murray, K.T., & Harlan, E.T (2000). Effortful control in early childhood: Continuity and change, antecedents and implications for social development. *Developmental Psychology*, 36, 220-232.
	3. STUDENT: Raver, C. C., Blair, C., & Willoughby, M. (2013). Poverty as a predictor of 4-year-olds' executive function: New perspectives on models of differential susceptibility. *Developmental psychology*, *49*(2), 292.
3. **October 25: Emotion Regulation**
	1. Friedlmeier, W., & Trommsdorff, G. (1999). Emotion Regulation in Early Childhood A Cross-Cultural Comparison between German and Japanese Toddlers. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *30*(6), 684-711.
	2. John, O. P., & Gross, J. J. (2004). Healthy and unhealthy emotion regulation: Personality processes, individual differences, and life span development. *Journal of personality*, *72*(6), 1301-1334.
	3. STUDENT: Morris, A. S., Silk, J. S., Steinberg, L., Myers, S. S., & Robinson, L. R. (2007). The role of the family context in the development of emotion regulation. *Social development*, *16*(2), 361-388.
4. **October 30: Motivation: Grit and Mindset**
	1. Kamins, M. L., & Dweck, C. S. (1999). Person versus process praise and criticism: implications for contingent self-worth and coping. *Developmental psychology*, *35*(3), 835.
	2. Duckworth, A. L., Peterson, C., Matthews, M. D., & Kelly, D. R. (2007). Grit: perseverance and passion for long-term goals. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *92*(6), 1087.
		1. *But see (optional): Gorski, P. C. (2016). Poverty and the ideological imperative: a call to unhook from deficit and grit ideology and to strive for structural ideology in teacher education. Journal of Education for Teaching, 42(4), 378-386.*
	3. STUDENT: Spitzer, B., & Aronson, J. (2015). Minding and mending the gap: Social psychological interventions to reduce educational disparities. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *85*(1), 1-18.
		1. *But see (optional): Yeager, D. S., & Walton, G. M. (2011). Social-psychological interventions in education: They’re not magic. Review of educational Research, 81(2), 267-301.*
5. **November 1: Schools**
	1. Roeser, R., Eccles, J., & Sameroff, A. (2000). [School as a context of early adolescents' academic and social-emotional development: A summary of research findings.](http://www-mi6.csa.com/ids70/view_record.php?id=15&recnum=13&SID=90e3554fe3402803ef3787d3dbabfd43) *Elementary School Journal. Vol 100*(5), May 2000, pp. 443-471
	2. Greenberg, M. T., Weissberg, R. P., O'brien, M. U., Zins, J. E., Fredericks, L., Resnik, H., & Elias, M. J. (2003). Enhancing school-based prevention and youth development through coordinated social, emotional, and academic learning. *American psychologist*, *58*(6-7), 466.
	3. STUDENT: Wentzel, K. R., & Caldwell, K. (1997). Friendships, peer acceptance, and group membership: Relations to academic achievement in middle school. *Child development*, *68*(6), 1198-1209. \*\*Good article for student
6. **November 6 The Self: Identity**
	1. Asendorpf, J. B., Warkentin, V., & Baudonnière, P.-M. (1996). Self-awareness and other- awareness. II. Mirror self-recognition, social contingency awareness, and synchronic imitation. *Developmental Psychology, 32*, 313-321.- find a newer article?
	2. Marcia, J. E. (1966). Development and validation of ego-identity status. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *3*(5), 551.
	3. STUDENT: Robins, R. W., Trzesniewski, K. H., Tracy, J. L., Gosling, S. D., & Potter, J. (2002). Global self-esteem across the life span. *Psychology and aging*, *17*(3), 423.
7. **November 8: The Self: Personality**
	1. Wängqvist, M., Lamb, M. E., Frisén, A., & Hwang, C. P. (2015). Child and adolescent predictors of personality in early adulthood. *Child development*, *86* (4), 1253-1261.
	2. Hughes, D., Rodriguez, J., Smith, E. P., Johnson, D. J., Stevenson, H. C., & Spicer, P. (2006). Parents' ethnic-racial socialization practices: a review of research and directions for future study. *Developmental psychology*, *42*(5), 747
	3. STUDENT: McLean, K. C., Lilgendahl, J. P., Fordham, C., Alpert, E., Marsden, E., Szymanowski, K., & McAdams, D. P. (2017). Identity development in cultural context: The role of deviating from master narratives. *Journal of personality*.
8. **November 13: Sex and Gender**
	1. Seavey, Katz & Zalk (1975). Baby X: The Effect of Gender Labels on Adults Responses to Infants. *Sex Roles, 1*, 103-109.
	2. Taylor, Rhodes & Gelman, (2009). Boys will be Boys and Cows will be Cows. *Child Development.*
	3. STUDENT: Olson, K. R., Key, A. C., & Eaton, N. R. (2015). Gender cognition in transgender children. *Psychological Science*, *26*(4), 467-474.
9. **November 15: Race/Ethnicity**
	1. Kinzler, K., Shutts, K., Dejesus, J., & Spelke, E. (2009). Accent trumps race in guiding children’s social preferences. *Social Cognition*, 27, 623-634.
	2. Dunham et al (2015). The development of race-based perceptual categorization: skin color dominates early category judgments. *Developmental Science, 18,* 469-483.
	3. STUDENT: Baron, A. S., & Banaji, M. R. (2006). The development of implicit attitudes evidence of race evaluations from ages 6 and 10 and adulthood. *Psychological Science*, *17*(1), 53-58.
		1. *Optional: Dunham, Y., Baron, A. S. and Carey, S. (2011), Consequences of “Minimal” Group Affiliations in Children. Child Development, 82, 793–811.*
10. **November 20: Prejudice and Intersectionality**
	1. Killen, M, Rutland, A., & Yip, T (2016). Equity and Justice in Developmental Science: Discrimination, Social Exclusion, and Intergroup Attitudes. *Child Development,* 87, 1317-1336.
	2. Rosenthal & Lobel (2011). Explaining racial disparities in adverse birth outcomes: Unique sources of stress for Black American women. *Social Science & Medicine, 72, 977-983.*
	3. STUDENT: Townsend et al (2010). I’m no Jezebel: I am young, gifted and black: Identity, sexuality and black girls. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 34,* 273-285.

*November 22, no class, Thanksgiving break!*

1. **November 27: Empathy**
	1. Zahn-Waxler, C., Robinson, J. L., & Emde, R. N. (1992). The development of empathy in twins. *Developmental psychology*, *28*(6), 1038.
	2. Soenens, B., Duriez, B., Vansteenkiste, M., & Goossens, L. (2007). The intergenerational transmission of empathy-related responding in adolescence: The role of maternal support. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *33*(3), 299-311.
	3. STUDENT: Caravita, S., Di Blasio, P., & Salmivalli, C. (2009). Unique and interactive effects of empathy and social status on involvement in bullying. *Social development*, *18*(1), 140-163.
2. **November 29: Morality**
	1. Nunner-Winkler, G., & Sodian, B. (1988). Children's understanding of moral emotions. *Child Development, 59,* 1323-1328
	2. Hamlin, K. Wynn, K. & Bloom, P. (2007) Social evaluation by preverbal infants. *Nature 450*, 557-559.
	3. STUDENT: Shaw, A., & Olson, K. R. (2012). Children discard a resource to avoid inequity. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *141*(2), 382.
		1. But see: Paulus, M. (2015). Children’s inequity aversion depends on culture: a cross-cultural comparison. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, *132*, 240-246.
3. **December 4: Intelligence and Creativity**
	1. Flynn, J. (1999). Searching for justice: The discovery of IQ gains over time. A*merican Psychologist*, 54, 5-20
		1. *Optional: Neisser, U. et al. (1996). Intelligence: Knowns and unknowns. American Psychologist, 51, 77-101.*
	2. Shi, B., Wang, L., Yang, J., Zhang, M., & Xu, L. (2017). Relationship between divergent thinking and intelligence: an empirical study of the Threshold Hypothesis with Chinese children. *Frontiers in psychology*, *8*, 254.
	3. STUDENT: Gaither et al. (2015). Thinking Outside the Box: Multiple Identity Mind-Sets Affect Creative Problem Solving. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 6,* 596-603.
4. **December** **6:** **Aging**
	1. Staudinger, U. M., & Pasupathi, M. (2003). Correlates of wisdom‐related performance in adolescence and adulthood: Age‐graded differences in “paths” toward desirable development. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *13*(3), 239-268.
	2. Weiss, D., & Lang, F. R. (2012). “They” are old but “I” feel younger: Age-group dissociation as a self-protective strategy in old age. *Psychology and aging*, 27(1), 153.
	3. STUDENT: Carr, D., House, J. S., Wortman, C., Nesse, R., & Kessler, R. C. (2001). Psychological adjustment to sudden and anticipated spousal loss among older widowed persons. The *Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 56(4), S237-S248.

**Assignment** **Guidelines and Rubrics**

* Attendance and class participation (10%)
* Popular Press Paper (10%)
* Response papers (15%) (3 papers, 5% each)
* Response questions (5%) (5 questions, 1% each)
* Class presentation (25%)
* Final paper (35%)
	+ Topic Approval (1%) *Due November 6*
	+ Annotated Bibliography (2%) *November 20*
	+ Outline (2%) *Due December 4*
	+ Paper (30%) ***Due Dec 14***

**Guideline for Class Participation (10%)**

Class discussions on the readings play a critical role in your success in the course. Effective class comments may integrate material from this and other courses, draw on real-world experiences and observations, address questions raised by others, or pose new questions to the class. High quality participation involves knowing when to speak and when to listen or allow others to speak. Take the time to think about how your comments will be received; comments that are vague, repetitive, unrelated to the current topic, or without sufficient foundation are distracting and do not move forward the discussion. *Those that are insensitive to other students in the class or are framed as personal attacks are unacceptable under any circumstances.*

If for any reason (social anxiety, language difficulties, etc) you feel that you will have problems speaking up in class, I have several methods for engaging in class participation without having to speak in class. Please set up an appointment to see me as soon as possible. This can include handing in a note with ideas and questions at the end of each class, or sending me a copy of your notes with questions or ideas integrated.

**Criteria for assessment:**

Strong Contributor: Contributions in class reflect thorough preparation. Ideas offered are substantive and provide good insights as well as direction for the class. Challenges are well substantiated and are persuasively presented in a respectful manner. If the strong contributor person were not a member of the class, the quality of discussion would be diminished considerably.

Adequate Contributor: Contributions in class reflect satisfactory preparation. Ideas offered are sometimes substantive, provide generally useful insights but seldom offer a new direction for the discussion. Challenges are sometimes presented, fairly well substantiated and are sometimes persuasive. If the adequate contributor were not a member of the class, the quality of discussion would be somewhat diminished.

Minimal Contributor: Contributions in class reflect minimal preparation. Ideas offered are occasionally but rarely substantive, and offer repetitive or obvious insights. Challenges are rarely presented, or are not persuasive if presented. If the minimal contributor were not a member of the class, the quality of discussion would diminish only slightly.

Non-Participant: The non-participant says little or nothing in class. Hence, there is not an adequate basis for evaluation. If this person were not a member of the class, the quality of discussion would not be changed.

Unsatisfactory Contributor: Contributions in class reflect inadequate preparation. Ideas offered are seldom substantive, provide few if any insights and are often tangential and off track. Comments are insensitive to other students in the class. If this person were not a member of the class, valuable time would be saved and the comfort level of the class would be elevated.

Guideline for popular press paper (10%): **DUE September 20, before class starts, ON BLACKBOARD**

Examples are provided on Blackboard.

Locate an article in the popular press (e.g., CNN, New York Times, etc.) published within the past 10 years (after 2008) describing an interesting finding related to Developmental Psychology. This could be anything: infants ability to count, influence of parenting (e.g. Tiger Parents! French Parents! Helicopter Parents!), adolescent brains, empathy in primates. Then locate the original source of the findings—the primary source article that originally reported the findings. (That is, the peer reviewed, scientific journal). Write a 3-page paper (APA format) that both summarizes the findings of the scientific article (roughly 1 page) and critiques the pop science article’s report of the findings (roughly 2 pages). Did the popular press article accurately represent the findings? Were any findings misrepresented and/or exaggerated to make it sound more exciting? Try to find an article that is about a specific study, rather than a group of papers, where the linked paper often isn’t discussed enough to provide you with material to write. **Please submit the popular article and the empirical article (links are fine as long as nothing is firewalled) on blackboard as well as your 3 page response. (1 page is a review of the articles, and 2 pages of critique).**

All papers must be double spaced, 12-point font, with pages numbered and 1-inch margins. There should be a separate title page in APA format, and a separate page for references. All references cited in the text must be listed in full in the references section. You should use the APA reference style. Refer to the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, 6th edition. There are many online reference guides, such as the Purdue OWL guide (<http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01/>)

**Guideline for Response Papers (15%)**

**Submit before class, day of class on Blackboard (Response Paper #1, #2, #3)**

You will be required to submit three two-page response papers. I recommend that you do not wait until the last three weeks to submit your papers. You are not allowed to submit a paper for a day that you are presenting in class, nor for the same day you submit a question. Papers should be in APA format (although there is no need for a formal reference section or title page, references within the text are enough), and should be 1 inch margins, 12 pt font, roughly 450-500 words (double spaced).

**It is your responsibility to keep track of how many reaction papers you have submitted across the semester and make sure that 3 are submitted by the last day of class. Each assignment is listed under “Course Work” on Blackboard, and you can upload your file up until the beginning of that day’s class time.**

The reaction papers should discuss 1 or 2 critical issues of interest to you about 1 or more of the week’s readings. Do not spend more than 2-3 sentences summarizing the article. They might include topics such as criticism of the readings and how future research may be able to improve on the work, an important related topic that was not covered by the readings and why it is important to be addressed, an idea for future research following up on the readings, or a way that the research in the readings could be applied to a real-world issue or setting, or other papers/ discussions connected to the class so far.

Papers will be graded on their understanding of the articles assigned and thoughtfulness in their response. You do not have to cite all of the weekly readings. Often, just one point from one of the articles will do. However, these responses are more than just a way to show me that you have read the articles. They are a way to show me that you have thought about the implications of the articles and they way in which the research on this topic has come together towards a common conclusion.

Merely saying “there should have been more participants”, “more gender/ ethnic diversity” or “more socioeconomic diversity” is not enough. You have to tell me *why* these elements are important to the findings and *how* findings might differ across groups.

I will read ONE draft over the course of the semester. Usually, it’s a good idea to send me the draft for your first response. If you would like me to read a draft, please send it by **8am on Sunday/Wednesday**, the day before it’s due. I will have it back to you by **11pm on Sunday/Wednesday** night, giving you Monday/Thursday morning to revise, or decide to wait until another week. I will only do this once, however!

**Rubric:**

0: Does not answer question/ no response/ late response.

1: Does not bring in new thought, does not cite literature from the week. No integration of research and discussion; does not go beyond reporting what is in the text.

2: Partially brings in new thought, does not cite enough literature from the week. No integration of research and discussion; does not go beyond reporting what is in the text.

3: Somewhat goes beyond literature in conclusion only vaguely citing literature from the week. No integration of research and discussion; does not go beyond reporting what is in the text.

4: Comes to some new insight or conclusion, citing literature from the week. Moderate integration of research and discussion, may go beyond reporting what is in the text, but provides little evidence of reflection and thinking of broader implications.

5: Brings up new materials, new insights or strong conclusions, citing literature from the week. Integrates research and discussion; goes beyond reporting what is in the text and provides evidence of reflection and thinking of broader implications.

**Guideline for response questions (5 questions, 1% each).**

**Submit before class, day of class on Blackboard (Weekly Question #1, #2, #3, #4, #5)**

**For classes in which you are not presenting, and are not submitting a paper,** you are required to ***write 2 discussion questions*** related to that week’s readings. It is your responsibility to keep track of how many weeks you have submitted questions across the semester and make sure that you have submitted 5 weeks worth of questions by the last day of class. **Each assignment is listed under “Course Work” on Blackboard, and you can upload your file up until the beginning of that week’s class time (Tuesday or Thursday).** You are encouraged to share your questions during class discussion, and the questions would include the same types of topics as described above for the reaction papers. Again, merely saying there should have been more diversity of gender, SES, or race/ethnicity is not enough. Why, or how this matters should be inherent in the question you propose.

You will receive 1 point for each set of questions that shows a level of thought about the articles assigned that shows you have read all the articles for the week.

**Guideline for Article/research presentation (25%)**

**Please see rubric below for guidance.**

Your class presentation is in the format of an article critique and topic review. Your goal is to take a subtopic in developmental psychology, related to the broad topic for the week, and teach the class. While I have provided an article for you to read, present and review, this is only a **starting point.** You should consider this article to be the first step of many. You should start with the QALMRI method, and move very quickly from there. Of your 25 minutes, spend NO MORE than 5 on the original paper. Assume we have all read it (we all should read it!)

I have purposefully chosen foundational or discussion-changing articles in Developmental Psychology. From this starting point, there are multiple directions you could take. I recommend reading all of the readings for the week before you begin to think about where you could go with your assigned article. You could explore further research from the original lab that goes deeper into detail on the phenomenon. You could find articles that propose alternative theories, find other results, or begin a controversy. You could bring up related topics and how the different processes work together. You could look into the neural correlates of the phenomena. You could look at the development of the phenomena across the lifespan, or across cultures and environments.

Be *creative, thoughtful and thorough*. By the end of your presentation, we should be knowledgeable not only about the article assigned, but several other articles and their contexts, as well as any controversy surrounding the findings. We should be knowledgeable about the general field that this article comes from/founded. Your presentation should last about 25 minutes, and you should cover **at least 2, if not 3** additional studies in addition to the original presentation. Not all studies have to be covered with the same depth of review and analyses; you can go into more or less detail with each article. Of the 25 minutes, **5 minutes** should be guided discussion. Present questions to be answered. Present a question or two you can make sure your fellow students will be able to answer/ think about. You should assume everyone in the class has read the assigned article, but not the follow-ups. The discussion can be all at the end, or can be integrated into the presentation, piece by piece.

In the week or so before your presentation, I **HIGHLY** recommend you set up a meeting with me or come to my office hours. I can give you many more articles to look at, depending on the direction you would like to go, and can make suggestions to ensure your presentation is a successful one! Once you have completed your powerpoint, please upload onto blackboard. You can do this up until class time on the day of your presentation.

**Rubric for class presentation**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|    |  | **Levels of Performance** |
| **Criteria** | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **1. Organization and Clarity**: Articles are on the same topic, appropriate to class, related to section of class. Stayed in time limit. | Articles not related or not appropriate to topic.  | Articles related but not appropriate/ appropriate but not related.  | Articles mostly related or mostly appropriate. <15 min>30min | Articles mostly related, well chosen, go slightly off topic. <20 min>26 min | Articles well chosen, related to each other and the topic. 25 minutes long.  |
| **2. Foundational article summary:** Foundational article is summarized completely and clearly | Summary not given; is vague  | Summary given but not clear, misses key points | Summary mostly clear and covers most of article | Summary clear and covers most of article, importance not recognized. | Summary clear and covers entire article, importance recognized.  |
| **3. Depth of presentation:** Foundational article is used to spark an in depth/wide ranging discussion of material | Discussion is too narrow/ not in depth/ doesn’t come from article. | Discussion is moderately narrow, only tangentially related to article. | Discussion related to article, mostly covers field. | Discussion related to article, builds slightly or only a small range. | Discussion related to article and builds on it to exploring the field. |
| **4. Thoughtfulness of presentation:** Additional material presented clearly and well.  | Additional material not well presented.  | Additional material vague or not clear.  | Additional material presented mostly clear. | Additional material presented clearly and moderately well.  | Additional material presented clearly and well.  |
| **5. Class discussion:** Leading clear and thorough class discussion.  | No class discussion.  | Class barely involved.  | Class moderately involved. Less than 2 minutes.  | Class somewhat involved, moderate discussion, <4 minutes. | Gets class involved, sparks full discussion. Full 5 minutes.  |

*TOTAL: \_\_\_\_/25*

###### **Guideline for Final Essay (35%): Due 12/14/18, 5pm.**

* *Topic approval & Discussion (1%)*
	+ You should attend office hours to check in about your topic at least once before November 6th at classtime, or email me with a possible topic. Once we have discussed it, you can upload onto Blackboard for grading.
* *“One-sentence” Bibliography (2%)*
	+ At least 10 empirical (that means there is data in the article) articles that you plan on referencing as part of your final paper. Below each reference, write a one sentence summary of what the authors found, or why the paper is integral to your topic.
* *Outline (2%)*
	+ A one-page (or more!) outline of the paper, with each of the major sections and the ideas you hope to explore in each section. This can be more complete than an outline, but at least an organization of topics is required.
* *Final Paper (30%)*

All students will be expected to write a final paper that integrates theory and research on some aspect of development. For their final papers, students have a choice of either analyzing additional material on topics that were covered in class or reviewing the literature on a topic that was not addressed in class but is directly relevant to the class material. The final paper can take two forms: either a thorough and integrative literature review that explores and identifies gaps in the literature or a study proposal to answer an outstanding question in the literature. Thus, select a question or a developmental issue that is of particular interest to you and explore the current research literature (as defined by articles in developmental or closely related developmental research journals). The journal articles selected should provide empirical data related to your topic and/or question.

Topics for final papers must be approved by me, and there are a series of due dates before the final due date to ensure you are keeping up with your paper. The paper must be on developmental issues, within social, emotional, or cognitive development. The paper should be typed, double spaced, and 20 pages in length. Title page, abstract, and references do not count in the 20 page limit. Grades on the final paper will be based on the quality of writing, the thoughtfulness of the paper, and on how well developmental theory and research are integrated. No late papers accepted.

The paper should have the following components:

* Title Page
* Abstract (200 words) (on a separate page)
* Body of the paper: Begin with statement of the question, then review the evidence (which may include evidence favoring conflicting views), then come to a conclusion about what the evidence you have reviewed shows. Use subheadings to separate major parts of the paper, including one called “Conclusions”. (This is the 20 pages).
* References (starting on a new page)

You should aim for **at least 10 references**, and **at least 8** of these should be ***empirical studies*** in journals. How should you find your references?

* Search through the reference lists at the end of the articles on this topic that are assigned for this class.
* Do an electronic search using PsycInfo or Google Scholar. If you click on “view record” you can read the abstract and decide if the article is relevant for your paper.

All references that are cited in your paper must be read. It is not acceptable to cite a source that you have found cited in a primary source. If you cite it, you must read the primary source.

For this paper, you will follow APA *Publication Manual* (Sixth Edition) in terms of style, referencing, etc.: <http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01/>

#### Outlines help make your paper better

After you have read all of the articles you plan to include as sources, write yourself a detailed outline. The outline should include the arguments of each of your references. For example, if your paper is about whether the object concept is present earlier than Piaget claimed, your outline must specify which sources you will review that claim YES, and which you will review that claim NO. Look at your outline carefully to be sure that the structure of your paper follows a logical progression. If your outline is good, the paper will almost write itself.

**Topics:**

You can write on any topic we have covered in class, but there are many other topics within development that we do not touch on. The key is to pick a topic you are inherently interested in, that is both broad enough that there is empirical literature to review for 20 pages, and narrow enough that you can take a “deep dive” into the research. I encourage you to use this as part of a literature review for your dissertation, comps preparation, etc!

For example, you could also write on:

* Children’s trust in testimony
* Children’s understanding of essences
* Children’s artistic development/ the role of the arts in development
* The development of memory
* The development of executive functioning
* The effects of media engagement on children
* Prenatal development and academic achievement
* Bilingualism
* Parenting practices and cognitive/social outcomes
* The development of sexual and gender identity
* The effects of nature and nature on a particular cognitive development
* Morality and its origins
* Self regulation and its relationship to emotion regulation
* Daycare and stay at home parent care in cognitive and social development
* The development of the understanding of death

**Rubric for Final Paper**

\_\_\_\_\_\_ /1pt: Topic Approval and Discussion

\_\_\_\_\_\_/2pts: Bibliography on 10 papers

0: Late/ < 6 Papers/ Not real summary sentences

1: 6-9 Papers/ Papers not on same topic/ Summaries incomplete

2: 10 Papers, all on same topic, with complete 1 sentence summaries

\_\_\_\_\_\_ /2pts: Outline of paper

 0: Late, no sections, no ideas

 1: Less than one page, or sections but no ideas

2: One page or more outline, with each major section and ideas for each section

\_\_\_\_\_\_ /30pts: Final Paper (***See rubric below***)

Total: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_/35 pts

Additional points (subsumed under point #6 below):

 No APA formatting -5pts

Major APA formatting errors -3pts

 Minor APA formatting errors -1pt

 Fewer than 19 pages -3pts

 More than 21 pages -3pts

 More than 3 spelling/ grammatical errors -5pts

For 30 points:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Criteria | Point Distribution |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1) Organization, Clarity, Writing style | Thesis of paper unclear or missing | Thesis of paper vague, paper disorganized | Thesis of paper ambiguous, paper moderately organized | Thesis of paper moderately clear, paper somewhat organized | Clear thesis of paper, with organized topics around thesis |
| 2) Literature choice/ Why topic is relevant for study | Papers unrelated to each other, no relevance given | Papers reviewed not really related, passing relevance given | Papers reviewed somewhat related, weak relevance given | Papers reviewed related, moderate relevance given | Papers reviewed clearly related to each other, strong relevance given |
| 3) Review 1: Critique, Commentary and Insights from literature review | Papers reviewed without critique, commentary, or insight | Papers reviewed with only passing critique and commentary | Papers reviewed with good critiques and commentary, but no real insight | Papers reviewed with good critiques and commentary, only passing insight | Papers reviewed with thorough and insightful critiques and commentary |
| 4) Review 2: Tell a story throughout the literature review | Papers do not build on each other, no story given | Papers don’t really build on each other, don’t tell a strong story | Papers somewhat build on each other, could lead to conclusions but not strongly | Papers are somewhat organized and tell a moderately related story, or only moderately lead to conclusions | Papers are organized to tell a story, build on each other, and lead to conclusions |
| 5) Conclusions | Conclusions not based on papers, or direct copies of conclusions already made | Conclusions directly from papers without insight | Conclusions based on papers, does not present new theory or idea | Conclusions build somewhat on papers, presents moderately new idea | Conclusions go beyond any one paper to build a new theory or idea for the field |
| 6) Technical points | Major pervasive errors in spelling, grammar, formatting | Major (5+) errors in spelling, grammar or formatting | Minor (4-5) errors in spelling, grammar or formatting | Only 1 or 2 errors in spelling, grammar or formatting | No errors in spelling, grammar or formatting |

\*If you are proposing a new study, the grading of that study will be included in the grading of the literature reviews and conclusion sections.

**Listing of Journals**

**\*Research in Developmental Psychology:**

#### British Journal of Child Psychology

#### British Journal of Developmental Psychology

#### Child Development

Child Development Perspectives

Cognitive Development

Development and Psychopathology

Developmental Psychology

Developmental Science

Human Development

Infant Behavior and Development

Infant Mental Health Journal

International Journal of Behavioral Development

Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology

Journal of Adolescence

Journal of Child and Family Psychology

Journal of Child Language

Journal of Clinical Child Psychology

Journal of Cognition and Development

Journal of Cognitive Development

Journal of Early Adolescence

Journal of Early Childhood and Infant Psychology

Journal of Educational Psychology

Journal of Experimental Child Psychology

Journal of Research on Adolescents

Journal of School Psychology

Social Development

**\*Reviews of Research/Theory in Developmental Psychology:**

Developmental Review

Psychological Bulletin

Psychological Review

Review of Educational Research

**\*These journals are not Developmental Psychology journals, but occasionally publish articles relating to Developmental Psychology**

Cognition

Cognition and Emotion

Emotion

Imagination, Cognition and Personality

Nature

Journal of the American Medical Association

Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning and Cognition

Journal of Experimental Social Psychology

Journal of Research in Personality

Journal of Personality

Motivation and Emotion

Psychological Science

Science